

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272671
Document Title:	Lewis C Derfuss III Comments - Support to move Corby Energy proposed BESS project to Lambie Industrial Park
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Lewis C Derfuss III
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/14/2026 7:08:56 AM
Docketed Date:	9/14/2026

Comment Received From: Lewis C Derfuss III
Submitted On: 9/14/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

Support to move Corby Energy proposed BESS project to Lambie Industrial Park

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

I attended the public meeting at Ulati Community Center in Vacaville on 1 September 2026. I attentively paid attention to your report and found your findings both seriously flawed and incomplete. It draws serious concern that a unelected board appointed by the governor and giving the power to override the will of the voting citizens of Vacaville and Solano county as well as the findings of both the City Of Vacaville City Counsel and Solano County Board of Supervisors. It is also suspect that your board operates without guardrails and can set the standards to determine the threshold of significant impact of the evaluated areas. I therefore have no trust in the validity of your findings.

I need answers to find out how your staff. Engineers and “experts” evaluated and came to their findings in the following areas:

1. Battery Safety –Lithium Iron Phosphate Chemistry has a known history of spontaneous combustion in not only BESS units but also in laptop and other Lithium battery powered units aboard aircraft, EV Vehicles, people’s houses and garages to mention a few, yet to determined this to be improved safe technology. How do you come to this determination when the daily news and history show the contrary --- Please explain your finding of Minimum to No negative effects.

Additionally, you cited two serrano’s one When not If a fire occurs they can not be extinguished, they can only be cooled with massive amounts of water to help contain and hopefully, not spread to other units—Explain how this is safe with minimal to No negative Effect. Also, I believe the stated onsite water was listed as 6000 Gal which would only provide minutes of water required to suppress a fire, far from the water required for required long term cooling of a fire and there are not enough water tenders in the area to supply the long-term needs So what is the plan, I suspect there isn’t one.

This leads into what is the plan to contain the toxins contained in the water used to cool the fire from spreading across the land and leaching into our streams, creeks, canals and ground water that supplies both our city and local residents wells

Your analysis took soil sampling that was either 18 to 24 inches deep, while this might appear as an in-depth analysis and may be of some value it actually dilutes the findings of where the biggest impact would be found in the top 6 inches of the soil. Your analysis is incomplete and needs to include an analysis of the top 6 inches of soil. You need to provide this data as part of your report and provide us the results. My bet is it will be enlightened and will change your finding of Minimum to No effect.

First, I take offense in the living, breathing citizen being reduced and referred to as Receptors, we are humans deserving of respect, not Receptors. Additionally, the

second scenario listed was Off gassing with no fire. The fact is there will be Off Gassing in both scenarios with or without fire. The plum AELG modeling is inadequate as it considers a 5 year average of meteorological data. Was your data compiled with the Deflagration Panels Open or closed as when open the Off Gassing will be greatly increase as they are there to rapidly relieve the internal pressure within the BESS Units to reduce potential explosions. It does not analyze data during the worst-case scenarios when winds are high or low and out of different directions such as the North with gust exceeding 50 MPH and sometime Zero with are not uncommon in the proposed area. It is also based on a 1 hour modeling and not the long term cumulative effects. When in modern history has a lithium fire only lasted one hour—the burn for days to weeks. Please redo your analysis and provide the results to include plum modeling not of averages but worst case and from various wind directions. I think you will find the result do not match your current findings of Minimal to No effect, unless of course you adjust your threshold stands to meet your objective. I look forward to seeing the results.

2. Engineering Controls --Flammable Gas and Smoke Detectors—That is nice but by the time they trigger it will be too late as a meltdown and fire will be active by the time a response team is on scene. How does this really help? NFPA 69 Roof Exhaust Ventilation System---This will help place increased toxins into the surrounding air—How does this help?
3. Administrative Controls—Ship BESS units with minimum charge – I guess this is good but I have never heard of a BESS unit fires while in-transit only when in operation. Why is this necessary if this is safe technology---I would like an answer to this question. Emergency Response Plans—Your answer—None exist—they will be developed once the BESS is in operation—That is not a satisfactory answer. You need to develop and publish a plan that is coordinated and signed off by all local fire agencies that will or could be called on to support a fire including required safety equipment PPE as well as Thermal Imaging Camera Systems and on-site or near-site explosion proof command and control facilities and who will provide these at no cost to the taxpayers or local fire agencies. In your report you indicated that the Dixon Fire District was onboard with this project—The Chief of the Dixon Fire District gave a compelling report that contradicts your assessment and clearly voiced opposition to this project. Please Explain your Confusion or Lie.
4. How do you plan to meet or circumvent the following LORS Solano County Ordinance No ZT-25-02? Solano County Agriculture Mitigation Ordinance No 2024-1858 , COC Land-1? Solano Irrigation District Rules and Regulations COC Land-2?

