

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272402
Document Title:	Danielle Rupprecht Comments - COMMENTS REGARDING DEFICIENCIES IN THE LAMBIE INDUSTRIAL PARK ELECTRICAL CAPABILITY AND INTERCONNECTION ANALYSIS
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Danielle Rupprecht
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/10/2026 6:02:44 AM
Docketed Date:	9/10/2026

Comment Received From: Danielle Rupprecht
Submitted On: 9/10/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

**COMMENTS REGARDING DEFICIENCIES IN THE LAMBIE
INDUSTRIAL PARK ELECTRICAL CAPABILITY AND
INTERCONNECTION ANALYSIS**

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

COMMENTS REGARDING DEFICIENCIES IN THE LAMBIE INDUSTRIAL PARK ELECTRICAL CAPABILITY AND INTERCONNECTION ANALYSIS

Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project (24-OPT-05)

These comments address a material deficiency in the Staff Assessment’s evaluation of the Lambie Industrial Park Alternative: the electrical capability and point-of-interconnection analysis does not reconcile Corby’s assertions concerning Vaca-Dixon with contrary information contained in the Staff Assessment itself and in the transmission-system record. These comments do not suggest that Lambie currently has 300 MW of available interconnection capacity or that Corby could connect there without further study or possible upgrades. Rather, they raise a more basic question: whether the record supports the assumption that locating the Project at Lambie would necessarily require construction of a new approximately 13- to 14-mile 230-kV gen-tie to Vaca-Dixon.

The distinction is important. The record establishes that Lambie is not merely an industrial property near distribution service. The Staff Assessment identifies the PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station as the proposed point of interconnection for two separate 400-MW BESS projects in the California ISO generation queue—each larger than the 300-MW Corby Project. Yet Staff’s Lambie analysis proceeds from the assumption that a BESS located at Lambie must physically connect to Vaca-Dixon by a new approximately 14-mile gen-tie. The Staff Assessment does not reconcile those two propositions.

I. Corby Concedes That the Lambie Site Can Physically Accommodate the Same 300-MW / 1,200-MWh BESS

In Data Response Set #4, dated October 3, 2025 (TN 266307), CEC Staff specifically requested the size, megawatt capacity, substation/switching-station details, gen-tie information, project-objective information, and other development considerations for Lambie Industrial Park. (Data Response Set #4, pp. 5-6.)

Corby responded that a 25-acre Lambie site would be sufficient to construct a BESS facility of the same size and capacity as the proposed Project—300 MW / 1,200 MWh—and would include the same BESS array, on-site substation, access roads, water tank, gen-tie, and ancillary facilities. (Data Response Set #4, p. 5.) This is an express applicant concession that the Lambie site is physically capable of accommodating the full Corby BESS facility.

The Staff Assessment independently accepts the same premise. It describes Lambie Industrial Park as approximately 1,461 acres, designated Industrial and zoned Manufacturing General, and states that approximately 25 acres would meet the applicant’s minimum acreage requirement for a 300-MW BESS. Staff further states that the BESS can be sited to avoid underground natural-gas pipelines. (Staff Assessment, pp. 8-36 to 8-37.)

II. The 13-Mile Gen-Tie Assumes That Vaca-Dixon Remains the Point of Interconnection

Corby’s Data Response does not identify an electrical study concluding that a 300-MW BESS located at Lambie could not interconnect through the existing transmission facilities at or near Lambie. Instead, the response retains Vaca-Dixon as the Project’s point of interconnection and then measures the distance from Lambie to Vaca-Dixon.

Corby states that a BESS located at Lambie would therefore require a gen-tie of “at least 13 miles,” measured point-to-point, and that the actual route could be longer because of land-ownership and right-of-way constraints. Corby also states that the depicted point-to-point route would cross 59 parcels. (Data Response Set #4, p. 5.)

On the following page, Corby states that Vaca-Dixon is the “only high-voltage transmission substation within 50 miles” and discusses its existing Energy Storage Agreements, interconnection arrangement, schedule, and the consequences of changing its existing point of interconnection. (Data Response Set #4, p. 6.)

Those considerations may explain why Corby prefers to retain Vaca-Dixon as its existing point of interconnection. What is less clear from the response is why they establish that a BESS physically located at Lambie must connect to Vaca-Dixon by a new 13- to 14-mile gen-tie, particularly when the Staff Assessment itself identifies the PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station as the proposed point of interconnection for two 400-MW BESS projects.

