

# Community Visioning Report



Shoreline Master Program Update 🌊 City of Long Beach 🌊 March 2015

Final Report: reflects input from the public; text revisions respond to comments by the Washington State Department of Ecology

This is the work product for Task No. 6.1 of SMA Grant Agreement No. G1400375



Final  
Community Visioning Report  
Long Beach Shoreline Master Program Update



Prepared by:

The City of Long Beach  
115 Bolstad West  
PO Box 310  
Long Beach, Washington 98631

Under supervision of:

The Washington State Department of Ecology  
PO Box 47775  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Contact:

Gayle Borchard  
Director of Community Development  
360.642.4421

Contact:

Kim Van Zwalenburg  
Senior Regional Shoreline Planner  
360.407.6520

This report funded in part by a grant from the  
Washington State Department of Ecology



March 2015

This document should be cited as follows:

City of Long Beach, Washington, 2015. Final Visioning Report: Long Beach Shoreline Master Program Update. March.

# Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Acronyms & Abbreviations.....	iii
Glossary .....	iv
Executive Summary.....	1
1.0 Introduction .....	3
1.1 Background .....	3
1.2 Purposes of this Document .....	3
1.3 How to Use this Document.....	3
2.0 Methodology.....	5
2.1 Website .....	5
2.2 Workshops .....	5
2.3 Visioning Exercise .....	5
2.3.1 Advertisement.....	5
2.3.2 Direct Contact of Stakeholders .....	5
2.3.3 Visioning Open House .....	6
2.3.4 Comment Period.....	6
3.0 Results .....	7
3.1 Topics of Interest/Concern .....	7
3.1.1 Environmental Protection.....	7
3.1.2 Public Access .....	7
3.1.3 Shoreline Development .....	8
3.1.4 Miscellaneous.....	8
3.2 The Future Long Beach Shoreline.....	9
3.2.1 In 10 Years .....	9
Environment.....	9
Public Access and Recreation.....	9
Shoreline Development.....	11

3.2.2	In 20 Years .....	11
	Environment.....	11
	Public Access and Recreation.....	11
	Shoreline Development.....	12
3.3	Goals and Policy Implications.....	12
3.3.1	Environmental Protection.....	12
3.3.2	Public Access and Recreation .....	13
3.3.3	Shoreline Development .....	14
4.0	Acknowledgements .....	15
5.0	References.....	17

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

**A. Decision-maker Workshop**

A.1 Long Beach Planning Commission Workshop Materials

**B. December 16, 2014 Visioning Exercise**

B.1 Chinook Observer Ad-Invitation to Visioning Open House

B.2 Direct Mail Materials

B.3 Visioning open House Sign-in Sheets

B.4 Visioning Open house Hand-outs

B.5 Chinook Observer Ad Inviting Comments on Inventory Report and Visioning

**C. Visioning Comments**

C.1 Summary of Comments

C.2 Comments in their Entirety



# Acronyms & Abbreviations

The first appearance in the text of each of the following acronyms and abbreviations is marked with the † symbol.

**Ecology:** Washington State Department of Ecology

**MHW or MHT:** Mean High Water or Mean High Tide

**OHWM:** Ordinary high water mark

**RCW:** Revised Code of Washington

**SCA:** Seashore Conservation Area

**SCL:** Seashore Conservation Line

**SED:** Shoreline Environment Designation

**SEPA:** Washington State Environmental Policy Act

**SMA:** Washington State Shoreline Management Act

**SMP:** Shoreline Master Program



*Blank Page*

# Glossary

The first appearance in the text of each of the following words or phrases is marked with the  $\Phi$  symbol.

**1889 GOVERNMENT MEANDER LINE:** The western limit of privately-owned beach property, the approximate location of mean high tide, at the time Washington achieved statehood in 1889. Also termed The 1889 Line or the Western Upland Boundary, or simply the 1889 Line.

**ACCRETION:** A gradual process in which layers of a material are formed as small amounts are added over time.

**DEFLATION PLAIN:** The low area between the foredune and old dune ridge, where the foredune blocks the deposition of new sand and wind scours and erodes the surface, often down to the water table.

**FOREDUNE:** The large, currently developing primary dune, closest to the ocean.

**INTERDUNAL WETLAND:** Wetlands located in small interdunal depressions to extensive deflation plains behind stabilized foredunes. Interdunal wetlands are primarily fresh water; they have mineral soil; and they are groundwater dependent with seasonal fluctuations.

