

**From:** [John Norris](#)  
**To:** [Shari Winstead](#); [Chris Eggen](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Will Hall](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Chris Roberts](#)  
**Cc:** [Debbie Tarry](#); [Carolyn Wurdeman](#); [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Ian Sievers](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Development code amendments  
**Date:** Monday, July 14, 2014 4:48:59 PM

---

Council,

Please see below the questions from Councilmember Salomon and answers from staff regarding the proposed development code amendments and Vegetation Management Plans. This will be added to the Green Folder.

-John

-----Original Message-----

From: Rachael Markle  
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 4:43 PM  
To: Jesse Salomon  
Cc: John Norris; Julie Ainsworth-Taylor  
Subject: RE: Development code amendments

Councilmember Salomon:

Please excuse the short hand responses. I hope they make sense and provide you with the information you were seeking.

1) CAN YOU EXPLAIN/DEFINE A VMP?

There is no standard definition or explanation of a vegetation management plan. That would be a first step in adopting a provision to allow vegetation management plans - what is "it" that the City would be allowing large tract land owners to do and potentially be exempt from. Generally, a VMP is a comprehensive plan for the management of vegetation on a property. VMPs set goals and objectives to be achieved for the property. VMPs can inventory the present state, say what is to be done, where things are done, when they will be done, how they are to be done, etc. It sets mitigation measures and monitoring standards. When I think of vegetation management plans I think of a conservation and preservation activities associated with vegetation. Such as plans to remove invasive species to promote the health of native vegetation perhaps in areas that also are layered with critical areas that need detailed replanting plans to protect against erosion, protect fish habitat, etc. Others may view vegetation management plans as a means to remove vegetation for other reasons. The purpose for VMPs should be clear so that it is applied as intended by Council if it is adopted as a tool to be implemented by staff. In the amendment proposed by Innis Arden VMPs would be used to: 1) maintain safety of pre existing recreational/access trails; or 2) preserve or restore views of Puget Sound & Olympic Mountains; or 3) maintain+ existing golf course; or 4) promote environmental stewardship; or 5) analogous purposes.

2) IS IT SIMPLY AN ACCOUNTING OF VEGETATION EXISTING ON A PROPERTY AND AN ACCOUNTING FOR WHAT HAPPENS TO THE VEGETATION?

No. The plan may include an accounting of the existing vegetation, or not and to what degree of accounting would be required would likely need to be determined and codified to ensure compliance. The plan would include accounting for what happened the vegetation, but again the degree to which this should be required would need to be determined as part of the code standards for a VMP or in the VMP itself.

3) I ASSUME IT WOULD ONLY BE AN EXEMPTION IF THAT IS STATED IN A VMP IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE (WOULD COUNCIL BE PASSING AN ORDINANCE ON THIS?).

Yes. Council would determine what provisions if any, a property owner would be exempt from doing when a VMP is approved. I do not recommend approving the Innis Arden amendment as proposed in the July 10, 2014 letter without further analysis of the implications for this reason. It needs to be discussed with the public, Planning Commission, City Council & perhaps qualified professionals if critical area standards are to be altered as a result of allowing Vegetation Management Plans. This may be a

fairly technical conversation that requires input from a variety of on call qualified professionals.

#### 4) WHY IS THIS (VMPs) A SUPERIOR MANAGEMENT TOOL?

VMPs represent a holistic approach prepared by qualified professional(s) to manage vegetation on a property over time. In general, work authorized by the VMP would not require a permit; the intent is to streamline the process. But, there should be, at the minimum, staff review to ensure that the work was consistent with the VMP including monitoring of the plan to ensure performance measures as specified in the plan by the qualified professional are being achieved (and if not that there are requirements for the property owner to implement contingency plans as recommended by the qualified professional(s)). A lot of work would need to be done to: define what a VMP is in Shoreline; more explicitly define the contents of the VMP; determine the process for approving/denying/modifying a VMP; determine the cost structure for review, inspection, ongoing monitoring, bonding and enforcement; and write the intent of the VMP to be clear to avoid internal conflicts. This is easier when narrowly define with the purpose being conservation, preservation or enhancement of a critical area through management of the vegetation. It becomes a bigger conversation when the purpose of a VMP is expanded to include other activities (recreation, views).

