

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272637
Document Title:	Kylie Carpineta Comments - Formal Opposition to Corby BESS Overriding Local Governance While Imposing Unnecessary Fire, Toxic Exposure, and Water Contamin
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Kylie Carpineta
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/13/2026 2:49:22 PM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

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

**Formal Opposition to Corby BESS Overriding Local Governance
While Imposing Unnecessary Fire, Toxic Exposure, and Water
Contamin**

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Dear commissioners,

My name is Kylie Carpineta born, raised in Solano county. My family lives on byrnes road which could be directly affected by the BESS Project.

Id like to formally object to this application and submit specific inquiries regarding the environmental review process.

How is it just to force our community to accept a project that we no longer want, and that our local governments have already rejected?

I live near the proposed location, and we have never experienced true blackout power outages. We are connected to the large PG&E substation, our power is never turned off, unless there is damage to power poles infrastructure such as in an auto accident. I don't believe Vacaville has experienced any true blackout situations for a very long time.

We simply do not need this battery storage facility in our backyard.

The benefits of having this battery storage here amount to cities like San Francisco getting lower electricity bills, while Vacaville residents are left absorbing the localized risks of toxic smoke, severe fire hazards, and potential water contamination. Why would we want this here, especially when our local governments have already stated that it does not belong?

We urge the Commission to respect established local governance, honor the voices of the residents who live here, and adhere to local land-use policies. The applicant has repeatedly disregarded local determination, having been turned down by both the City of Vacaville and Solano County. Rather than adjusting to local land-use standards, the developer is utilizing state-level certification processes to override local jurisdiction and impose this project upon our community. This approach undermines procedural fairness and disregards local governance.

We trust the California Energy Commission will uphold a transparent, objective process and refrain from providing undue leverage to private developers seeking to bypass local oversight. We urge the Commission to carefully evaluate the factual findings in its own report, address the serious environmental gaps identified by the public, and deny certification for this project.

To ensure the public record fully reflects these concerns under CEQA, I request that the CEC provide direct written responses to the following inquiries in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) / Staff Assessment:

1. Project Objectives & Local Grid Baseline (CEQA Guidelines § 15124)

Given that the immediate surrounding neighborhood sits on a high-reliability circuit servicing Kaiser Hospital with no history of localized blackouts or capacity shortfalls, what specific, measurable reliability benefit does this project provide to the immediate Vacaville community?

How does the EIR evaluate the environmental equity of imposing localized safety hazards on Vacaville residents primarily to export energy and lower utility bills for distant urban centers like San Francisco?

2. Hazards & Hazardous Materials / Air Quality (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G)

In the event of an uncontrolled thermal runaway fire, what specific atmospheric dispersion modeling has been conducted for toxic off-gassing, including Hydrogen Fluoride (HF) and Hydrogen Cyanide (HCN)? What are the projected ground-level concentration levels at the nearest residential property lines?

What is the modeled evacuation radius during a major toxic smoke incident, and how does the EIR demonstrate that local rural road infrastructure can safely support an emergency evacuation?

3. Hydrology & Water Quality (CEQA Guidelines § 15064)

How does the EIR guarantee that firefighting runoff, hazardous chemical release, or site drainage during a thermal event will not contaminate the local groundwater table, nearby residential water wells, or local agricultural water sources?

If groundwater wells are utilized for site operations or post-incident cooling, what is the modeled draw-down impact on neighboring domestic wells?

4. Land Use, Planning & LORS Conformance (Public Resources Code § 25545.10)

Both the City of Vacaville and Solano County have formally determined that utility-scale BESS facilities are incompatible with this site's zoning and local land-use policies. Under AB 205 opt-in provisions, what specific mitigation or project modifications is the CEC requiring to resolve these direct conflicts with local Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards (LORS)?

Please look closely at the facts within your own report, respect the policy decisions of our local leaders, and do the right thing: deny certification for the Corby BESS project.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kylie Carineta