**MEAN HIGH WATER:** The average of all the high water heights observed over a specific 19-year period (currently 1983 through 2001) called the National Tidal Datum Epoch. Also termed Mean High Tide.

**ORDINARY HIGH WATER MARK (OHWM):** On lakes, streams, and tidal water, that mark that will be found by examining the bed and banks and ascertaining where the presence and action of waters are so common and usual, and so long continued in all ordinary years, as to mark upon the soil a character distinct from that of the abutting upland, in respect to vegetation as that condition exists on June 1, 1971, as it may naturally change thereafter, or as it may change thereafter in accordance with permits issued by a local government or the department; provided that in any area where the ordinary high water mark cannot be found, the ordinary high water mark adjoining salt water shall be the line of mean higher high tide and the ordinary high water mark adjoining fresh water shall be the line of mean high water.

**SEASHORE CONSERVATION LINE (SCL):** Originally, a line established in 1968 approximately one hundred feet (100') east of the vegetation line; the area west of the SCL is included in the Seashore Conservation Area. Now, a moveable line reviewed and re-established by the Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission every 10 years, starting in 1980. There are now 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010 SCLs. The 1980 SCL is the current building setback line in Long Beach, and private construction may not occur west of the 1980 SCL.

**SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM (SMP):** Local land use policies and regulations designed to manage shoreline use. An SMP is intended to protect natural resources for future generations, provide for public access to public waters and shores, and plan for water-dependent uses. SMPs are created by an Ecology-local community partnership, and must comply with the Shoreline Management Act and Shoreline Master Program Guidelines.

**SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM GUIDELINES:** Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Guidelines are state standards that local governments must follow in drafting their shoreline master programs. The Guidelines translate the broad policies of the Shoreline Management Act (Revised Code of Washington RCW\* 90.58.020) into standards for regulation of shoreline uses.

**STAKEHOLDER:** A party or entity (person, organization, group, etc.) who has an interest in the SMP update.

**VISIONING:** A community exercise whereby stakeholders express how they envision the future. Visioning can identify common goals community members can collectively attempt to achieve.

**WATER-DEPENDENT USE:** A use or portion of a use which cannot exist in a location that is not adjacent to the water and which is dependent on the water by reason of the intrinsic nature of its operations.

**WATER-ENJOYMENT USE:** A recreational use or other use that facilitates public access to the shoreline as a primary characteristic of the use; or a use that provides for recreational use or aesthetic enjoyment of the shoreline for a substantial number of people as a general characteristic of the use and which through location, design, and operation ensures the public's ability to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of the shoreline. In order to qualify as a water-enjoyment use, the use must be open to the general public and the shoreline-oriented space within the project must be devoted to the specific aspects of the use that fosters shoreline enjoyment.

**WATER-ORIENTED USE:** A use that is water-dependent, water-related, or water-enjoyment, or a combination of such uses.

**WATER-RELATED USE:** A use or portion of a use which is not intrinsically dependent on a waterfront location but whose economic viability is dependent upon a waterfront location because:

**WETLAND(S):** Those areas that are inundated or saturated by ground or surface water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.



# Executive Summary

The City of Long Beach is preparing this Visioning<sup>†</sup> Report in accordance with terms and conditions of Grant Agreement No. G1400375 with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)<sup>†1</sup>. The current Shoreline Master Program<sup>†</sup> (SMP)<sup>†</sup> update, including this document, is intended to provide environmental protection for the area designated as “shoreline”, to preserve and enhance public access to the shoreline, and to manage shoreline development.

The Washington shoreline is a valued resource for all state citizens. The ocean beach is shared by all citizens as a public asset, while the shoreline area further east, encompassing the dunes and the deflation plain<sup>†</sup> may be either public or private lands. For that reason, depending on each person’s relationship to the shoreline, citizen points of view on how the shoreline should be preserved and/or developed can be expected to vary. It is the City’s job to listen to citizen input, and to create goals and policies that accomplish environmental protection, public access, and shoreline development consistent to the extent practicable with the public’s vision.

