

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272661
Document Title:	Deanna Cole Comments - Corby BESS Comment Letter
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Deanna Cole
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/13/2026 3:54:48 PM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

*Comment Received From: Deanna Cole
Submitted On: 9/13/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05*

Corby BESS Comment Letter

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

September 8, 2026

California Energy Commission
Docket Unit

Re: Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project — Docket No. 24-OPT-05

Dear Commissioners and CEC Staff:

I am submitting this public comment regarding the proposed **Corby Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Project** in Solano County. My family owns the property at **5405 Kilkenny Road, Vacaville, California**, identified in the Draft EIR as **CB-07**.

My family has continuously owned this property since **1974**. It is not simply an investment property to us. It is our family home and a property that has been part of our family for more than five decades, long before the proposed BESS project.

Our property is located directly across from the proposed project area. Because of that proximity, we would experience the project's impacts every day—during construction and throughout the project's operational life.

I respectfully ask the California Energy Commission to give particular consideration to the potential effects on the existing residential properties immediately surrounding the proposed facility, including the potential consequences for homeowners whose properties may be affected by the project's visual character, noise, safety risks, insurance considerations, marketability, and transformation of the surrounding rural landscape.

1. Property Value and Economic Effects

I understand that under CEQA, a reduction in private property value, standing alone, is generally considered an economic effect rather than an environmental impact. However, the potential change in property value in this case is closely connected to identifiable physical changes resulting from the project.

Those physical changes include:

- Construction activity and associated noise;
- Construction dust and truck traffic;
- Permanent battery storage containers and electrical equipment;
- Operational noise from cooling systems, fans, inverters, transformers, and other equipment;
- Operational noise during periods of maximum cooling demand;
- A substantial sound wall;
- Fencing, roads, lighting, and other infrastructure;
- Above-ground transmission structures and conductors;
- The visual conversion of an open agricultural setting into a utility-scale energy facility;

- Potential fire and thermal-runaway hazards;
- Emergency response activity;
- Potential effects on homeowners insurance availability, cost, coverage, or underwriting; and
- The cumulative effect of these changes on the desirability and marketability of nearby residential property.

For a homeowner directly across from the project, these are not abstract economic considerations. They are physical changes that could affect how the property is experienced, used, marketed, insured, and valued.

I therefore respectfully request that the CEC specifically address the potential consequences of these physical impacts rather than simply concluding that property-value effects are outside the scope of CEQA.

2. Our Property — CB-07

The Draft EIR identifies **5405 Kilkenny Road as CB-07**. The property is approximately 10.36 acres and is located at the northwest intersection of Kilkenny Road and Byrnes Road.

It contains our one-story ranch-style residence, built in 1975, as well as outbuildings and agricultural areas.

Our family has owned this property continuously since 1974. The home and surrounding property have therefore existed in this location for more than half a century before the proposed BESS project.

The long-term residential and agricultural character of this property should be considered when evaluating what it means to place a large-scale energy storage facility directly across the road.

3. Construction Noise Versus Permanent Operational Noise

I am particularly concerned that construction noise and permanent operational noise are different impacts and should be evaluated separately.

During construction, nearby residents could experience:

- Heavy equipment;
- Grading and excavation;
- Trucks entering and leaving the site;
- Road construction;
- Equipment installation;
- Backup alarms;
- Material delivery;
- Extended daytime construction activity; and

- Construction-related dust and vibration.

After construction is complete, however, the project will not become silent.

The BESS facility will have equipment that must operate continuously or periodically, including cooling systems, fans, inverters, transformers, and other electrical equipment. Cooling requirements may become particularly important during periods of extreme heat, when equipment may need to operate more intensively.

The Draft EIR identifies operational noise levels and proposes a sound wall as mitigation. However, I believe the CEC should specifically examine **maximum or worst-case operational conditions**, rather than relying primarily on average or representative noise levels.

I respectfully request that the CEC address:

1. The type and operating characteristics of the proposed cooling systems;
2. Whether cooling fans operate continuously or cycle on and off;
3. Expected noise levels during periods of maximum cooling demand;
4. The difference between average modeled noise and maximum potential noise;
5. Nighttime operational noise;
6. Tonal, cyclical, low-frequency, or other characteristics that may make mechanical noise more noticeable to nearby residents;
7. Whether all equipment could operate simultaneously under worst-case conditions;
8. The actual expected performance of the proposed sound wall; and
9. Whether post-construction noise monitoring will be required at nearby residences.

