

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272629
Document Title:	Robin Jaeckel Comments - Opposition to Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Robin Jaeckel
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/11/2026 5:17:59 PM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

Comment Received From: Robin Jaeckel
Submitted On: 9/11/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

Opposition to Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

To the Honorable siting Commissioners:

I am writing to formally submit my strong opposition to the certification of the Corby Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Project (Docket No. 24-OPT-05). While I recognize the state's energy storage objectives, this massive industrial facility is fundamentally incompatible with the quiet, rural agricultural character of the Solano County community. The introduction of continuous, intrusive mechanical noise from 341 BESS enclosure cooling units, 114 inverters, and major substation transformers will permanently degrade the local acoustic environment and threaten the quality of life for nearby residents.

The Staff Assessment establishes that the existing baseline environment is a low-density rural agricultural area. Siting an industrial project with up to 341 self-contained battery enclosures—each requiring constant, active liquid cooling and HVAC thermal management systems—creates an unprecedented noise footprint. This continuous mechanical hum, combined with the low-frequency hum from the step-up transformers and current limiting reactors at the 1.85-acre project substation, represents a severe multi-source noise intrusion that will operate 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

Furthermore, this heavy industrial infrastructure is being placed unacceptably close to established, noise-sensitive residential receptors. The assessment notes that the nearest residential receptor (REC01) sits a mere 90 feet north of the project parcel boundary. Solano County's General Plan enforces strict non-transportation stationary noise standards of 55 dBA Leq during the daytime and 50 dBA Leq during the nighttime to protect rural residents. Introducing hundreds of fans, compressors, and specialized cooling mechanisms directly adjacent to a residential property line creates a severe, continuous risk of violating these health-protective standards.

The severity of this noise impact is explicitly underscored by the applicant's necessity to install a massive 15 foot-high, 785-foot-long post and pre-cast concrete sound barrier along the northern edge of the project parcel. The requirement for a wall of this magnitude is definitive proof of the excessive noise potential inherent to 341 operating units. This barrier will not only fail to completely mitigate low-frequency vibrations, but it will also introduce a harsh industrial wall that permanently scars the visual character, lines, and textures of our existing rural landscape.

A quiet rural environment is a finite resource. Squeezing a massive 300-megawatt industrial battery complex into an Exclusive Agriculture zone directly diminishes the peace, health, and comfort of the families who live here. We urge the California Energy Commission to deny certification for this project and protect our community from permanent acoustic degradation.

I feel this would cause disrupted sleep cycles and increased health risks like chronic fatigue, headaches, and elevated stress levels.

Critical Questions for the CEC to address:

1. **Cumulative Acoustic Modeling:** Has a comprehensive cumulative acoustic assessment been conducted that measures the simultaneous operation of all **341 AC units** alongside other necessary industrial equipment, rather than evaluating units individually or in isolation?
2. **Ambient Noise Baseline:** What is the current nighttime ambient noise level (in dBA and dBC) of the surrounding residential areas, and by how many decibels will the continuous operation of this equipment increase that baseline?

3. **Low-Frequency Noise Mitigation:** What specific physical barriers, acoustic shrouds, or soundproofing enclosures are required to suppress the low-frequency vibrations known to penetrate residential structures and disrupt sleep?
4. **Siting and Geometry:** Why was the equipment layout designed to place these 341 units in their current configuration, and can they be relocated further inward or underground to maximize the buffer distance to nearby residents?
5. **Independent Post-Construction Verification:** Will the CEC mandate independent, third-party noise monitoring within 30, 90, and 180 days of project operation to verify compliance with local noise ordinances? Will there be additional noise monitoring over time as equipment ages and gets louder?
6. **Enforcement and Penalties:** What legal remedies, operational restrictions, or financial penalties will the CEC enforce if post-construction noise levels exceed the promised thresholds?
7. Have there been any studies on how the constant noise would affect horses, dogs and other animals?

This area is definitely not the correct site for a facility like this. The Lambie Industrial park is the best location for a BESS facility, there are no people, homes or domestic animals for miles.

Thank you for your time and your rigorous oversight in protecting our community from severe environmental noise encroachment.

Sincerely,

Robin Jaeckel, Vacaville resident.