In order to elicit public comment on the future Long Beach shoreline, the City has done the following to date:

- Developed and regularly maintained a portion of its municipal website dedicated to the SMP update process;
- Conducted a City Council workshop on the SMP update;
- Conducted a Planning Commission workshop on the SMP update;
- E-mailed 100+ SMP stakeholders about the SMP update effort, and inviting them to a “visioning” open house;
- Direct mailed 540+ shoreline area property owners about the SMP update effort, and inviting them to the visioning open house;
- Published an ad in a newspaper of general circulation inviting the public to attend the Visioning workshop;
- Conducted a visioning open house to inform the public regarding the SMP update process and to invite citizens to provide their vision statements on the future shoreline; and
- Published an ad in a newspaper of general circulation inviting citizens to review and comment on the Draft Inventory & Characterization Report (work product of Task No. 5 under Grant Agreement No. G1400375) and to provide visioning comments

The city has had moderate success in eliciting input from citizens, and the scope and focus of that input is discussed in further detail in this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first use of an abbreviation, acronym, or term requiring definition in the document Glossary is marked with this †symbol.

In general, the visioning exercise revealed those who responded prefer to “leave well enough alone.” Respondents value what is here, and while they do not expect time to stand still and anticipate the leisurely rate of development will continue, they would like to enjoy the Long Beach shoreline in the future much as they do today. They see a future with clammers and horses sharing the beach, kites flying over a natural shoreline, and fishermen earning their living in the ocean off our shore.

Many comments envision a future shoreline with preservation or improvement of existing public amenities, such as the boardwalk, and additional recreational amenities, such as viewing platforms, public art, and enhanced and more user-friendly public beach access.

Respondents seem to have captured and to value the essence of Long Beach, a residential/resort community where people visit or live to recreate. They accept a level of shoreline development, but only if it will not interfere with the historical early seashore charm or the traditional recreational opportunities offered by Long Beach



# 1.0 Introduction

The City of Long Beach is updating its SMP. The City recognizes the shoreline is an asset to all state citizens, and is of particular concern to those who live in a shoreline community and/or own shoreline property. For these reasons, it is important to incorporate citizen input to the SMP update process. Getting meaningful public input is always a challenge, and the city faces two challenges in particular. First, Long Beach does not have a highly activist community. In addition, 45% of the dwelling units in the city are seasonal housing; in fact, there are more housing units in Long Beach than there are full-time residents, and many shoreline area property owners are seasonal residents. So, the city faces a challenge to effectively include in the SMP update process not only its full-time residents, but also those who may be far-flung.

## 1.1 Background

As part of its SMP update, the city prepared a Public Participation Plan (City of Long Beach, 2013). An element of that plan was to conduct a shoreline “visioning” exercise after completion of a Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report. That inventory report was complete in draft format in November 2014, and in December 2014. Using the inventory to establish a baseline of current conditions to spur discussion of desired future conditions, the city conducted an exercise to capture a community vision of the future shoreline. This meeting was anticipated to be a broad community-wide meeting, and it was.

## 1.2 Purposes of this Document

This report summarizes the results of the visioning exercise. It serves to identify the vision of a desired future shoreline, including goals and policies that will fulfill that vision. This report supports SMP update development by identifying public goals and policies that will implement those goals.

## 1.3 How to Use this Document

In concert with other documents, and information, this document is meant to inform the city’s development of its updated SMP. The public may best use this document to understand how others envision the future shoreline, and compare this to their own vision. Also, this document provides ideas about how the city might go about accomplishing the desired future shoreline. Once the Washington State Department of Ecology reviews and vets this document, it can be used by the city to finalize a complete suite SMP goals and to develop additional SMP policies to implement these goals.



*Blank Page*

## 2.0 Methodology

In order to inform decision-makers and citizens regarding this SMP update—and in particular regarding the visioning exercise—the city undertook several methods to both disseminate information and to elicit citizen input. At each step, the city has strived to emphasize that shoreline management has three essential components: environmental protection, public access, and shoreline development.

The specific method described in the report is a “visioning” exercise. This exercise was conducted at an open house-style public meeting. This document includes any vision statements or comments received on visioning through January 31, 2015.

Documentation of all methods used are found in the appendices to this report.

### 2.1 Website

A specific portion of the city’s website is dedicated to SMP update. (see <http://www.longbeachwa.gov/smp-home/>) That website includes current status of the effort, SMP update documents, contact information, and information on how a citizen can participate in the SMP update effort. The City advertised the Visioning open house on the Public Participation portion of its SMP website.

### 2.2 Workshops

Prior to the public visioning open house, the city conducted a Planning Commission workshop on the SMP update process, and provided materials to Commissioners for review. (see Appendix A.1 for workshop materials) While city workshops are open to the public, they are not interactive. That is, the public does not sit down with decision-makers, but rather has the opportunity to observe the Commission as they get “up to speed” on a topic or process. In this manner, the public gets informed as decision-makers get informed. Staff has also kept the City Council apprised of SMP update progress during regular staff updates.