4. Proposed Sound Wall and Visual Impact

The Draft EIR proposes a substantial sound wall as part of the project's noise mitigation. While I understand that the wall is intended to reduce noise, the wall itself will become a permanent visual feature directly across from our home.

A wall approximately **10 feet high**, together with fencing, battery containers, electrical equipment, roads, lighting, and other infrastructure, would fundamentally change the view and character of the property immediately across from our residence.

This is particularly important because our home is in an existing rural and agricultural setting.

The CEC should evaluate the sound wall as both a noise mitigation measure **and a physical visual structure** that nearby residents will experience every day.

I respectfully request that visual simulations be provided from nearby residential viewpoints, including from our property, at approximately normal residential eye level. These simulations should show the actual combined appearance of:

- The sound wall;

- Fencing;
- Battery storage containers;
- Electrical equipment;
- Roads;
- Lighting;
- Landscaping;
- Screening vegetation at realistic maturity; and
- The overall facility as it would appear from our home.

5. Above-Ground 230-kV Transmission Lines and Structures

Another significant concern is the proposed **above-ground 230-kV transmission infrastructure** associated with the project.

The Draft EIR states that the project would require approximately 1.1 miles of new 230-kV generation tie line connecting the BESS to the PG&E Vaca-Dixon Substation. Although portions of the line would be underground, substantial portions would be above ground. The proposed overhead transmission structures would range from approximately **90 to 130 feet in height**, with up to 10 overhead structures identified along the overall route.

The Draft EIR identifies overhead structures on the project site as well as additional structures between Kilkenny Road and Interstate 80.

For residents living in this area, these structures represent another permanent change to the existing agricultural and rural landscape.

This is particularly important from our property at 5405 Kilkenny Road. We are already concerned about the proposed BESS facility, battery containers, fencing, electrical equipment, lighting, and approximately 10-foot sound wall replacing the open agricultural setting that we currently experience from our home. The addition of **90- to 130-foot transmission structures and overhead conductors** adds another substantial vertical element to the landscape.

The visual effect should not be evaluated independently from the BESS facility. From nearby residences, residents would potentially see the combined effect of:

- The BESS facility;
- The approximately 10-foot sound wall;
- Battery storage containers;
- Electrical equipment and substation infrastructure;
- Security fencing;
- Roads and other site improvements;
- Lighting;
- Landscaping and screening;
- 90- to 130-foot transmission structures; and

- Above-ground 230-kV conductors.

The Draft EIR includes visual analysis of the proposed gen-tie route, including views from Kilkenny Road. However, I believe the analysis should specifically address what these structures will look like from **existing nearby residences**, including our property, rather than primarily evaluating the project from public viewpoints.

The height of these structures is particularly significant. A 90- to 130-foot transmission structure is dramatically taller than the proposed 10-foot sound wall and would create a prominent vertical element in an otherwise relatively open agricultural landscape.

For our family, this is especially concerning because our current view from the front porch and front yard includes an open agricultural field and the distant view toward **Mount Diablo**. The proposed project would introduce several layers of permanent infrastructure into that view rather than simply placing one facility on the landscape.

I respectfully request that the CEC:

1. Provide accurate visual simulations of the overhead transmission structures and conductors from **5405 Kilkenny Road**, including from our front porch and front yard;
2. Show the transmission structures together with the proposed BESS facility, sound wall, fencing, landscaping, and other infrastructure;
3. Identify the locations and heights of each overhead structure that could be visible from our property;
4. Explain whether the proposed landscaping will screen any portion of the transmission infrastructure and, if so, at what realistic maturity;
5. Evaluate the cumulative visual effect of the BESS and overhead transmission facilities on the existing rural and agricultural character;
6. Address whether the overhead transmission infrastructure could contribute to concerns regarding the marketability or perceived value of nearby residential properties; and
7. Consider whether alternative project locations or configurations could reduce the amount of new above-ground transmission infrastructure experienced by existing residents.

I also ask the CEC to distinguish between **compliance with applicable transmission-line safety standards and the separate question of the project's visual and residential-setting impacts**. Compliance with engineering and safety requirements does not necessarily mean that the physical presence of 90- to 130-foot structures has no effect on the surrounding landscape or nearby residences.

