

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272446
Document Title:	Jeffrey J Jaeckel Comments - Opposition to Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Jeffrey J Jaeckel
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/10/2026 8:09:34 AM
Docketed Date:	9/10/2026

Comment Received From: Jeffrey J Jaeckel
Submitted On: 9/10/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

Opposition to Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

To the Honorable Members of the Commission;

My name is Robin Jaeckel, and I am a resident of Vacaville. I am submitting this statement to voice my strong opposition to the proposed Corby Battery Energy Storage System project. While the state pursues clean energy goals, they must not be achieved by sacrificing the economic security, safety, and property values of local homeowners.

The official California Energy Commission (CEC) Staff Assessment explicitly confirms that this project will cause **Significant and Unavoidable impacts** to our community. We must look closely at how these findings translate directly into severe, localized property value losses.

Permanent Visual Degradation: The CEC Staff Assessment directly concludes that this project will “substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.” In real estate, aesthetic appeal is directly tied to market value. Forcing an industrial-scale footprint onto 40 acres of rural agricultural land permanently damages the visual environment, creating an unavoidable aesthetic discount for nearby homes.

Industrialization of Residential Buffers: By introducing heavy utility infrastructure near our neighborhoods, this project fundamentally alters our local market dynamics. Buyers looking for rural or suburban peace will cross these neighborhoods off of their lists. This shrinks our local buyer pool, increases the days a home sits on the market, and drives localized prices downward.

The Burden of Mandatory Disclosures:

Under California law, home sellers must legally disclose proximity to high-risk industrial utilities. Future buyers will be explicitly warned about this massive battery facility. This mandatory disclosure codifies a permanent “Market Stigma.” Potential buyers will demand steep price discounts-or walk away entirely-due to the well-documented anxieties surrounding “thermal runaway” fires, toxic gas releases, and explosions seen at similar facilities across the state.

Uninsurability and Escalate Carrying Costs:

The added risk of an industrial hazard zone near residential structures threatens our ability to secure affordable homeowners’ insurance. As California’s insurance market remains incredibly strained, introducing and industrial fire risk will drive premiums higher or make policies entirely unobtainable for nearby parcels. High insurance costs directly reduce what a buyer can afford to pay for a home.

While macro-level industry studies often claim that battery projects do not impact broad real estate markets across an entire county, those studies hide the devastating micro-level reality. The properties on the immediate border of this project-along the city and county lines, will bear the full, concentrated brunt of this financial damage.

The CEC Staff Assessment admits that even with proposed mitigation strategies, the damage to our local character remains **unavoidable**. It is unjust to ask local families to absorb permanent property devaluation and financial loss for a utility project. I urge the Commission to reject the current site and protect our community’s equity, safety, and future.

I have questions:

1. What steps will be taken to prevent an “aesthetic discount” on nearby residential market values? Will the CEC or Corby be paying residents for financial loss due to this Corby Battery Energy Storage project should it be authorized by you, the CEC?
2. What economic studies did the CEC use to assess the micro-level reality of property devaluation on the immediate city and county borders?
3. How will the CEC plan to protect residential buffers from being permanently altered by heavy utility infrastructure?
4. How will the CEC mitigate the “Permanent Visual Degradation”?
5. How will the CEC address the permanent ‘Market Stigma’ created by mandatory proximity disclosures under California Law?
6. How will the CEC ensure that nearby homeowners can secure affordable homeowners’ insurance in an already strained California market?
7. Who will absorb the carrying costs if local property insurance premiums spike or policies become unobtainable due to the industrial fire risk?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jeff Jaeckel, Willow rd. Vacaville resident