### 2.3 Visioning Exercise

#### 2.3.1 Advertisement

The city advertised an invitation to the visioning open house in the December 10, 2014 edition of the *Chinook Observer*, a newspaper of general circulation. The ad also invited citizens to a discussion on the general concept of the SMP update and what it means at that same open house. (see Appendix B.1)

#### 2.3.2 Direct Contact of Stakeholders

On December 5, 2014, the city direct–mailed a letter to owners of properties located west of Ocean Beach Boulevard. A total of 542 letters were mailed; nine were returned as undeliverable,

unable to forward. The letter generally described the SMP process, described the draft Inventory and Characterization report, told the recipient where that document was located on the city’s website, and invited the recipient to review and comment on that report. The letter also invited the recipient to the SMP update Visioning Open house. (see Appendix B.2 for the letter and the list of recipients)

In addition to advertising and direct mail, the city e-mailed 102 stakeholders representing a broad spectrum of interests to the visioning open house.

### **2.3.3 Visioning Open House**

On December 16, 2014, the city hosted a visioning open house. Based on sign-in sheets (see Appendix B.4), about two dozen citizens plus staff plus decision-makers attended. In addition, a senior staff member from the Department of Ecology, Mr. Rick Mraz, attended the open house. This event, which started at 6 PM and ended at 7:30 PM, was intended as an actual open house where citizens were able to mill about, chat with one another, pick up informational materials (see Appendix B.4 for SMP update and visioning materials), and ask staff questions. They then could sit and write their vision statements. The open house format quickly morphed into a question and answer format, which was apparently what the citizenry was most comfortable with, and since many people had general process questions, it worked out well that those sort of basic questions were answered for all. Ecology staff participated by answering technical questions that city staff could not.

Visioning was explained in simple terms—basically, people were asked to close their eyes and envision their ideal shoreline in 10 years, then to describe it as well as those things the city could do to make that vision happen; they should then repeat that process for a timeframe of 20 years.

Many people at the open house wanted to think about what they learned that night, and provide their vision statements at a later time. The city agreed that if citizens desired more time for a more thoughtful response, then more time was fitting.

### **2.3.4 Comment Period**

Because some citizens wanted or needed more time to prepare their vision statements, the city left that deadline open-ended by the end of the open house. The city decided that an additional six weeks was sufficient time, and so closed the comment period for both visioning and review of the Inventory and Characterization Report on January 30, 2015. The City advertised its deadline for written comments in the January 28, 2015 edition of the *Chinook Observer*. (see Appendix B.5 for advertisement). Ten citizens provided vision statements.



## 3.0 Results

The following is a compilation of citizen’s vision statements, generally from written vision statements, with a small amount of additional information from topics brought up at the open house or from citizens calling in or stopping by the City Hall counter to discuss shoreline issues. Also, one comment stems from Pacific County’s SMP update process.

One topic of concern that was brought up repeatedly at the open house was beach safety. While clearly of great concern to Long Beach citizens, this is not a topic addressed in an SMP. Ecology staff made this point clear at the open house. There was at least one member of the local beach safety committee at the open house who was able to capture these comments. (see Appendix C.1 for a summary of comments and Appendix C.2 for comments as provided in their entirety)

### 3.1 Topics of Interest/Concern

#### 3.1.1 Environmental Protection

All respondents stated a strong preference for preserving the dune area as-is, including the dune itself, dune grass, interdunal\* wetlands, and storm water protection features. Respondents were split on the preservation of beach pine forests: some see them an essential element of the dune environment, and other see them as a fire hazard that blocks ocean views and harbors troublesome predator wildlife such as bears.

With the exception of one respondent who preferred a moratorium on all shoreline area building, and one who preferred development only be allowed immediately west of the downtown corridor, respondents who stressed preservation accepted the context that preservation would occur in conjunction with the relatively low levels of development historically experienced in Long Beach.

The city also received several comments on tsunami protection.

#### 3.1.2 Public Access

In general, many people felt public access is adequate; several respondents preferred it be increased, but with attendant parking. Most commenters approved of vehicle beach access, and want to see that continue. Several respondents addressed a fairly common problem: once down on the beach, it can be difficult to find your way back. A topic that hits upon both public access and shoreline development is the Discovery Trail. The city received numerous comments about expanding or improving the trail.

One commenter provided several suggestions for additional attractions at beach approaches to improve the public access experience.