II. Staff’s Own Table 8-2 Identifies Lambie Switching Station as a PG&E Point of Interconnection for Two 400-MW BESS Projects

The Staff Assessment contains directly relevant contrary information. At page 8-32, Table 8-2 identifies proposed BESS projects in the California ISO generation queue and expressly identifies the following:

- Tolenas — 400 MW — projected online February 18, 2031 — “Interconnect to Lambie Switching Station (owned by PG&E).”
- Brushy — 400 MW — projected online February 18, 2031 — “Interconnect to Lambie Switching Station (owned by PG&E).”

The source identified by Staff for Table 8-2 is “California ISO 2026.” (Staff Assessment, p. 8-32.) Each of those proposed BESS projects is 100 MW larger than the 300-MW Corby Project.

A CAISO queue entry does not, standing alone, establish that 400 MW of unused transmission capacity is presently available or that either queued project will ultimately be constructed. It does establish, however, that the PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station is recognized and being used in the CAISO interconnection process as a point of interconnection for utility-scale BESS projects of at least the same order of magnitude as Corby. That fact is directly relevant to Corby’s assertion that Vaca-Dixon is the only high-voltage transmission substation within 50 miles and to Staff’s assumption that Lambie necessarily requires a dedicated 14-mile physical connection to Vaca-Dixon.

III. The Staff Assessment Does Not Reconcile Its Own Contrary Electrical Evidence

The internal inconsistency is apparent when the Staff Assessment is read as a whole:

- At pp. 8-20 to 8-21, Staff accepts the applicant’s stated siting requirement that an alternative site be able to connect to Vaca-Dixon under the applicant’s existing interconnection agreements.
- At p. 8-32, Staff identifies two separate 400-MW BESS projects whose POI is the PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station.

- At pp. 8-36 to 8-37, Staff nevertheless assumes that a BESS located at Lambie must build a new approximately 14-mile 230-kV gen-tie to Vaca-Dixon and evaluates the environmental consequences of that assumed line.

The analysis does not explain how Staff reconciled Corby's statement that Vaca-Dixon is the only high-voltage transmission substation within 50 miles with Staff's own identification of a PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station serving as the proposed POI for two 400-MW BESS projects. Nor does the alternatives analysis identify substantial evidence establishing that Lambie Switching Station is electrically unavailable to a 300-MW BESS as a matter of transmission capability.

IV. The Existing 230-kV Transmission Record Further Demonstrates That Lambie Is a Transmission-System Node

California ISO transmission-planning records identify the Vaca Dixon-Lambie and Lambie-Birds Landing 230-kV circuits as components of the regional transmission system. In the 2008 Transmission Plan, CAISO approved reconductoring of the Vaca Dixon-Peabody, Vaca Dixon-Lambie, and Lambie-Birds Landing 230-kV lines with 1113 ACSS conductor or equivalent as a reliability project. (California ISO, 2008 Transmission Plan, Project No. 25, Vaca Dixon-Birds Landing 230-kV Line Reconductoring, Appendix B, p. 144.)

CAISO explained that the project addressed contingency overloads and anticipated increasing transmission loading associated with new generating facilities. More recent CAISO local-capacity and transmission-planning materials continue to identify the Lambie Switching Station-Vaca Dixon 230-kV tie as part of the Greater Bay Area transmission boundary.

This record does not prove that Corby can interconnect 300 MW at Lambie without upgrades. It does, however, confirm that Lambie is an established 230-kV transmission switching point embedded in the same regional transmission network—not an electrically isolated site for which Vaca-Dixon is self-evidently the only possible transmission interconnection.

V. Corby's Material Modification Assertion Does Not Establish Electrical Infeasibility

Corby states that its Energy Storage Agreements require delivery of 300 MW for four hours specifically to Vaca-Dixon, that a POI change would require a CAISO Material Modification Assessment, and that CAISO “will only approve MMAs if it is conclusively determined that the proposed POI change improves interconnection costs and benefits.” (Data Response Set #4, p. 6.)