6. Existing Agricultural View and Mount Diablo

The visual impact is especially significant to our family because of what we currently see from our home.

The orchard that historically occupied the agricultural property across from us was removed several years ago. The property has most recently been farmed for **hay**. Although the orchard is

no longer there, the continued agricultural use has preserved an open landscape across from our home.

From our **front porch and front yard**, we currently look across the road over this open agricultural landscape toward **Mount Diablo**.

The attached photograph documents this existing view.

Exhibit A — Existing View From 5405 Kilkenny Road Toward Mount Diablo

This existing view is part of the character and setting of our home. It is an open agricultural landscape rather than an industrial or commercial development.

If the proposed BESS project is constructed, this open setting would instead contain a utility-scale energy facility, including battery containers, electrical infrastructure, fencing, roads, lighting, above-ground transmission structures, and a substantial sound wall.

Instead of looking across the road from our front porch toward an open agricultural field and Mount Diablo, we would be looking toward a large-scale energy facility, a 10-foot sound wall, and potentially 90- to 130-foot transmission structures and overhead conductors.

That is a fundamental change in the visual character and setting of our home.

I respectfully ask the CEC to evaluate this change from the perspective of the residents who will experience it at close range, rather than relying solely on distant or public-road viewpoints.

7. Construction Dust and Dust Mitigation

I am also concerned about construction dust.

The proposed project would involve site preparation, grading, excavation, road construction, installation of equipment, movement of construction vehicles, and other activities across approximately 40 acres.

These activities have the potential to generate significant amounts of dust, particularly during dry and windy conditions.

For a residence immediately across from the project, dust could affect:

- Our home;
- Windows and outdoor areas;
- Vehicles;
- Landscaping;
- Yards and patios;
- Outdoor activities;

- Agricultural areas; and
- The general enjoyment of our property.

I respectfully request that the CEC require a detailed and enforceable construction dust-control plan addressing:

- Watering and other dust-suppression measures;
- Increased watering during dry or windy conditions;
- Specific wind-speed thresholds requiring additional controls or temporary cessation of dust-generating activities;
- Construction access and haul routes;
- Truck and material-covering requirements;
- Prevention of track-out onto Kilkenny Road and Byrnes Road;
- Protection of immediately adjacent residences;
- Monitoring for visible dust leaving the project boundary;
- A documented complaint-response procedure; and
- Clear requirements for corrective action and enforcement when dust-control measures are not effective.

It is important that dust mitigation not simply be described as a general best-management practice. For residents immediately adjacent to the project, the measures should be specific, enforceable, monitored, and responsive to actual conditions.

8. Homeowners Insurance and Property Marketability

Another concern that deserves consideration is homeowners insurance.

I am **not asserting that the Corby BESS project will necessarily cause our insurance premiums to increase or make our property uninsurable**. Rather, I am asking that the potential issue be evaluated because a large battery energy storage facility introduces a different type of risk into the immediate vicinity of an existing residence.

The project itself is being evaluated for potential fire and thermal-runaway risks. The Draft EIR recognizes that a BESS fire could produce smoke for many hours or longer and identifies fire and explosion as a significant risk requiring mitigation.

Given these circumstances, I believe it is reasonable to ask whether the proximity of a large BESS facility could affect residential insurance underwriting decisions.

I respectfully request that the CEC and project applicant address:

1. Whether residential insurance underwriters were consulted regarding the potential effect of the proposed facility on nearby homes;
2. Whether the applicant has obtained any analysis concerning insurance availability or cost for residences near the project;

3. Whether insurers could impose higher premiums, higher deductibles, exclusions, or additional conditions;
4. Whether proximity to the facility could affect renewability or availability of private residential insurance;
5. Whether the applicant has considered the possibility that nearby homeowners could have fewer private insurance options;
6. Whether the project could affect the practical marketability of nearby homes if prospective buyers are concerned about insurance; and
7. What evidence supports any conclusion that the project would have no effect on nearby residential insurance.

9. Fire and Thermal-Runaway Risk

The Draft EIR acknowledges the potential for fire and explosion associated with the BESS and identifies this as a significant risk requiring mitigation.

For residents living directly across from the proposed facility, the issue is not simply whether a fire is likely. The existence of a large battery installation introduces a type of industrial hazard that does not currently exist across from our home.