Sincerely,  
Rachael Markle  
City of Shoreline  
Director, Planning and Community Development  
206-801-2531

> -----Original Message-----

> From: John Norris  
> Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 3:14 PM  
> To: Rachael Markle; Steve Szafran; Julie Ainsworth-Taylor  
> Subject: FW: Development code amendments  
> Importance: High  
>  
> Can you please respond to Jesse's question below? Thanks.  
>  
> -John  
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jesse Salomon  
> Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 3:05 PM  
> To: John Norris  
> Subject: Re: Development code amendments  
>

> Can you explain/define a vmp? Is it simply an accounting of vegetation existing on a property and an accounting for what happens to the vegetation? Is it an exemption to existing rules (eg the tree code)? I assume it would only be an exemption if that is stated in a vmp implementing ordinance (would council be passing an ordinance on this?).

>  
> I'm not clear from an environmental and or property management perspective why this is a superior management tool.

>  
> Jesse Salomon, Councilmember  
> City of Shoreline  
> Jsalomon@Shorelinewa.gov  
> (206) 396-5807  
>

>  
>  
>  
> Sent from my iPad  
>

>> On Jul 14, 2014, at 1:00 PM, "John Norris" <jnorris@shorelinewa.gov> wrote:

>>  
>> Council,  
>>  
>> Councilmember Roberts had the following questions regarding the Development Code amendments that are up for discussion tonight. Staff's response is below. We'll also put this response in the green folder. Please let me know if you have any additional questions. Thanks!  
>> -John  
>>  
>> 1) As "Department" is defined in the definition section, it appears there are still a few times in the proposed development code that the full name of the planning department is spelled out. Is that necessary?  
>>  
>> You are correct in that it is not necessary to spell out Planning and Community Development each time. All references after the definition of Department can be changed to "Department".  
>>  
>>  
>> 2) If the council wanted to go forward with a VMP approach, would that need to go to the planning commission again?  
>>  
>> A change that is beyond the scope of what the Planning Commission (PC) considered should go before the PC in a separate public hearing but is not required. At the June 5 public hearing before the PC, no specific language was proposed by Innis Arden, only comments by Mr. Eglick, attorney for Innis Arden, that the PC should direct staff to work with the Golf Club and Innis Arden to create a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) process and its relevant code language. Thus, for the public, the first time they would have heard about this concept would have been via attendance at the June 5 public hearing or by express review of Mr. Eglick's comment letters submitted to the PC. In other words, at the PC public hearing, the VMP concept was first introduced.  
>>  
>> While the GMA recognizes changes will occur in proposed legislation, if that change occurs after the time for public review and comment then the City has to provide for additional review/comment before they can vote unless it is within the scope of alternatives previously available.  
>>  
>> In this situation, not only is the VMP proposal outside the scope of alternatives previously considered, the public has never been officially given the opportunity to review/comment on this specific concept (that is unless they were at the June 5 hearing, but even then, no textual language was provide; just a concept). Thus, staff is recommending that if the City Council is interested in considering the creation and adoption of VMP code language, the safest course of action would be to return to the PC for re-noticing and public hearing.  
>>  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Chris Roberts  
>> Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 6:24 AM  
>> To: Debbie Tarry  
>> Cc: Carolyn Wurdeman; John Norris  
>> Subject: Development code amendments  
>>  
>> Debbie,  
>>  
>> Two quick questions.  
>>  
>> 1) As "Department" is defined in the definition section, it appears there are still a few times in the proposed development code that the full name of the planning department is spelled out. Is that necessary?  
>>  
>> 2) If the council wanted to go forward with a VMP approach, would that need to go to the planning commission again?  
>>  
>> Thanks,  
>>

>> Chris  
>>  
>> Chris Roberts, Councilmember  
>> City of Shoreline  
>> croberts@shorelinewa.gov  
>> (206) 391-2733