

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272641
Document Title:	Mackenzie Maas Comments - FORMAL OPPOSITION TO CORBY BESS FAILURE TO HONOR LOCAL SAFETY STANDARDS, MEASURE T, FARMLAND PROTECTIONS, AND SAFER INDUSTRIAL
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Mackenzie Maas
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/13/2026 2:39:25 PM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

Comment Received From: Mackenzie Maas
Submitted On: 9/13/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

**FORMAL OPPOSITION TO CORBY BESS FAILURE TO HONOR
LOCAL SAFETY STANDARDS, MEASURE T, FARMLAND
PROTECTIONS, AND SAFER INDUSTRIAL**

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Date: September 11, 2026

To: California Energy Commission (CEC) *Re: Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Corby BESS Project*

From: Mackenzie Maas Solano County Resident

Subject: Public Comment and Objections: Corby Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Project

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Mackenzie Maas, and I am a long-time resident of Solano County who cares deeply about the safety, stability, and long-term future of our community. This is where I plan to raise my family and build my future. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Corby BESS Project and to submit formal public comments on its environmental review.

While the developer is using California's state "Opt-In" process (AB 205) to bypass local approval, the law still requires the California Energy Commission to thoroughly study, explain, and address all safety and environmental impacts before approving this project. State environmental law also requires you to carefully evaluate how this project conflicts with the local rules our community put in place to protect itself.

Solano County created its local BESS Ordinance using scientific research and hard lessons from real-world battery fires elsewhere. These rules were designed to make sure large industrial energy sites are placed in appropriate areas (away from neighborhoods, homes, and farms). Bypassing these local rules puts our community at unnecessary risk.

I ask that the Commission provide clear, direct answers to the following key concerns in your final review:

1. Respecting Local Rules and Neighborhood Safety

Our county leaders spent considerable time creating guidelines to protect families and farmland from high-risk industrial developments.

- **Question 1.1:** How does the state justify ignoring Solano County's local BESS rules and land use standards designed to protect surrounding neighborhoods and agricultural land?
- **Question 1.2:** What specific evidence proves that overriding these local land use protections will not result in significant, unmitigated impacts to local residents?

2. Honoring Measure T and Protecting Our Farmland

It is frustrating to see state officials overlook the clear vote of Solano County residents. Through Measure T, our community voted overwhelmingly to protect our agricultural land and open spaces from industrial sprawl.

- **Question 2.1:** How does this project respect Measure T and our community's explicit vote to protect local farmland?
- **Question 2.2:** Has the state evaluated the long-term impact of turning Solano County's farmland into utility-scale industrial battery sites?
- **Question 2.3:** Why is the state overriding a local, voter-approved protection measure instead of requiring developers to build in existing industrial parks?

3. Giving Serious Consideration to Lambie Industrial Park

Environmental review laws require the state to look at reasonable alternative locations that avoid harming neighborhoods and farmland. Dismissing the **Lambie Industrial Park** option without a real, side-by-side comparison is a major oversight.

Lambie Industrial Park is an established industrial area specifically built for heavy infrastructure, located away from homes and protected farmland.

- **Question 3.1:** Why was Lambie Industrial Park dismissed without a full, fair side-by-side comparison against the proposed Corby site?
- **Question 3.2:** What actual technical or financial facts show that using Lambie Industrial Park is not feasible?
- **Question 3.3:** Since building at Lambie Industrial Park would protect neighborhoods and honor Measure T, why is the state choosing a site near homes instead?
- **Question 3.4:** Will the state commit to a complete, formal evaluation of Lambie Industrial Park before making a final decision?

4. Emergency Preparedness and First Responder Safety

A major incident at a battery facility requires specialized equipment, huge amounts of water, and coordinated evacuations.

- **Question 4.1:** Has an independent safety assessment been completed and approved by local fire departments?
- **Question 4.2:** Do our local fire crews currently have the specialized training, monitoring tools, and water supply needed to handle a major battery incident without leaving the rest of the community unprotected?
- **Question 4.3:** If a major event requires an immediate evacuation, what specific routes will residents use, and how will traffic be managed?

Conclusion

The people who live in Solano County are the ones who will have to live with the consequences if something goes wrong. We aren't asking for special treatment. We are simply asking that the state respect the local safety rules our community put in place and honor the voters' mandate under Measure T.

Brushing off sensible alternatives like Lambie Industrial Park to put high-risk infrastructure near homes and farms is the wrong choice. Under environmental review laws, you are required to

respond to these public comments in writing, and I look forward to reading your detailed responses in the final report.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mackenzie Maas Solano County Resident