The Draft EIR indicates that a thermal-runaway event could result in smoke lasting many hours or longer, even if the event is limited to one container.

I respectfully request that the CEC clearly address the implications for the nearest existing residences, including:

- Emergency response;
- Smoke exposure;
- Evacuation considerations;
- Fire-department access;
- Potential impacts on neighboring property;
- Emergency notification;
- Monitoring during a fire;
- Post-fire soil and water sampling; and
- The practical ability of residents to remain safely in or return to their homes following an incident.

10. The 880-Foot Setback

The Draft EIR indicates that the nearest BESS unit would be approximately **880 feet from the closest residential property line**.

The EIR also recognizes that setbacks used by other California jurisdictions vary considerably, with some jurisdictions requiring setbacks approaching **1,000 feet**.

Given that our residence is among the closest residential properties to the project, I respectfully ask the CEC to explain why the proposed location and setback are considered appropriate for this particular site.

The fact that some jurisdictions have adopted substantially larger setbacks demonstrates that there are reasonable policy choices available for separating large BESS facilities from existing residences.

11. Lambie Industrial Park — An Alternative That Deserves More Meaningful Consideration

One of our greatest concerns is the proposed project's location immediately adjacent to established rural residences.

The Draft EIR does identify the **Lambie Industrial Park Alternative**, but I believe this alternative deserves much more meaningful consideration, particularly when evaluating the concentrated impacts that the proposed Corby location would impose on nearby homeowners.

The Draft EIR itself provides important facts about the Lambie site. Lambie Industrial Park encompasses approximately **1,461 acres**, is designated for industrial use, and is zoned **Manufacturing General**. The County Board of Supervisors identified the Lambie site as suitable for a BESS and stated that its zoning would be compatible with a BESS and that the site would have a sufficient buffer from sensitive receptors.

The EIR further recognizes that the large Lambie property provides flexibility to maximize separation between the BESS enclosures and sensitive receptors.

These characteristics are particularly important when compared with the proposed Corby location.

At Corby, the BESS would be placed immediately adjacent to an established rural residential community, including our family home at 5405 Kilkenny Road. We would experience the facility at close range every day—including its sound wall, equipment, lighting, overhead transmission infrastructure, operational noise, construction activity, dust, and potential safety concerns.

By contrast, Lambie is already an industrially designated and industrially zoned location. Moving the BESS facility to an industrial setting could reduce the conflict between a utility-scale battery facility and existing residential homes.

We recognize that the Lambie alternative would require a substantially longer gen-tie to the Vaca-Dixon Substation. The Draft EIR estimates approximately **13 to 14 miles**, compared with the much shorter interconnection associated with the proposed project. The EIR identifies additional construction, agricultural, residential, visual, and biological impacts associated with that longer transmission route.

However, I believe the analysis should not treat the longer gen-tie as the end of the inquiry.

The question should be whether the additional impacts associated with the Lambie interconnection are preferable to placing a 300-MW/1,200-MWh battery facility immediately adjacent to established rural residences.

The Draft EIR should more fully weigh the concentrated, long-term impacts on the existing homeowners at the Corby site against the broader impacts of relocating the BESS to an industrially designated property.

In particular, the alternatives analysis should explicitly consider whether Lambie would reduce:

- Direct impacts to existing residences;
- Residential noise exposure;
- Visual impacts to established homes;
- The need for a substantial sound wall immediately across from residences;
- Construction disturbance to nearby homeowners;
- Potential property-value and marketability concerns;
- Potential insurance concerns associated with living immediately adjacent to a BESS;
- Perceived and actual fire and thermal-runaway risks to nearby residences;
- The amount of above-ground utility infrastructure experienced by nearby homeowners; and
- The conversion of an existing agricultural setting into a utility-scale industrial facility.

I am especially concerned that the alternatives analysis does not adequately account for the **private burden concentrated on the homeowners immediately surrounding the proposed Corby site.**

The EIR identifies Lambie as an alternative that appears potentially feasible for avoiding or reducing potentially significant impacts.

I therefore ask the CEC to revisit the Lambie alternative and provide a more balanced comparison that specifically considers **the protection of existing homes and homeowners**, not simply the relative length and cost of the transmission interconnection.