As part of Pacific County’s SMP update process, “access” has been discussed in terms of access to full fishing rights, with no ocean obstructions or any other diminution of fishing access or

rights. Fishing is an important element of the regional economy, and an historic way of life. Feeling regarding fishing rights and ocean access for fishing are very strong.

### 3.1.3 Shoreline Development

With one exception, respondents preferred to retain the 1980 Seashore Conservation Line<sup>†</sup> (SCL)<sup>†</sup> as the building setback line. One respondent preferred the line be moved west, but did not state where it should be. No respondents suggested that development of actual buildings be located within 200 feet of ordinary high water mark<sup>†</sup> (OHWM)<sup>†</sup>.

Many comments suggested improvements to or recreation-related development of the Discovery Trail and beach approaches.

One respondent pointed out the City must develop policies regarding wind and wave energy facilities in the ocean area.

### 3.1.4 Miscellaneous

One respondent focused on permit process issues, recommending several things (city responses are in *italic*):

1. Shoreline permits should be subject to SEPA<sup>†</sup> (the Washington State Environmental Policy Act). *This is already the case; however, it should be noted that several classes of projects are exempt from shoreline permitting processes, and several classes are exempt from SEPA processes. These exemptions are set out in state law.*
2. SEPA should include analyses by experts, including wetland experts and hydrologists. *SEPA is prepared under the guidance of the lead agency, utilizing those experts the lead agency thinks necessary, based on the nature of the individual project and the resources affected.*
3. Environmental experts must not be hired by the lead agency or the applicant. *This comment begs the question of who would hire the experts. The applicant is responsible for accurate and truthful preparation of the SEPA document, and the lead agency is ultimately responsible for its contents.*
4. A perimeter survey should be taken of a proposed development before the application is approved. *The city requires that property corners be staked before a building is constructed. For a “development” such as a subdivision requiring either a short or long plat, a survey is an integral part of that approval process.*
5. Signatures of owners of adjacent properties for proof of receipt of applications of shoreline permits should be obtained before they are approved. *Applications for permits are not made available to adjacent owners as a routine course of business. Shoreline permits are subject to a rigorous hearing procedure in front of the Long Beach hearing examiner, including public notice via direct mail to any owner of property located within 300 feet of the proposed project site, publication on a newspaper of general circulation, and posting of the subject*

*site, a notice procedure that exceeds state requirements. Also, a public copy of the project file is made available for review at city hall. Finally, any permit file may be requested via a Public Records Request to the city clerk.*

## 3.2 The Future Long Beach Shoreline

The shoreline vision described below is based on citizen input during the Long Beach visioning process, other input provided to city staff, and input on ocean resources that is relevant to Long Beach that was gleaned from the Pacific County SMP update process.

### 3.2.1 In 10 Years

The “best and most well-known” aspects of the Long Beach shoreline and near-shore will have been preserved: ocean views; a sweeping expanse of sand; a high foredune blanketed in dune grass with beach pine forest; excellent bike/pedestrian, vehicular, and equestrian beach access; the Discovery Trail and boardwalk; and numerous recreational opportunities.

The Long Beach ocean beach will look just as it does today: flocks of shorebirds and pelicans will roost on the beach, clammers will be digging, walkers will be strolling, street vehicles (not including all-terrain vehicles or off-road vehicles) will be travelling the beach, as will wind-driven vehicles. The primary foredune<sup>†</sup> will be taller, and blanketed with dune grass. Much as it does today, the deflation plain<sup>†</sup> will include a mix of dune grass, wetland vegetation, shore pine forest, and also landscaping plants associated with development.

### Environment

There will have been no net loss of shoreline functions and values, including wetlands, water treatment, habitat, and storm management. Views from the beach toward the ocean will be natural, with no wind or wave farm development. Views from the beach toward town will be of the primary foredune, with a few treetops and rooftops peeking over, and with intermittent raptor perches that also serve as public access signage (see below).

The citizenry will be well-informed on tsunami-related issues. A vertical evacuation structure will be complete in a non-shoreline area, and a pedestrian tsunami evacuation route will be complete.

The City will have enacted a vegetation management program adopted by ordinance and consistent with the city’s critical areas regulations, so owners can understand exactly how to maintain shoreline property legally and effectively. Dunal forests will be managed for fire control and to reduce habitat for large predator species such as bears.

### Public Access and Recreation

Regarding the ocean portion of the city’s shoreline area, fishing will continue, with no diminishment of fishing rights or access.

