

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272794
Document Title:	Heidi Wood Comments - Corby Project is unsafe for residents of Vacaville
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Heidi Wood
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/15/2026 11:32:12 AM
Docketed Date:	9/15/2026

Comment Received From: Heidi Wood
Submitted On: 9/15/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

Corby Project is unsafe for residents of Vacaville

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

I am against the approval of the Corby project at the Byrnes and Kilkenny proposed site. Some of my questions and concerns are stated below, in my review of CEC Staff Assessment of the Corby Project. I recommend the CEC deny the project.

In the Executive Summary section, pg 1-4, the assessment states “provision of an onsite firefighting water supply” is part of the project. Question: Are lithium ion battery fires able to be put out with the use of water? If not, what other successful fire fighting supplies and means will be provided by Corby to prevent fires and their chemical impact to our air, ground water, and other environmental impacts?

In the Executive Summary, pg 1-13, section 1.7 mentions *Economic and Public Benefits*. How does this project benefit me and my neighbors in any way? If the Corby Project get approved, the value of my home and local neighborhoods will go down. I will no longer be able to purchase fire insurance or home owners insurance at my current rate, due to my home’s proximity to the project site. It is unlikely I will be able to sell my home, as I will need to disclose the proximity of the nearby Corby Project. I will also run the risk of having contaminated drinking water. All of these risks are significant to the financial and physical health of my home and family. These risks are in no way mitigated by any “gift” or “donation” the Corby company may have made to any local organization.

There are several inaccuracies in the Biological Resources, section 5.2-2, one of them being the temperature range covered (pg 218 of 1,403). Mathematically, a range consists of the difference between the largest and smallest values in a data set.

Inaccurate temperatures reported: “Annual temperatures range from 36.7 degrees Fahrenheit (F) to 95.2°F, with the coolest temperatures in January and the warmer temperatures in July. (WRCC 2026)”. This listed range of temperatures is 58.5 degrees F. This is clearly inaccurate information, as several times each year we have temperatures above 100 F, sometimes as high as 110 F. Just this year alone we have reached temperatures of 106 as measured at the Vacaville Nut Tree Airport on July 14, 2026. In June of 2026, there were 7 days that were above your top temperature of 95.2F. In July of 2026(<https://www.extreme-weatherwatch.com/cities/vacaville/year-2026>), there were 17 days above 95.2F - more than half the month was hotter than your temps listed in your report. Historically temperatures in Vacaville in 2023 had a low of 26 F and a high of 110F, which is a range of 84 degrees F(<https://www.extreme-weatherwatch.com/cities/vacaville/year-2023>)

The 2024 temperatures in Vacaville had a low of 28F and a high of 112 F, which is a range of 84 degrees F (<https://www.extreme-weatherwatch.com/cities/vacaville/year-2024>). This is significantly higher than the range of 58.5 degrees listed in the staff assessment. High temperatures adversely affect batteries, making fires much more likely.

Page 271 of the staff assessment lists the Clean Water Act, Sections 401 and 404 (33 USC, SS 1251-1376). By federal law, every applicant for a federal permit or license for an activity that may result in a discharge into a California water body, including wetlands, must request state certification that the proposed activity would not violate state and federal water quality standards. How will Next Era and the California Energy Commission ensure the Corby project does not contaminate local groundwater as happened with NextEra’s BESS project (the East Hampton Energy Storage Center) in New York?

On page 274 of the staff assessment, Solano County General Plan Policy RS.P-71: ensure that land use activities and development in occur in a manner that minimize the impact of earth, disturbance, erosion, and *surface runoff pollutants on water quality*. This is an issue with ground water and the water table being contaminated with runoff pollutants from the BESS. Solano County has an ordinance against the lithium ion batteries, because they catch fire and can cause runoff from firefighting.

Lastly, on page 277, Table 5.2.2 in the Environmental Impacts section, the question is posed “Would the project

(E.) conflict with any local policies or ordinances, protecting biological resources, such as a tree, preservation policy or ordinance?” Yes, this project is in conflict with the Solano County General plan, Policy RS.P-71, which states “ensure that land use activities and development in occur in a manner that minimize the impact of earth, disturbance, erosion, and **surface runoff pollutants on water quality.**” This is an issue with ground water and the water table being contaminated with runoff pollutants from the BESS. Solano County has an ordinance against the lithium ion batteries, because they catch fire and can cause runoff from firefighting. Therefore, this should be rated “Significant with unavoidable impact”.

I strongly recommend amending the staff assessment to correct these and other inaccuracies and denying the Corby Project.