12. The Atwell/NextEra Depreciation Example

I am also submitting with this comment letter a May 8, 2025 correspondence from **Atwell, LLC concerning a different NextEra energy project in Rice County, Kansas.**

That correspondence is not being offered as proof that the Corby project will cause a particular dollar amount of depreciation to our property. The projects, locations, circumstances, and properties are different.

However, the correspondence is relevant because it provides a real-world example of an energy developer recognizing concerns regarding potential depreciation to a nearby residential property.

In that case, the developer initially indicated that **\$75,000–\$100,000** would be reasonable to offset potential depreciation. Following discussions with the affected family, NextEra offered a **\$200,000 “good-faith depreciation payment,”** in addition to a **\$25,000 signing bonus**.

Again, I am not claiming that these amounts establish the value of any potential loss at our property.

Rather, this example raises an important question:

If an energy developer in another project considered potential residential depreciation sufficiently real to warrant a six-figure good-faith payment, why has the potential economic effect on immediately adjacent residential properties not been more thoroughly evaluated here?

At a minimum, this example supports the reasonableness of conducting an independent property-value analysis before the project is approved.

13. Independent Property-Value Analysis

Given the proximity of CB-07 to the proposed project, I respectfully request that the CEC require or undertake an independent analysis of potential residential property-value effects.

Such an analysis should consider the combined effect of:

- Visual changes;
- Noise;
- Construction impacts;
- Dust;
- Industrial infrastructure;
- Above-ground transmission structures and conductors;
- Fire and safety concerns;
- Insurance considerations;
- Changes in rural character;
- Loss or obstruction of the existing Mount Diablo view;
- Buyer perceptions; and
- Marketability of nearby residential properties.

The purpose would not necessarily be to establish that the project will cause a specific dollar loss, but rather to determine whether a reasonable and supportable risk of diminution exists and, if so, what measures could fairly address that risk.

14. Economic Benefits Versus Private Economic Burden

I recognize that the project could provide economic benefits to the local government and community.

The Staff Assessment identifies significant potential economic benefits, including approximately **\$70.5 million in operational property-tax revenue over the project's lifetime.**

Those public benefits are important considerations.

However, the CEC should also consider who bears the costs of achieving those benefits.

If a project produces substantial public revenue while imposing concentrated and potentially long-term burdens on a small number of existing homeowners—particularly those directly adjacent to the facility—there should be a transparent evaluation of that distribution of benefits and burdens.

The economic benefits to the broader community should not automatically outweigh or obscure substantial private impacts experienced by the homeowners who live immediately next to the project.

15. Alternatives and Location

Beyond Lambie specifically, the CEC should evaluate whether other alternative locations or configurations could achieve the project's objectives while reducing impacts to existing residences.

The Draft EIR states that CEQA requires consideration of alternative locations and that, if no feasible alternative locations exist, the reasons for that conclusion should be disclosed.

Given the substantial difference between an agricultural site immediately adjacent to existing rural residences and a large industrially designated property such as Lambie, the CEC should not limit the alternatives inquiry to whether the proposed site has the shortest or simplest interconnection.

The relevant question is also whether a different location could better protect existing homeowners while still accomplishing the fundamental objectives of the project.

If a location farther from established homes is reasonably available, that alternative could reduce:

- Noise exposure;
- Visual impacts;
- Fire-risk concerns;
- Insurance concerns;
- Construction disturbance;
- Dust impacts;
- Above-ground transmission impacts;
- Changes to rural residential character; and
- Potential property-value effects.

16. Combined Effect on Our Home

The concern is not any one impact in isolation.

It is the **combined effect** of all of these changes on a home that has been in our family since 1974.

Today, we have an existing rural and agricultural setting across from our home. We can look from our front porch toward an open agricultural field and Mount Diablo.

During construction, we could experience heavy equipment, truck traffic, noise, dust, and disruption associated with construction of both the BESS facility and associated transmission infrastructure.

After construction, we would have a permanent utility-scale BESS facility across from us, including battery containers, electrical infrastructure, fencing, roads, lighting, cooling equipment, an approximately 10-foot sound wall, and potentially 90- to 130-foot transmission structures and overhead conductors.

We would also live with the knowledge that the facility presents a recognized potential fire and thermal-runaway hazard and that there may be questions regarding insurance and future marketability.

The project would therefore introduce not only the BESS facility itself, but also new above-ground transmission infrastructure into the surrounding landscape.