On the ocean beach, pedestrians, vehicles, and equestrians will continue to share the beach with one another. The beach and Bolstad approach will continue to be used for public festivals. A portion of the beach would be set aside as an off-leash dog area. In order to connect town to the beach, the city will undertake to establish more beach access points as well as a non-motorized beach access signage program as follows:

- mow undeveloped rights-of-way leading to the beach as access trails
- sign pedestrian beach access at points along Ocean Beach Boulevard—possibly expanding use of the city’s current partnership with the Chinook Nation to emblazon signage with the Nation’s distinctive symbol
- provide parking at beach access trail heads where possible
- install raptor perches at intervals along the 1990 SCL and include signage on these perches to assist walkers back to town; also, distinctively mark each pole to assist in beach rescues
- install a horse area with hitching posts and watering trough

The city’s boardwalk is refurbished, and may be extended south of Sid Snyder.

Several new amenities would be located at the Bolstad beach approach:

- a modern, clean, and well-maintained comfort station would be located on the beach approach near the north end of the boardwalk
- a spray park would be located near the approach and just east of the boardwalk; this spray park will provide a near-ocean place for children to play in the water and experience the beach without being exposed to the dangers of the Pacific Ocean

The Sid Snyder beach approach will be more developed with amenities nearby that might include the following:

- a kiosk or gazebo with interpretive signage for birdwatching
- BBQ facilities and wind-sheltered picnic areas
- bicyclist meeting/rest area
- a viewing platform for wildlife/ocean viewing and/or where plein-air artists could paint –this could be tied to a festival or to the Kite Museum

The Discovery Trail will be extended northward to eventually reach Ocean Park. It will also be more developed with amenities that might include the following:

- milepost or point-of-interest signage on the trail itself, or on rocks – something more organic than a hard sign
- art installations
- comfort stations
- a substantial memorial to those lost at sea, shipwrecks, and the Coast Guard
- a connection to the planned cross-town trail, and eventually to a cross-Peninsula trail
- possibly a bicycle campground
- “soft” parks with minimal or no paving

## Shoreline Development

The city will require culverts in new east-west roadways in the shoreline area as needed to preserve hydraulic connectivity. A balance will be reached between minimizing fill and providing sufficient elevation to avoid flooding of roads or structures. The 1980 SCL will continue to be the setback line, and current standards of lot coverage and building height will be maintained, as will current requirements for stormwater retention.

The dune area will look much as it does today, with a modest addition of single family and medium density homes. Minor densification of residential uses may occur, with a smaller ground footprint per dwelling unit in the dune area. It is possible, though not likely, that an additional near-ocean hotel is built immediately west of downtown.

Regarding development and regulatory processes, the city will elicit annual or bi-annual input from citizens regarding its progress on shoreline issues and to identify new issues.

### 3.2.2 In 20 Years

The physical configuration of the future city shoreline will be subject primarily to the influences of infrastructure and climate. Shoreline development will be subject primarily to the influence of demography.

## Environment

With repair of the Columbia River jetties, accretion<sup>†</sup> may begin to reoccur, with a concomitant deepening of the city's dune and beach areas. In essence, Long Beach proper could become further removed from the ocean. Sea level rise could counteract accretion, or if accretion doesn't occur, it could begin to erode the shoreline.

Along the ocean beach, the experience will still be fundamentally natural: the ocean will not be developed with wind or wave energy projects, and no pier will be built. Having said that, man's modern presence will be apparent with vehicular traffic on the beach. The view toward town will still be fundamentally natural, with a hint of human development, except west of downtown, where commerce is located closer to the ocean beach.

Long Beach citizens will continue to value what they have historically valued and will encourage their government to modify practices or regulations to protect those things. For that reason, the city will still see no net loss of shoreline functions and values as a result of human activity.

Regarding tsunami mitigation, the city will continue to explore other opportunities, and will have built at least one more vertical evacuation structure. This structure is expected to be neighborhood-serving, and so of a more modest size than the original vertical evacuation project.

## Public Access and Recreation

Since the beach is the reason people come to Long Beach and recreation is the reason people come to the beach, the city will continue to provide excellent public access opportunities and recreational amenities. More sophisticated activities and festivals that will change with the times will continue to occur on the ocean beach. By this time, beach access is fully developed, and

visitors as well as locals can “find their way around” on foot or bicycle. Amenities developed in the past decade will be maintained and continue to provide a unique and rich shoreline experience.