Current CAISO Generator Management guidance does not appear to state the categorical standard described by Corby. CAISO's BPM distinguishes among types and timing of POI modifications. For certain qualifying POI modifications, CAISO and the Participating Transmission Owner may approve the modification where it either improves or does not adversely affect the costs and benefits of interconnection, including reliability, and the proposed change can be accommodated. Other POI changes are evaluated through the applicable material-modification process and may constitute a Material Modification under the tariff and BPM. The published guidance therefore does not appear to support the broader proposition that CAISO will approve a POI change only upon a conclusive determination that it affirmatively “improves” interconnection costs and benefits. (California ISO, BPM for Generator Management, current published version, provisions addressing Point of Interconnection modifications and Material Modification Assessments.)

Corby's queue position, LGIA, ESAs, commercial schedule, and possible need for an MMA may be relevant to commercial or procedural feasibility. Those considerations may bear on ultimate feasibility and must be evaluated as such. They do not substitute for an electrical analysis of the Lambie transmission configuration, nor do they establish that the assumed 14-mile physical gen-tie is technically necessary. They likewise do not establish that Lambie lacks the electrical capability to serve as a transmission-level BESS location. Those concepts should not be conflated.

VI. Applicable Electrical and Transmission Standards Underscore the Missing Evidentiary Link

The Staff Assessment's Transmission System Engineering section recognizes that transmission facilities must conform to CPUC General Order 95 or the National Electrical Safety Code, California High Voltage Electrical Safety Orders, California ISO standards, the National Electrical Code, and related industry standards. Staff also requires signed and sealed electrical one-line diagrams, engineering descriptions, interconnection approvals for project modifications, and professional-engineer verification. (Staff Assessment, pp. 4.3-16 to 4.3-17.)

PG&E likewise directs transmission-connected generation through the applicable CAISO interconnection process and transmission requirements. For a utility-scale inverter-based resource, interconnection capability can turn on such matters as thermal loading, voltage performance, short-circuit duty, transient/dynamic stability, protection and control, reactive capability, affected-system impacts, network upgrades, and deliverability status.

The Lambie alternatives discussion identifies no project-specific electrical engineering determination demonstrating that Lambie Switching Station cannot accommodate a 300-MW BESS, even with ordinary interconnection facilities or network upgrades. More importantly for the adequacy of the EIR, it does not reconcile that omission with Staff's own identification of two 400-MW BESS projects proposing to interconnect at Lambie.

That distinction is particularly relevant because the Corby project had already been advanced through the local permitting and interconnection process before the Applicant elected the CEC opt-in pathway. Public records establish that the Applicant previously pursued a Solano County use permit for the Corby project and later elected the AB 205 opt-in process before the CEC. Solano County itself describes the AB 205 process as allowing eligible developers to bypass the County's local permitting ordinance. The electrical alternatives analysis should therefore distinguish technical limitations of an alternative site from advantages attributable to the procedural and engineering history of the Applicant's preferred site and POI.

VII. The Electrical Comparison Does Not Account for Existing and Planned Vaca-Dixon Interconnection Infrastructure

The Lambie alternatives discussion does not identify a comparable engineering evaluation of the interconnection facilities or network upgrades that would actually be required for a 300-MW BESS interconnecting through the existing Lambie 230-kV transmission node. The record therefore does not permit a comparison of the actual Vaca-Dixon interconnection work with the actual Lambie interconnection work. Nor does it distinguish disadvantages inherent in Lambie's

electrical characteristics from cost, schedule, or procedural disadvantages resulting from the Applicant's prior advancement of its preferred Vaca-Dixon interconnection.

Separate from those network upgrades, the Applicant identifies facilities to be installed specifically for Corby, including a new 230-kV double-bus bay and associated equipment within Vaca-Dixon, together with PG&E-owned interconnection facilities. Thus, the proposed Vaca-Dixon interconnection itself depends upon new and modified PG&E transmission infrastructure; it is not an upgrade-free existing interconnection against which Lambie can be compared.

The proposed Project likewise does not interconnect with Vaca-Dixon without new and modified transmission facilities. The Applicant states that PG&E is "currently performing network upgrades" at Vaca-Dixon "[t]o accommodate the interconnection of the Project and other future projects." Those activities include grading, concrete pads, relocation of existing structures, and relocation of structures supporting the existing Vaca-Plainfield 60-kV transmission line. The Applicant further states that the relocated structures are being designed to accommodate equipment modifications at Vaca-Dixon and to permit the existing 60-kV line to cross beneath the proposed Corby 230-kV gen-tie. (Project Description Update #2, § 2.7.)

