A. Call to Order
B. Roll Call and Excuse Absent Members
C. Adoption of Agenda
D. Adoption of Meeting Minutes, October 8 and November 12
E. New Business:
   1. Review and approval of the NFP Supplemental Site Plan Application for a demolition project at 500 Golden Drive
   2. Review and approval of the NFP Supplemental Site Plan Application for a redevelopment project at 3825 Stadium Drive
F. Old Business (none)
G. Board Comments
H. Citizen Comments
L. Adjourn Meeting
A. Meeting called to order by the board chair at 4:00 PM.

B. Members present:
   Bobby Glasser
   Kyle Martin
   Paul MacNellis
   Mitch Lettow
   Erin Fuller

   Members absent:
   Ashley Cole Wick
   Alan Sylvester

   Staff present:
   Jamie McCarthy
   Nolan Bergstrom

C. A motion was made by Paul MacNellis to adopt the agenda as presented, supported by Erin Fuller. The motion passed by voice vote.

D. A motion was made by Paul MacNellis to adopt the minutes from the September 24, 2019 meeting, supported by Erin Fuller. The motion passed by voice vote.

E. New Business:

   1. The NFP Board debriefed following the slope variance request at the meeting on September 24 petitioned by Spartan Services Partners, LLC for 3825 Stadium Drive. The board reviewed the process and the standards by which projects must be evaluated to meet the requirements for a variance.

   The NFP Board discussed the broader site plan review process, which departments or city staff are responsible for which portions of site plan review, what permits and inspections take place and when (to ensure site plan compliance), and what information is required at site plan review versus permitting (i.e., stamped engineering drawing). The NFP Board is interested in having engineering staff at one of the board meetings to further explain the process.

F. Old Business:
1. The NFP Board was introduced to Nolan Bergstrom as the new NFP intern in CP&ED. Nolan is a graduate student at Western Michigan University studying regional and urban planning. Nolan will be assisting the City in phase 2 of the NFP mapping process with guidance from the NFP Board.

Ms. McCarthy started the discussion by reminding the board of key objectives used in phase 1 of the NPF process, including: 1) scientifically defensible, 2) does not preclude development, 3) protective of natural features, and 4) phase 2 will consider whether other mechanisms are necessary to protect natural features. The board discussed categories of natural features including how to prioritize woodland protection (is there an acreage or percent canopy cover goal we need to define?), how best to prioritize slopes (intersection with other natural features?), where are the gapes in the current overlay district, buffer zones and edge effects, and outstanding sections for floodplains and wildlife corridors.

Board members reviewed the current overlay district with staff, and Nolan provided maps of publicly available datasets. The board suggested Nolan research available data to enhance the district to protect the natural features:

- Compare the State’s GIS hydrology layer and National Wetlands Inventory data with the existing overlay district to determine which features adjacent to water and wetlands would need to be added to the district to protect riparian areas and water quality.

- Determine how to prioritize and protect important slopes or geologic features that are not currently included in the overlay district.

- What criteria should be used to identify and prioritize woodlands for protection?

- Are there other features or priorities that have not be considered when developing the overlay district?

G. Board Comments (none)

H. Citizen Comments (none)

L. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.
A. Meeting called to order by the board chair at 4:02 PM.

B. Members present:
   - Bobby Glasser
   - Kyle Martin
   - Paul MacNellis
   - Mitch Lettow
   - Erin Fuller
   - Alan Sylvester

   Members absent:
   - Ashley Cole Wick

   Staff present:
   - Nolan Bergstrom
   - Jamie McCarthy

C. A motion was made by Paul MacNellis to adopt the agenda as presented, supported by Erin Fuller. The motion passed by voice vote.

D. No meeting minutes from the October 8, 2019 meeting were provided by staff at the meeting. These minutes will be available at our next meeting.

E. New Business:

   1. Ms. McCarthy provided an update on upcoming projects that will likely come in front of the board soon:

      - The redevelopment project at 3825 Stadium Drive is still working on geotechnical sampling, analysis, and engineering design for the large retaining wall at the back of the development. They anticipate submitting their full application for site plan review in early December.

      - The Heritage Community of Kalamazoo is working on a site plan application for a demolition project they wish to begin before December 31, 2019. They anticipate having a full application for site plan review in late November.

      - DNS Stadium Drive, LLC is working with the Assistant City Planner on a rezoning application for early 2020 for the parcels at Stadium Dr. and Drake Rd. This project will likely be seeking variances from the NFP ordinance and would come to the board for a recommendation if a successful rezoning takes place.
F. Old Business:

1. Mr. Bergstrom and Ms. McCarthy lead a discussion with the board on various mapping analyses done as part of NFP phase 2 efforts.

   - **Water Resources & Wetlands:** Mr. Bergstrom further explored buffer analysis of parcels located along waterways and wetlands, which the Board had requested during the October 8 meeting. Upon presenting the maps of parcels located within 100 ft and 300 ft of waterways and wetlands, the board discussed the scientific and practical merit of using one buffer layer over the other. The Board requested that staff provide a comparison and statistics of the existing NFP overlay district and the 100 ft and 300 ft buffer layers at a future meeting.

   - **Slopes:** Mr. Bergstrom provided the board with a map of slopes within the City 20% or greater in grade. The slopes cover a significant portion of the City. The board asked staff to determine how much of the slopes are already protected with the existing overlay district. The board discussed other natural features, such as forests, that could be layered to determine the most critical slopes for protection.

   - **Woodlands & Tree Canopy:** Mr. Bergstrom provided an overview of the iTREE mapping program that he used to begin to calculate existing tree canopy cover. Mr. Bergstrom entered around 800 random points into the program with a binary coding of tree or non-tree. The analysis estimated the tree canopy within the city at approximately 25% coverage. Board members recommended several other data sources Mr. Bergstrom could use to come iTREE data against.

G. Board Comments (none)

H. Citizen Comments (none)

L. Meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.
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