

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272627
Document Title:	Charlene Schmid Comments - Water Resources
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Charlene Schmid
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/11/2026 9:10:17 PM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

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

Water Resources

The Draft EIR describes the Local Compliance requirements on page 5.16-5 but fails to describe how this project meets the stated goals. I would like specific information as to how this project meets the following from the Solano County General Plan:

â€¢ Chapter Four: Goal 10: Foster sound management of the land and water resources in Solano County's watersheds to minimize erosion and protect water quality using best management practices and protect downstream waterways and wetlands.
Specific request includes how this project protects water quality.

â€¢ Chapter nine: Goal RS.G-1: Manage and preserve the diverse land, water, and air resources

of the county for the use and enrichment of the lives of present and future generations; Goal RS.G-9: Protect, monitor, restore and enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources to meet the needs of all beneficial uses; and Goal RS.G-10: Foster sound management of the land and water resources in Solano County's watersheds to minimize erosion and protect water quality using best management practices and protect downstream waterways and wetlands.

Specific request includes how this project preserves water resources, enhances the quality of groundwater and protects water quality downstream.

â€¢ Policy RS.P-8: Protect marsh waterways, managed wetlands, tidal marshes, seasonal marshes, and lowland and grasslands because they are critical habitats for marsh-related wildlife and are essential to the integrity of the marshes.

Specific request includes how this project protects nearby ecosystems.

â€¢ Policy RS.P-65: Require the protection of natural water courses.

Specific request includes how this project protects water courses.

â€¢ Policy RS.P-70: Protect land surrounding valuable water sources, evaluate watersheds, and preserve open space lands to protect and improve groundwater quality, reduce polluted surface runoff, and minimize erosion.

Specific request includes how this project preserves open space lands and improves groundwater quality.

â€¢ Policy RS.P-75: Require and provide incentives for site plan elements (such as permeable pavement, swales, and filter strips) that limit runoff and increase infiltration and groundwater recharge.

Specific request includes how this project increases infiltration and groundwater recharge.

And regarding the Vacaville City Plan compliance,

â€¢ Goal COS-2: Preserve and restore Vacaville's creeks.

Specific request includes how this project preserves and restores Sweany and Ulati Creeks?

â€¢ Goal COS-14: Protect the quality and supply of surface water and groundwater resources; Policy COS-P14.1: Protect the Alamo, Encinosa, Gibson, and Ulati Creek watersheds by minimizing point and nonpoint source pollutants.

Specific request includes defining point and nonpoint source pollutant potentials and how will the project protect water from these identified pollutants.

Continuing to 5.16.2 Environmental Impacts on page 5.16-7:

Please describe A) What practices are considered "mitigation" B) What is the cost, to include loss incurred by significant receptors (neighbors and their decades of agricultural life) and C) Who holds the liability for the following should the project:

a. Violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would: ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;

Additionally, what is the amount of groundwater that is recharged by the current prime farmland across the identified 65.9-acre project footprint on page 5.16-1? How does this correspond to the rating of less than significant impact under item b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? I do not believe the rating as less than significant represents the amount of loss to groundwater when staff has not identified or there is not a standard for potential recharge and filtration provided in prime farmland.