

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272658
Document Title:	annmarie nielson Comments - Formal Opposition to the Proposed Corby BESS Project Protecting Established Families, Homes, and Our Community
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	annmarie nielson
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/13/2026 6:26:08 PM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

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

**Formal Opposition to the Proposed Corby BESS Project Protecting
Established Families, Homes, and Our Community**

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Dear Members of the California Energy Commission:

My name is Ann Marie Nielson, and I strongly oppose the proposed Corby Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) project in Vacaville. I am a longtime Solano County resident, and my husband and I purchased our property more than 25 years ago. We built our home from the ground up with the intention of raising our family here and keeping this property for generations to come.

This project poses serious and long-term concerns regarding our property value, quality of life, safety, and financial security. Locating a large-scale lithium-ion battery storage facility near established homes and agricultural properties could fundamentally change how prospective buyers, lenders, insurers, and appraisers view properties in this area.

For families like ours, our home is not simply a piece of real estate. It represents decades of work, financial investment, stability, and something we hope to leave to our children. We should not be expected to accept an unknown financial risk simply because an industrial energy facility is proposed near the community we established long before this project was considered.

Beyond these financial concerns, this project raises serious questions regarding fire safety, toxic or hazardous releases, emergency response, environmental impacts, noise, visual impacts, and the long-term health and well-being of nearby residents. The introduction of a major industrial facility into an area characterized by homes, family farms, agriculture, and open space would permanently alter the rural character of our community and create an ongoing source of concern for those living closest to it.

QUESTIONS THE CEC MUST ANSWER REGARDING PROPERTY VALUE AND MARKETABILITY

Before approving the Corby BESS project, I ask the California Energy Commission to provide clear, evidence-based answers to the following questions:

- 1.** What evidence does the CEC have demonstrating that locating a large-scale BESS facility near existing rural residences will not negatively affect surrounding property values or marketability?
- 2.** Has the CEC conducted or required an independent property-value study or appraisal analysis specifically evaluating homes and agricultural properties surrounding the proposed Corby BESS site? If not, why not?
- 3.** How has the CEC evaluated buyer perception? Even if the CEC concludes that the facility can operate safely, prospective buyers may still have concerns regarding battery fires, thermal runaway, hazardous emissions, emergency response, evacuation, noise, visual impacts, and

insurance availability. How has the CEC accounted for the effect those concerns may have on buyer demand, marketability, and resale value?

4. If nearby homeowners experience a measurable loss in property value after this project is constructed, who bears that financial loss? Will the developer compensate affected property owners, or are existing homeowners simply expected to absorb that loss?
5. What specific protections are being provided to homeowners who purchased, built, maintained, and invested in their properties decades before this industrial facility was proposed?
6. Has the CEC consulted local real-estate professionals, licensed appraisers, mortgage lenders, and insurance companies regarding how proximity to a utility-scale BESS facility could affect marketability, lending, insurance availability, and property values? If so, please identify those consultations and their findings.
7. If the CEC has not established through substantial evidence that surrounding property owners will be protected from these financial impacts, on what basis can the Commission conclude that these impacts have been adequately evaluated?
8. If no project-specific property-value study has been conducted, why should neighboring homeowners be required to accept the risk first and prove their financial loss only after the project is built?

These are not hypothetical numbers on a report. Our homes represent decades of work, our financial security, and what we intend to leave to our children. If the CEC approves this project, it should be prepared to explain, with evidence, why neighboring families should be required to assume the financial risk created by an industrial project from which they receive no corresponding financial protection.

The consequences of locating this facility directly beside established homes do not end with fire risk, emergency response, property values, or insurance. Even if a catastrophic incident never occurs, nearby residents would still be required to live with the everyday impacts of this industrial facility.

Noise, Visual Impacts, and Construction

The risks associated with this project extend beyond the possibility of a major emergency. Even during normal, day-to-day operation, this facility would fundamentally change what it is like to live in the homes and on the properties surrounding it.

Cooling systems, transformers, inverters, alarms, and other equipment could create ongoing noise, vibration, and nighttime disturbances. Construction would also bring dust, diesel exhaust, heavy truck traffic, lighting, road impacts, and prolonged disruption.

Rows of battery containers, fencing, lighting, transformers, and electrical infrastructure would permanently change the residential and rural character of the surrounding area. Landscaping and screening cannot completely eliminate the industrial presence of a facility of this magnitude.

These impacts matter because they affect how people experience and enjoy their own homes every single day.

For those of us who live here, these are not temporary inconveniences or impacts that exist only on paper. They would become part of our everyday lives and, when combined with the safety concerns surrounding this project, would create a constant burden on the people who live closest to it.

