

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272547
Document Title:	Erin Matthew Byrne Comments - Corby Project should only move forward on county approved industrial site
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Erin Matthew Byrne
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/11/2026 9:15:58 AM
Docketed Date:	9/11/2026

Comment Received From: Erin Matthew Byrne
Submitted On: 9/11/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

Corby Project should only move forward on county approved industrial site

I believe a few years ago we were in the same community room voicing our opinions against a similar project called Menard. It was located a few thousand feet from my home in the north village community.

We voiced our concerns. The city listened. They came up with standards in order to balance the benefit against harm. They understood that more would have to be done in order to fully understand the long term impact of these projects.

The city came up with standards required for battery projects in and around Vacaville. This was a clear message to businesses that wanted to develop that they would have to meet a standard that the community collectively required.

With this project specifically , a recommended alternative site seems to meet everyone's needs including the energy companies. Even if more development at that site is needed, it's already properly zoned. It's not agricultural land. Now this company wants to override both our standards and zoning to increase their profit margins.

Why are we as a community tasked with proffering to this commission to do the obvious thing? I don't understand why we have to beg people in power to prioritize our safety over corporate interests.

The issue isn't that people in Vacaville are anti clean energy. They are anti incompetency. Many people at the meeting pointed out serious issues with the EIR report including miscalculations. This is unacceptable as an energy commission that has the power to override city ordinances and laws.

I don't believe the energy commission has done its due diligence. The commission must remind itself that it must find that there is no more prudent and feasible means of achieving the public convenience and necessity.

This clearly doesn't meet this standard.