### Shoreline Development

Should substantial accretion occur, the building setback line may move west; should erosion occur, it may move east. Depending on foredune height and pressure to retain ocean views, building heights may be increased. Also, should higher-density buildings agree to place parking on the ground floor and reduce their footprint, additional heights might be allowable.

While some escalation of development may occur as baby boomers retire and build their retirement homes, it is more likely the city’s current substantial stock of seasonal housing (45%) will instead be converted to retirement homes.

If not before now, a final hotel will be built behind the boardwalk west of downtown.

## 3.3 Goals and Policy Implications

Below are the goals and policies that seem to spring from the input the city has received from the visioning open house, comments made to staff, and from attendance at a Pacific County SMP update work session. These are not a complete set of goals for inclusion to the updated SMP, but rather those limited to public input received to date.

### 3.3.1 Environmental Protection

**Goal E-1:** No net loss of shoreline values and functions.

*Policy E-1.1:* All development, including water-dependent and preferred shoreline uses, shall be subject to mitigation sequencing.

*Policy E-1.2:* Require buffers and setbacks pursuant to the most current adopted version of the city’s Critical Areas Regulations.

*Policy E-1.3:* Establish appropriate and effective shoreline environment designations (SED)<sup>†</sup>.

*Policy E-1.4:* Require restoration as part of development approval as opportunities arise.

*Policy E-1.5:* Require culverts in all new roads where culverts would restore hydraulic connectivity.

*Policy E-1.6:* Establish a program of culvert installation in existing roads where such installation would restore hydraulic connectivity. Culvert at least one (1) road per year under this program.

**Goal E-2:** Retain shoreline vegetation while controlling fire and eliminating large predator habitat.

*Policy E-2.1:* Develop and pass by ordinance a vegetation management program, including a public information component.

### **3.3.2 Public Access and Recreation**

**Goal P-1:** Retain current levels of commercial fishing access to ocean.

**Goal P-2:** Retain existing natural views of ocean.

*Policy P-1.1:* Off-shore wind or wave energy facilities located within 3 miles of the OHWM may not limit or interfere with ocean fishing or alter the natural view.

**Goal P-3:** Increase pedestrian public access.

*Policy P-3.1:* Mow undeveloped rights-of-way through the dune to establish pedestrian access to beach from Ocean Beach Boulevard.

*Policy P-3.2:* Where practicable, provide parking at spur trailheads.

**Goal P-4:** Improve visibility of public access

*Policy P-4.1:* Establish and implement a distinctively-branded pedestrian access signage program.

*Policy P-4.2:* Place raptor roosts intermittently in the dunes near the beach and use these roosts to also display pedestrian signage. Work with surf rescue to mark these poles distinctively to assist in water rescue operations.

**Goal P-5:** Enhance the Sid Snyder beach approach

*Policy P-5.1:* Establish a program of improvements over time for this beach approach including but not limited to BBQ/picnic facilities, viewing facilities, a bicycle assembly area.

**Goal P-6:** Enhance the Bolstad beach approach

*Policy P-6.1:* Establish a program of improvements over time for this beach approach including but not limited to a new comfort station and a child's splash park.

**Goal P-7:** Enhance the Discovery Trail

*Policy P-7.1:* Establish a program of improvements over time for Discovery Trail including but not limited to mile/points of interest markers, art installations, comfort stations, and possibly a bike campground.

*Policy P7-2:* Extend the Discovery Trail northward.

*Policy P7-3:* Build a substantial tri-part memorial to those lost at sea, shipwrecks, and the Coast Guard.

*Policy P7-4:* Connect the Discovery Trail to the planned Cross-Town Trail, and eventually to the proposed Cross-Peninsula Trail.

### **3.3.3 Shoreline Development**

**Goal S-1:** Retain the current feel of shoreline development, set well back from the OHWM, and with an “early seashore” architectural theme.

*Policy S-1.1:* In the absence of accretion, retain the 1980 SCL as the building setback line.

*Policy S-1.2:* Continue to apply city shoreline zoning west of the 1889 Line.

*Policy S-1.3:* Consistently apply and enforce the Shoreline Design District elements of the Long Beach Design Guidelines west of the 1889 Line.

*Policy S-1.4:* Foster high-density resort development behind the boardwalk west of town.

*Policy S-1.5:* Foster lower density smaller scale rural resort development at several locations along the shoreline setback behind the 1980 SCL.

**Goal S-2:** Control development-related flooding in the deflation plain.

*Policy S-2.1:* Consistently enforce code that requires project design must ensure stormwater enter and exit a site in generally the same locations and in the same or less amount than pre-project.