Stress, Health, and Quality of Life

That burden also carries a very real human cost. The impacts of this project cannot be fully understood by evaluating noise levels, setbacks, emissions, or other individual standards in isolation. The Commission must also consider what it means for families to live with all of these concerns at the same time.

There is also a human cost that cannot be adequately measured by simply determining whether the project complies with a numerical standard.

Living near a facility associated with fire, smoke, evacuation, contamination, noise, and possible financial loss creates ongoing stress and uncertainty. Residents should not have to wonder what an alarm means, whether an incident requires evacuation, whether smoke is safe to breathe, or whether their families, pets, livestock, and property are in danger.

The cumulative stress associated with fire risk, evacuation concerns, insurance uncertainty, property values, noise, construction, and visual impacts should be treated as a legitimate quality-of-life concern.

Taken together, these impacts demonstrate why the location of this project matters so much. Residents should not be expected to sacrifice their safety, peace, financial security, and quality of life simply because each individual impact may be argued to fall within an allowable standard. The cumulative impact on the people who actually have to live beside this facility must be given meaningful weight before any decision is made.

Given the combined safety, financial, environmental, and quality-of-life consequences described above, I believe the Commission has an obligation to provide clear answers to the residents who will bear these impacts before making any decision regarding approval of this project.

QUESTIONS THE CEC MUST ANSWER REGARDING INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL RISK

Property value and insurance are closely connected. Even if a home does not immediately lose appraised value, increased premiums, reduced coverage, nonrenewal, or difficulty obtaining insurance could significantly affect the cost, desirability, and marketability of that property. Before approving this project, the CEC should answer the following:

- 1.** Has the CEC conducted or required an independent analysis of whether locating a large-scale BESS facility near existing homes and agricultural properties could increase homeowners, farm, commercial, or other property insurance premiums?
- 2.** Has the CEC determined whether nearby property owners could face nonrenewal, cancellation, reduced coverage, higher deductibles, exclusions, or difficulty obtaining new insurance because of their proximity to the Corby BESS facility?
- 3.** Have insurance companies actually been consulted regarding how they would underwrite properties located near a utility-scale lithium-ion battery storage facility? If so, which insurers were consulted, what questions were asked, and what were their responses?
- 4.** If the project causes insurance premiums for neighboring properties to increase, who will be financially responsible for that increased cost?
- 5.** Will the project developer be required to compensate neighboring property owners for documented increases in insurance premiums attributable to the facility? If not, why should neighboring residents be required to absorb that additional cost?
- 6.** What happens if a neighboring property becomes insurable only through the California FAIR Plan or another higher-cost or more limited coverage option because private insurers will no longer insure it?
- 7.** What level of liability, environmental impairment, pollution, fire, and catastrophic-loss insurance will the developer be required to maintain throughout the entire operating life of the project?
- 8.** What are the dollar limits of those policies, and has the CEC independently determined whether those limits would be sufficient to address a worst-case fire, thermal runaway event, hazardous or toxic release, evacuation, containment event, or damage to neighboring properties?
- 9.** Will the developer's insurance specifically cover smoke damage, chemical releases, firefighting runoff, soil contamination, groundwater contamination, crop or livestock losses, evacuation expenses, business interruption, and loss of use of neighboring homes and properties?

10. Are there exclusions in the developer's insurance policies for lithium-ion battery fires, pollution, gradual contamination, PFAS, hazardous materials, cyber incidents, or other risks associated with BESS facilities?

11. If a catastrophic incident produces damages exceeding the developer's insurance limits, who bears the remaining costs—the developer, its parent company, taxpayers, local government, or the affected property owners?

12. Most importantly, why should existing residents be required to assume a new financial and insurance risk created by a privately developed industrial energy facility when those residents have no guarantee that they will be compensated for increased premiums, loss of coverage, decreased property value, or uninsured losses?

My husband and I chose to build our home here because of the open land, agriculture, rural character, and safe, family-oriented environment. We invested in this community long before the Corby BESS project was proposed. We should not now be placed in a position where the value, insurability, safety, and future of our property are put at risk for a project we did not ask to have located near our home.

These questions deserve clear answers **before not after an approval decision is made**. Once this facility is constructed, nearby families cannot simply undo the consequences if property values decline, insurance becomes more expensive or unavailable, or the character and safety of our community are permanently changed.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the California Energy Commission **not to approve the Corby BESS project at this location** and to pursue an alternative location that does not place established residences, families, agricultural lands, and neighboring property owners at unnecessary risk, **such as the Lambie site**.

The burden of an industrial energy project should not be transferred onto the families who were here first.

IF THIS WERE YOUR FAMILY, YOUR HOME, AND YOUR FUTURE, WOULD YOU APPROVE THIS PROJECT?

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Nielson
Vacaville, CA 95688
Solano County Resident