VIII. Lambie Was Identified as a BESS Siting Alternative During Solano County's BESS Regulatory Process Beginning in 2024

Lambie Industrial Park had been identified as a potential location for a BESS well before the Staff Assessment was published. Solano County's records show that Lambie was being discussed as an alternative location as early as 2024. The County imposed an interim moratorium on new front-of-the-meter BESS facilities on January 23, 2024, and formed a Technical Working Group in March 2024 that included emergency-response, hazardous-materials, agricultural, industry, and public representatives. The County reports that the group met with national experts, including the National Fire Protection Association and Underwriters Laboratories, concerning BESS best practices, fire protection, and impact mitigation. (Solano County Board of Supervisors, File No. 25-905, Nov. 4, 2025 Agenda Submittal.)

At the County Planning Division's July 18, 2024 public BESS workshop, residents raised concerns about BESS facilities near homes and schools, particularly near the Vaca-Dixon Substation. The County's later staff report specifically records that many participants suggested alternative locations such as Lambie Industrial Park as a way to maintain grid connectivity while avoiding residential-proximity concerns. (Ibid.) Thus, Lambie was being identified in the County's BESS siting process more than a year before Corby's October 3, 2025 Data Response Set #4.

The County's regulatory process continued. On August 12, 2025, County staff presented a draft permanent BESS ordinance addressing siting standards, agricultural-land protections, setbacks, and emergency-response measures. On August 26, 2025, the Board amended its interim ordinance to lift the moratorium for front-of-the-meter BESS projects in specified Manufacturing and Industrial zoning districts, while retaining the moratorium in other zoning districts. County

staff explained that specific new safety, siting, and operational standards could be applied in the Manufacturing and Industrial districts and that BESS siting elsewhere presented more complex threats to human health, safety, and welfare. (Solano County Board of Supervisors, File No. 25-706, Aug. 26, 2025.)

On November 4, 2025, the Board adopted Zone Text Amendment ZT-25-02 establishing permanent BESS-specific land-use, siting, safety, setback, technical-review, impact-mitigation, permitting, and decommissioning standards. The County limited front-of-the-meter BESS facilities to specified Manufacturing, Industrial, and Commercial zoning districts and prohibited them in Agricultural, Residential, Resource Conservation, and Park zoning districts. The County described these districts as presenting the most conducive environment for safe BESS placement consistent with the General Plan and expressly identified protection of agricultural land among the ordinance’s purposes. (Solano County Board of Supervisors, File No. 25-905, Nov. 4, 2025.)

The County then carried Lambie directly into the CEC proceeding. In its November 19, 2025 scoping comments on the Corby Project, Solano County expressly stated that the Draft EIR “must analyze the Lambie Industrial Park” as an alternative site and identified it as approximately 1,461 acres with an Industrial land-use designation and Manufacturing General zoning. The County also cautioned that alternatives should not be rejected based on conclusory economic claims, costs to the project proponent, or contractual obligations, and stated that the environmental effects of a longer gen-tie should be weighed in the comparison. (County of Solano, Scoping Comments for Corby BESS Project, Nov. 19, 2025, TN 267642, p. 2.)

This history is relevant to the electrical-capability analysis because Lambie was not a late-arriving alternative. It had been specifically identified during the County’s BESS siting process as a location that could maintain grid connectivity while reducing residential-proximity concerns. By October 2025, CEC Staff had specifically required Corby to address Lambie in Data Response Set #4. Yet the resulting electrical comparison does not identify a comparable engineering analysis of a 300-MW BESS interconnecting through the existing Lambie 230-kV transmission node. Instead, it retains Corby’s previously selected and preferred Vaca-Dixon POI and attributes to Lambie the environmental, right-of-way, cost, and schedule consequences of an approximately 13- to 14-mile gen-tie to that location.