For our family, the concern is the cumulative transformation: an open agricultural view toward Mount Diablo could become a view containing a utility-scale battery facility, a 10-foot sound wall, fencing and electrical infrastructure, and potentially 90- to 130-foot transmission structures and overhead conductors.

These changes should be evaluated together because that is how the project will actually be experienced by nearby homeowners.

The issue is not simply that a new project will be visible. The issue is that the physical environment immediately surrounding a family home that has existed here for more than 50 years would be fundamentally changed.

Specific Requests to the California Energy Commission

For clarity, I respectfully request that the CEC:

- 1.** Specifically respond to the potential property-value consequences of the project's physical impacts on CB-07 and other immediately adjacent residences.
- 2.** Identify and evaluate the physical factors that could contribute to residential property-value diminution.
- 3.** Evaluate operational noise under maximum or worst-case cooling conditions, not solely average conditions.
- 4.** Provide a clear comparison between average modeled noise levels and maximum potential operational noise.
- 5.** Evaluate nighttime, tonal, cyclical, and low-frequency characteristics of operational equipment.
- 6.** Evaluate potential effects of the project on residential insurance availability, premiums, deductibles, exclusions, and renewability.
- 7.** State whether the applicant consulted residential insurance underwriters concerning nearby properties.
- 8.** If the CEC concludes that the project will not affect residential insurance, identify the evidence supporting that conclusion.
- 9.** Explain why no more detailed property-value or marketability analysis has been undertaken for residences immediately adjacent to the project.
- 10.** Require or undertake an independent appraisal or market study addressing potential diminution in value associated with the project's physical impacts.
- 11.** Examine comparable energy-infrastructure projects where developers have addressed concerns regarding residential depreciation.
- 12.** Consider appropriate property-value protection or depreciation-compensation mechanisms if a measurable adverse effect is identified.
- 13.** Explain why the approximately 880-foot setback from the nearest residential property line is adequate, particularly given that other California jurisdictions have adopted setbacks approaching 1,000 feet.
- 14.** Reevaluate the Lambie Industrial Park Alternative and provide a more complete comparison of its benefits and disadvantages relative to the proposed Corby location, specifically including its potential to reduce concentrated impacts on existing residences, property values, insurance considerations, noise, visual impacts, fire-risk concerns, construction disturbance, above-ground transmission infrastructure, and the conversion of agricultural land. The CEC should explain why the additional length of the Lambie gen-tie outweighs the potential benefits of locating the BESS

within a large industrially designated and Manufacturing General-zoned property with greater flexibility to separate the facility from sensitive residential receptors.

- 15.** Require post-construction noise monitoring at nearby residences and establish corrective measures if actual noise exceeds modeled or permitted levels.
- 16.** Evaluate the disproportionate private economic burden that may be imposed on homeowners immediately adjacent to a project that provides broader public economic benefits.
- 17.** Consider the attached Atwell/NextEra correspondence as a relevant example of an energy developer addressing potential residential depreciation through financial compensation, while recognizing that the circumstances are not directly comparable.
- 18.** Clearly explain how the project's public economic benefits are being weighed against concentrated private economic impacts on nearby homeowners.
- 19.** Require a detailed, enforceable construction dust-mitigation and monitoring plan addressing dry and windy conditions.
- 20.** Establish enforceable procedures for responding to dust that leaves the project site and affects neighboring residences or public roads.
- 21.** Provide visual simulations from 5405 Kilkenny Road, including views from the front porch, front yard, and normal residential eye level.
- 22.** Specifically evaluate the visual effect of the proposed approximately 10-foot sound wall from nearby residences.
- 23.** Evaluate the loss or obstruction of the existing open agricultural view toward Mount Diablo from our home.
- 24.** Evaluate the combined visual effect of the sound wall, fencing, battery containers, electrical equipment, roads, lighting, landscaping, and transmission infrastructure on the existing rural character.
- 25.** Identify the proposed landscaping and screening height, expected maturity, establishment timeline, and long-term maintenance requirements.
- 26.** Evaluate the cumulative effect on nearby residences of construction dust, construction noise, permanent operational noise, visual changes, lighting, above-ground transmission infrastructure, fire and safety concerns, insurance considerations, and the loss of the existing open agricultural setting and Mount Diablo view.
- 27.** Evaluate the visual, residential-setting, and potential marketability impacts of the proposed above-ground 230-kV transmission line and its approximately 90- to 130-foot structures on nearby residences, including 5405 Kilkenny Road.

