

## Summary of November 30, 2022 Planning Board Meeting Minutes – BESS Application

Based on the excerpt provided from the Town of Islip Planning Board proceedings for the November 30, 2022 meeting regarding KCE NY 29, LLC (PB 2022-028), 220 Rabro Drive, Hauppauge.

### Project Overview

- Applicant: KCE NY 29, LLC / Key Capture Energy (represented by John Anzalone, Harris Beach, PLLC).
- Location: 220 Rabro Drive, Hauppauge (SE corner of Rabro Drive and Wheeler Road / Route 111).
- Request: Special Permit for a Tier 3 Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) under Town Code §68-456(F)(3).
- Additional request: Waiver of fencing requirements under §68-456(G) to allow a 12-foot visual/sound barrier wall; site plan modifications may also be requested.

### What the Applicant Presented

- Interconnection: Project would tie into LIPA's high-voltage grid via an underground connection to the existing LIPA substation north of the site across Rabro Drive.
- Purpose/justification: Applicant argued siting is constrained by the need to be near high-voltage transmission, substations, and load centers; stated project benefits include grid reliability, renewable integration, and peaker replacement.
- Company experience: KCE described itself as developer/owner/operator with projects in NY; referenced state energy-storage goals and studies asserting cost and emissions benefits.
- Technology and safety framing: Described modules, sensors, battery management system (BMS), and suppression equipment; discussed remote monitoring and an unmanned facility.
- Site plan highlights (as described): Demolition of an existing office building; construction of a large BESS with 276 battery units and 35 power conversion system units; project substation and control building; perimeter 12-foot sound/visual barrier wall; landscaping buffers and drainage improvements; minimal expected traffic (roughly one maintenance visit per month).

### Planning Staff Report

- Site details: 6.5-acre Industrial 1-zoned parcel; proposed 150 MW Tier 3 system; tallest structures noted were lightning masts at ~55 feet.
- Operations: 24/7/365 operations; daily/weekly remote inspections plus periodic on-site inspections.
- Noise: Staff cited estimates that noise would comply with Town limits; background noise increase at residential receptors estimated at ~1–3 dBA.

- Wall/fencing waiver: Staff explained the code's standard is a 6-foot fence with self-locking gate; applicant proposed a 12-foot wall (with some chain-link fencing still on portions of the site).
- Conditions to be refined: Staff recommended approval in concept but emphasized working out enforceable conditions, including superior landscaping, decorative exterior finish for the wall, and a site-specific (not generic) decommissioning plan; staff also suggested limiting the number/height of containers and requiring substantial future changes to return to the Board.

### Key Board Questions and Notable Answers

- Maintenance/Staffing: Board clarified the site would be unmanned; applicant said monitoring is remote and physical maintenance would be about once per month, typically 1–3 people, depending on task.
- Battery life & augmentation: Applicant stated ~20-year operational life with periodic augmentation every ~3–5 years to offset battery degradation, using preplanned pads and conduits.
- Commercial arrangements: Applicant stated there was not yet an executed purchase agreement/PPA; discussion referenced contracting opportunities through utility RFPs and/or NYSEDA.
- 55-foot structures: Clarified as lightning masts (not light poles) to meet electrical standards for high-voltage equipment.
- Sound levels: Chairman asked for on-site sound levels; engineer later stated loudest spot on site was about 75 dB; applicant agreed to provide additional written sound info.
- Decommissioning: Chairman pressed for a site-specific decommissioning plan as required by code; applicant acknowledged the submitted plan was generic and needed more specificity; discussion referenced the code-required decommissioning bond and incorporating responsibilities into covenants & restrictions (C&Rs).
- Monitoring location: Board member asked who monitors the site and whether it is local; applicant could not specify the monitoring location at that time (said NY or elsewhere) and was asked to provide that answer in writing.

### Public Input

No public speaker cards were submitted and no members of the public spoke on the BESS application in the excerpt provided.

### Procedural Outcome / Action Taken

- The Planning Board voted to keep the public hearing open for two weeks and reserve decision.
- Purpose of reserving: allow time to review emails received, work on a site-specific decommissioning plan, refine covenants & restrictions (C&Rs), and obtain a written response about where the site would be monitored from.

## Key Takeaways

- At this meeting, the Board did not approve the project; it kept the record open and reserved decision.
- Two recurring issues were explicitly flagged on the record: (1) the need for a site-specific decommissioning plan (and related bond/C&R language) and (2) clarity on the remote monitoring location and security response.
- The applicant emphasized landscaping/sound-wall screening and code compliance, while the Board focused on missing specifics (sound details, decommissioning, monitoring).