The County record also provides context for the Applicant’s change in permitting pathway. Solano County records state that the County received a use-permit application in June 2023 for a proposed BESS facility on Exclusive Agriculture (A-40) land and later developed BESS-specific regulations while the moratorium was in place. County materials also recognize AB 205’s alternative CEC opt-in permitting process and the potential for applicants to bypass the local permitting process. This history does not itself establish the electrical feasibility of Lambie, but it makes the distinction between technical infeasibility and advantages arising from the Applicant’s previously advanced Vaca-Dixon configuration particularly important. (Solano County Board of Supervisors, File Nos. 25-652 and 25-905.)

IX. Staff Itself Concludes That a Long Gen-Tie Does Not Render Lambie Infeasible

Even under Staff's assumed 14-mile Vaca-Dixon connection, Staff expressly states that the longer gen-tie "would not render the alternative infeasible." (Staff Assessment, pp. 8-37 to 8-38.) Staff further acknowledges that the CEC has approved other energy projects with similar or longer gen-tie lines traversing mixed agricultural, industrial, and residential areas. (Id. at p. 8-38.)

Staff also concludes that Lambie meets the applicant's minimum site-size requirement, can support the 300-MW project and ancillary facilities, and would attain the Project objectives of supporting grid stability and efficient use of renewable energy. (Staff Assessment, p. 8-37.) Staff notes that the applicant's preferred one- to two-mile gen-tie distance is not an absolute feasibility limitation and may be exceeded when doing so permits development at a site with fewer impacts to sensitive resources. (Ibid.)

X. CEQA Requires an Alternatives Analysis Supported by Evidence Rather Than an Unreconciled Applicant Assumption

CEQA requires an EIR to describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21002, 21081; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15126.6(a), (f).) If the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative location exists, the EIR must disclose the reasons for that conclusion. (Guidelines, § 15126.6(f)(2).)

An EIR must provide decisionmakers and the public with sufficient analysis to permit informed comparison rather than merely accept an applicant's preferred project configuration as the baseline for determining alternative feasibility. (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 404; Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 566, 575.) Alternatives may not be rejected merely because they are less attractive to the project proponent or would require alteration of the proposed project's configuration. (See Preservation Action Council v. City of San Jose (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 1336, 1353.)

Here, the Staff Assessment identifies significant and unavoidable visual impacts from placing industrial-appearing BESS and transmission facilities in the proposed rural agricultural setting. (Staff Assessment, § 5.15; § 11.1.) The adequacy of the Lambie analysis is therefore consequential. An alternative located in an industrially designated area and farther from sensitive receptors cannot be evaluated through a transmission assumption that is materially at odds with electrical-system information elsewhere in the same EIR without explanation.

XI. Deficiencies and Unresolved Record Questions

The present record therefore raises the following unresolved issues. These questions identify the evidentiary deficiencies in the published Staff Assessment; they are not intended to prescribe how Staff should cure them:

1. What significance did Staff assign to Corby's statement that Vaca-Dixon is the "only high-voltage transmission substation within 50 miles," given Staff's own identification of the PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station as a 230-kV POI for two 400-MW BESS projects?
2. What substantial evidence supports treating a new approximately 13- to 14-mile physical gen-tie to Vaca-Dixon as a necessary feature of the Lambie Alternative rather than as a

consequence of retaining the applicant’s existing preferred POI and commercial arrangement?