28. Provide residence-level visual simulations showing the combined appearance of the BESS facility, approximately 10-foot sound wall, fencing, equipment, landscaping, and above-ground transmission structures and conductors from 5405 Kilkenny Road, including the front porch and front yard, and explain whether feasible alternatives could reduce these combined impacts.

Conclusion

My family has owned and cared for **5405 Kilkenny Road continuously since 1974**. For more than five decades, this property has been our home and our family's long-term investment.

We understand that California needs reliable energy infrastructure and that battery storage can provide important benefits to the electrical grid. We are not opposed to responsible energy development simply because it is different from what currently exists.

Our concern is **where this particular project is being placed and who will bear the consequences of that decision**.

For our family, the proposed project is not an abstract development somewhere in the community. It would be directly across from our home.

The open agricultural view that we currently experience from our front porch—including the distant view toward Mount Diablo—could be replaced by a large-scale energy facility, an approximately 10-foot sound wall, fencing, electrical infrastructure, and potentially 90- to 130-foot transmission structures and overhead conductors. We could also experience construction dust and noise, permanent mechanical and cooling-system noise, changes to the visual character of our surroundings, and the ongoing presence of a large battery installation with recognized fire and thermal-runaway risks.

At the same time, the Draft EIR identifies **Lambie Industrial Park**, a large industrially designated and Manufacturing General-zoned property, as a potentially feasible alternative. The County has identified that site as suitable for a BESS and noted its buffer from sensitive receptors. The EIR also recognizes that the size of the Lambie property provides flexibility to maximize separation from sensitive receptors.

I believe those facts deserve greater weight when deciding whether it is appropriate to place the Corby BESS immediately adjacent to established rural residences.

These impacts could also affect the practical marketability, insurability, and value of our property.

I respectfully ask the California Energy Commission to fully evaluate these concerns, require meaningful analysis where information is currently lacking, and give serious consideration to

whether the project's benefits can be achieved in a manner that does not place such a concentrated burden on the homeowners living immediately adjacent to the proposed facility.

At a minimum, nearby homeowners should not be expected to simply absorb potentially significant private losses for the benefit of broader public economic gains without those losses being carefully evaluated and addressed.

Thank you for considering my comments and the concerns of our family and our neighbors.

Respectfully,

Deanna Cole
5405 Kilkenny Road
Vacaville, CA 95687

Attachments / Exhibits

- **Exhibit A — Existing View From 5405 Kilkenny Road Toward Mount Diablo**
- **Exhibit B — May 8, 2025 Atwell, LLC / NextEra Correspondence Regarding Depreciation Payment**

Exhibit A



Exhibit B

ATWELL, LLC

5/8/2025

Boyd J. Walker and Sharon Family Trust

McPherson, KS 67460

Dear Walker Family,

NextEra is working on securing a substation location for a wind project in Rice County, KS. Mr. Baldwin's tract to the north is our best prospect, so we would like to move forward with the deal while being considerate of your interest and position as well. Zillow values your homestead (Legal description: 11.4 acres in the NW/c SW/4 in Sec. 15-T20-R4; Tax ID: 0591751500000003000) at \$310k. Originally, NextEra thought 75k-100k would be a reasonable offer to offset depreciation. After hearing your feedback regarding the home's value, NextEra would like to extend a good-faith depreciation payment of \$200k that would go into effect as follows: (1) Mr. Baldwin's realty purchase-option is exercised for construction of the substation, or (2) a deed of sale is provided for the above-described property (including home and land). The term of this good neighbor agreement (i.e., Participation Agreement) would mirror the term of the Mr. Baldwin's agreement (five years) so that there's no lapse in coverage so to speak.

Additionally, NextEra is offering your family a **\$25,000 signing bonus**.

This project would provide renewable energy for 100,000 homes. That's 300,000 people that would benefit as the U.S. faces an energy shortage in the next two years from the increase in electricity usage from cell phones, electric cars, data centers, and a steadily growing population. In short, this project would help advance national interests and would add to your legacy while eliminating financial risk to your homestead. I would like to say thank you with utmost gratitude for your consideration.

Respectfully,



Ryan Duffield, MLS, CPL
Rduffield@atwell-agent.com
918.850.0821