*Policy S-2.2:* Require runoff to wetlands be pretreated by vegetation; pretreatment and discharge to wetlands is preferred. If pretreatment is not possible, non-treated runoff must be diverted.

*Policy S-2.3:* Fill in the shoreline area should be the minimum required to ensure no flooding of roadways or structures occurs.

**Goal S-3:** Prepare Long Beach for a worst case tsunami scenario.

*Policy S-3.1:* Complete vertical evacuation structure at Long Beach Elementary School and begin to plan and construct one or more smaller neighborhood-serving structures.

*Policy S-3.2:* Build a pedestrian route that connects the city of Long Beach to the Long Beach water plant tsunami assembly area.

*Policy S-3.3:* Keep the public informed of changes in tsunami protocols, changes in scientific predictions, and changes in tsunami hazard mitigation.



## 4.0 Acknowledgements

The City of Long Beach is one of numerous government entities in the State of Washington required to update its SMP. We do this in accordance with Ecology’s SMP Guidelines, the requirements of individual but similar SMA Grant Agreements, and following Ecology’s Master Program Planning Process. Therefore, there exists a consistent SMP update approach across the State; this consistency of approach leads to a general product consistency while taking into account local circumstances. For that reason, Long Beach looked toward its colleagues and their SMP update work products in preparing this report; we saw no reason to re-invent the wheel. The City reviewed several existing visioning reports, and they are identified in the reference section of this report. Thanks to our colleagues who went before us in the SMP update process for creating a most worthwhile legacy.

Thanks also to Department of Ecology Shorelands and Wetlands specialist Rick Mraz, who participated in the visioning process. Mr. Mraz answered citizen questions the answers to which were beyond the expertise of city staff, and helped the public to better understand the scope and purpose of the SMP update process.



*Blank Page*

## 5.0 References

During preparation of this plan, the following documents were reviewed. In some cases concepts from these plans were used.

Byrne, Abby and Rose Morgan on behalf of the Douglas County Regional Shoreline Master Program Update, 2006. *Citizen's Vision for Douglas County Shorelines: 2006-2016*. Spring.

City of Long Beach, 2015. <http://www.longbeachwa.gov/smp-home/>. Site last visited 2/9/15.

Kittitas County/Van Ness Feldman GordonDerr, 2012. *Community Visioning Report. Kittitas County Regional Shoreline Master Program Update*. October.

Washington State Department of Ecology, 2015. [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sma/laws/rules/173-26/231\\_modifications.html#3aiiiA>New\\_development](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sma/laws/rules/173-26/231_modifications.html#3aiiiA>New_development). Site visited 2/10/15

\_\_\_\_\_, 2015. <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/toolbox/process/task3.1.html>. Site visited 2/9/15

\_\_\_\_\_, 2015. <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/toolbox/process/task3.4.html>. Site visited 2/10/15



*Blank Page*

# APPENDICES

## **A. Decision-maker Workshop**

A.1 Long Beach Planning Commission Workshop Materials

## **B. December 16, 2014 Visioning Exercise**

B.1 Chinook Observer Ad-Invitation to Visioning Open House

B.2 Direct Mail Materials

B.3 Visioning open House Sign-in Sheets

B.4 Visioning Open house Hand-outs

B.5 Chinook Observer Ad Inviting Comments on Inventory Report and Visioning

## **C. Visioning Comments**

C.1 Summary of Comments

C.2 Comments in their Entirety

## **A. Decision-maker Workshop**

### **A.1 Long Beach Planning Commission Workshop Materials**

## A.1 Long Beach Planning Commission Workshop Materials

**B. December 16, 2014 Visioning Exercise**

B.1 Chinook Observer Ad-Invitation to Visioning Open House

B.2 Direct Mail Materials

B.3 Visioning open House Sign-in Sheets

B.4 Visioning Open house Hand-outs

B.5 Chinook Observer Ad Inviting Comments on Inventory Report and Visioning

## B.1 Chinook Observer Ad-Invitation to Visioning Open House

## B.2 Direct Mail Materials

### B.3 Visioning open House Sign-in Sheets

## B.4 Visioning Open house Hand-outs

B.5 Chinook Observer Ad Inviting Comments on Inventory Report and Visioning

## **C. Visioning Comments**

C.1 Summary of Comments

C.2 Comments in their Entirety

## C.1 Summary of Comments

## C.2 Comments in their Entirety