3. What electrical engineering evidence did Staff rely upon in determining that interconnection of the 300-MW Lambie Alternative through the Lambie 230-kV transmission node was not a configuration warranting analysis?
4. How does Staff reconcile the conclusion that Lambie requires a 14-mile gen-tie with CAISO transmission records identifying the Vaca Dixon-Lambie 230-kV circuit and Staff’s own identification of 400-MW BESS projects interconnecting at Lambie?
5. To what extent is Staff’s rejection or downgrading of Lambie based on physical/electrical infeasibility, as distinguished from the applicant’s existing ESAs, LGIA, queue position, schedule, site-control preference, or desire to retain Vaca-Dixon?
6. What evidence supports Corby’s characterization of the CAISO POI-modification standard, including its statement that a POI change is approved only if it “conclusively” improves interconnection costs and benefits, in light of CAISO’s published Generator Management guidance?
7. How can the environmental consequences attributed to a 14-mile gen-tie serve as a basis for comparing Lambie with the proposed Project where the necessity of that particular physical transmission configuration has not been reconciled with the contrary transmission evidence contained in the Staff Assessment itself?
8. What transmission configuration did Staff evaluate to determine whether a 300-MW BESS located within Lambie Industrial Park could interconnect through the existing Lambie 230-kV transmission node, including any necessary interconnection facilities or network upgrades, rather than through a new approximately 14-mile dedicated gen-tie to Vaca-Dixon?
9. How did Staff compare the new and modified PG&E transmission facilities associated with the proposed Vaca-Dixon interconnection with the interconnection facilities and network upgrades, if any, that would be required for a 300-MW BESS interconnecting through the existing Lambie 230-kV transmission node?
10. To what extent do the asserted cost or schedule disadvantages attributed to Lambie result from electrical or physical limitations at Lambie, as distinguished from the Applicant’s prior advancement of engineering, interconnection studies, agreements, queue position, and PG&E planning for its preferred Vaca-Dixon POI?
11. Given that Lambie Industrial Park had been identified in Solano County’s BESS siting process as early as July 2024 as an alternative that could maintain grid connectivity while reducing residential-proximity concerns, what electrical analysis was performed to evaluate that alternative on its own transmission configuration rather than by retaining Vaca-Dixon as the POI?

12. How did Staff distinguish disadvantages inherent in Lambie itself from cost, schedule, or procedural disadvantages resulting from the Applicant’s prior advancement of its preferred Vaca-Dixon interconnection and permitting path?

XII. Conclusion

The present record does not support a categorical conclusion that Lambie Industrial Park lacks the electrical capability to accommodate a 300-MW Corby BESS. Corby concedes that the site can physically accommodate the full 300-MW / 1,200-MWh facility. The Staff Assessment identifies an existing PG&E-owned Lambie Switching Station and, more significantly, identifies two 400-MW BESS projects in the CAISO queue proposing that station as their point of interconnection. CAISO transmission-planning records also identify Lambie as part of the regional 230-kV transmission system.

Nevertheless, Staff’s environmental comparison assumes that Lambie necessarily requires a new approximately 14-mile 230-kV gen-tie to Vaca-Dixon. The Staff Assessment does not reconcile that assumption with its own contrary transmission evidence and does not identify substantial electrical engineering evidence establishing that a 300-MW interconnection at Lambie is technically unavailable. Because the assumed 14-mile line drives several of Staff’s adverse comparisons of Lambie, that unreconciled premise is material to the adequacy of the alternatives analysis and to the administrative record.

Sincerely,

Danielle Rupprecht

Solano County Resident

Authorities and Record Materials Cited

- California Energy Commission, Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project Staff Assessment, TN 271468 (July 15, 2026), especially pp. 4.3-16–4.3-17, 8-20–8-21, 8-32, and 8-36–8-38.
- Tetra Tech / Applicant, Data Response Set #4, TN 266307 (Oct. 3, 2025), especially pp. 5–7.
- California ISO, 2008 Transmission Plan, Project No. 25, Vaca Dixon–Birds Landing 230-kV Line Reconductoring, Appendix B, p. 144.
- California ISO, BPM for Generator Management, current published version, provisions governing Point of Interconnection changes and Material Modification Assessments.
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company, transmission-generation interconnection and operating requirements, including Section G3.
- Applicant, Project Description Update #2, § 2.7 (Vaca-Dixon network upgrades and Corby-specific interconnection facilities).
- Solano County, Battery Energy Storage Systems materials and County legislative record concerning Corby and the AB 205 opt-in process.

- Solano County Board of Supervisors, File No. 25-905, BESS Ordinance / Zone Text Amendment ZT-25-02, Agenda Submittal and adopted ordinance (Nov. 4, 2025), including County history of the July 18, 2024 public workshop and BESS regulatory process.
- Solano County Board of Supervisors, File No. 25-706, Amendment No. 1 to Interim Ordinance No. 2024-1852-U-E (Aug. 26, 2025).
- Solano County Board of Supervisors, File No. 25-652, Draft BESS Ordinance presentation and Board direction (Aug. 12, 2025).
- County of Solano, Scoping Comments for Corby BESS Project (Nov. 19, 2025), TN 267642, especially p. 2 (Alternatives Analysis and Lambie Industrial Park).
- Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21002, 21081.
- Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15126.6.
- Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376.
- Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553.
- Preservation Action Council v. City of San Jose (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 1336.