City of Vacaville Municipal Code Section 14.12.040.100, COC Land-3? I need answers to all of these.

5. Comparison of Alternative Sites—Your analysis states No Compatible Sites yet it states Least Environmental Effects but then says Would Not Meet Project Objectives. It goes on to say Lambie Industrial Park Alternative- Avoids Zoning Conflicts, Impacts to agricultural, biological resources, cultural resources, land use and visual resources along the Gen-Tie Route, Overall impact are of similar severity as the proposed project. Requires the same COC/mitigation as the proposed project. Central overhead Gen-Tie Route Alternative---Requires less ground disturbance, Overall impacts remain similar to the proposed project, Requires the same COC/Mitigation as the Proposed project. This entire analysis is flawed, probably because it was evident that the board or staff did not actually visit the Lambie site to conduct a proper analysis as they described the site as consisting of rolling hills that required extensive earth grading ---this side is mostly flat land. As far as Gen-Tie --this side also has several Calpine Peaker plants with existing 230KW Grid Ties which would provide much easier Gen-Tie with minimum ground disturbance and visual impact. I am really interested how you explain evaluating the Lambie site without your Board/Staff visiting and understanding the alt site---Please explain in your report
6. Environmental Agriculture/Land Use --Zoning Compatibility BESS site avoid important farmland, Cultural Resources—Unknown but expected to be similar. Hazards—facility would be greater distance from residence as Project COC/Mitigation expected to be similar to proposed site. Visual Resources—Land is predominantly undeveloped land Impact similar to proposed project So again please answer how you arrived at your analysis without adequate site visit—Please answer in your report
7. Now let's transition to what was missing in you analysis: You stated this project was good for our community sighting Construction Union Jobs Taxes, and Community Benefits Requirements met Support which amounted to \$500,000 to Solano Community Foundation—This seriously smells of a bribe or quid-per-bro I believe the term is.
8. You did not adequately evaluate the cost of forever loss of production, including the loss of profits for crops that can no longer be produced and sold at a profit sustaining local farmers answer how this doesn't have a negative impact far outweighing your projected benefits. You also did not evaluate the increased fire and property insurance increases due to increased fire potential or if we would even be able to get insurance outside the high-risk plans. You also did not evaluate the decrease/loss of property values, as who would want to buy land or a house near a

BESS. You also did not evaluate the negative impact on the Kaiser Hospital a class 1 Trauma Center and how you would protect its staff and patients, How could they safely be evacuated. You also failed to evaluate the impact on I-80 a major East-West arterial and the local roads shutting down citizens ability to get to/from work schools, appointments, etc as well as interstate commercial truck traveling delivering food and goods not only to local but from San Francisco to New York What is the mitigation plan for all these items and who pays for losses incurred as a result of these interruptions. Additionally, who pays for decommission of BESS or if the project owners/managers decide to walk away with the profits they realize and sell or declare bankruptcy. Roads leading to the BESS sites are posted at a maximum 7 Ton limit—Your BESS units and well as cranes and construction equipment will exceed these weight limits and damage or destroy our local rural roads, who pays to repair or replace to current or better condition.

9. Who Pays!! Is there a multiple Billion Dollar bond being held as a security for the entire life of the project?

In Closing, your board/staff did a hacked-up job of providing an acceptable analysis and I doubt you can do much if any better. For a Truthful, Fair, Unbiased analysis you need to bring it outside firms that are not burdened with Bias and Power to make this project work despite the pushback from invested citizens. If you can't fairly evaluate the pros and cons of this program, you should not vote in favor of it. Do the right thing During the presentation on 1 September 2026 you have recorded testimony of experts in various areas of evaluated areas that provided honest testimony that disputed your finding—reach out to them for help. Remember you are being held responsible for your actions and truthful answers to all questions provided not only be me but all the voting citizens who have provide testimony and challenges to your analysis I look forward to you amended report.

Lewis Derfuss, 5160 Poplar Road, Vacaville CA 95687