Comment Letters on Draft VISION 2050 Plan

The Puget Sound Regional Council sought public input on the Draft VISION 2050 Plan from July 19 through September 16, 2019. Background information on the project and public comment period is available on the project webpage.

The comment letters are organized by commenter affiliation: Agencies and Organizations, Cities and Counties, Individuals, and Tribal Nations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Nations</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puyallup Tribe of Indians</td>
<td>T - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suquamish Tribe</td>
<td>T - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulalip Tribes</td>
<td>T - 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 6, 2019

Josh Brown, Executive Director
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

Subject: Draft Vision 2050

Dear Executive Brown,

Thank you for engaging with tribes as part of the development of Puget Sound Regional Council’s Vision 2050. The Puyallup Tribe of Indians believes that in order for our region to be successful Tribes should help develop the framework and vision of our region’s growth in a collaborative manner. In our view, since the treaty of Medicine Creek of 1854, and subsequent treaties that encompass the ceded lands of the central Puget Sound region, tribes have been traditionally overshadowed by the development goals set by local County and City governments. With our land bases and natural resources diminished, it is imperative for Tribes to participate in local and regional land use decisions like Vision 2050.

Vision 2050 is an opportunity to rectify how local jurisdictions have traditionally interacted with tribes from a regional perspective. Many of our traditional lands under local control have development goals that are incompatible with those of the Puyallup Tribe. Because of the lack of meaningful consultation and coordination on local land use policy our people are more susceptible to adverse health & safety impacts from certain types of development. Our fishing rights have been infringed by the call for regional transportation infrastructure that does not take fish passage into consideration. And our ability to continue to reclaim our traditional land base is inhibited by rapid subdivision of tribal lands. With the central Puget Sound region anticipating an increase of 1.8 million people in our region we need to think differently about how tribes participate in the planning of that growth.

Looking forward, Vision 2050 can create a roadmap for local jurisdictions and tribes to work collaboratively in their comprehensive planning efforts. As a regional body the Puget Sound Regional Council has the ability to take bold leadership in ensuring this process is identified in the goals and policies outlined in the plan. We believe collaboration should be necessary and not voluntary. Only by working together will we be able to address the development pressures of large-scale regional growth.
Attached are the Puyallup Tribe’s comments for the draft Vision 2050 plan that outline the tenants of what I have discussed. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me or my staff to help clarify and address any of our comments. I look forward in continuing this dialog so that we as Tribal Nations not only have a place in this region’s past but also collectively a place in this region’s future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Bean, Chairman
Puyallup Tribal Council

CC: Councilmember Ryan Mello, Chair Growth Management Policy Board
Councilmember Hank Margeson, Vice-Chair Growth Management Policy Board
Director of Regional Planning Ben Bakkenta, PSRC

3009 East Portland Avenue, Tacoma, WA. 98404   Ph: (253) 680-5774   Fax: (253) 680-5771
Puyallup Tribe Comments on Vision 2050

- Page xiii – Include as part of Figure 1 PSRC member Tribal Reservations and/or names in the map.
- Page 17 – Include statement under section Coordination with Tribal Nations: “It is important to meaningfully consult with Tribes to coordinate local land use goals and expectations.”
- Page 27 – Replace Tribal Lands definition to: “Tribal Lands, which are composed of both in-fee and federal trust status, serve as part of the reservation land base, usual and accustomed stations for treaty rights, and culturally significant sites for tribal nations.”
- Page 29 – Change the legend color for Tribal Land to be more clearly seen.
- Page 55 – Include coordination with Tribes by amending policy MPP-En-1: “Develop regionwide environmental strategies, coordinating among local jurisdictions, tribes, and countywide planning groups.”
- Page 85 – Include joint planning with Tribes by amending policy MPP-DP-27: “Support joint planning between cities, tribes, and counties to work cooperatively in planning for urban unincorporated areas to ensure an orderly transition to city and tribal governance, including efforts such as: (a) establishing urban development standards, (b) addressing service and infrastructure financing, and (c) transferring permitting authority.”
- Page 87 – Consider new Development Patterns Policy MPP-DP-53: “Consider the potential impacts of development to culturally significant sites & tribal treaty fishing, hunting, and gathering grounds.”
- Page 87 – Consider new Development Patterns Policy MP-DP-54: “Protect tribal lands from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.”
- Page 121 – Consider new Transportation Policy MPP-T-35: “Ensure the transportation system supports continuous uninterrupted fish passage.”
From: Alison Osullivan <aosullivan@suquamish.nsn.us>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2019 10:20 PM
To: Paul Inghram <PInghram@psrc.org>
Subject: RE: VISION 2050 Draft

Paul,
I have looked through Vision 2050 and did not have a lot of comments. The comments I do have are as follows:

1. The Suquamish Tribe (Tribe) is supportive of the new sections regarding, stormwater, the open space plan and climate change.

2. The Tribe is pleased to see that coordination with Tribes is emphasized in the plan.

3. I did have some discussion with staff at the open house regarding the importance of water quantity (which could go in any number of sections including but not limited to: MPP-En-3 and MPP-En-10).

4. In addition to wildlife corridors the identification of species of local importance should be included (which could refer to species that are or are not listed on the ESA list). Counties and cities should classify and designate “locally important habitat and species” as per [WAC 365-190-130 (2))(b)]. This could be added to MPP-En-14.

Thanks,
Alison

Alison O'Sullivan
Senior Biologist, Suquamish Tribe Fisheries Department

P.O. Box 498 (mailing)
18490 Suquamish Way
Suquamish, WA  98392
phone: (360) 394-8447
September 16, 2019

Paul Inghram, Director of Growth Management Planning
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104

SUBJECT: Tulalip Tribes – Comments on the Draft VISION 2050

Mr. Inghram,

Tulalip Tribes “Tribes” appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft VISION 2050. We also welcomed meeting with you and your colleagues at Tulalip earlier this year to discuss how regional planning issues affect the Tulalip Tribes, the role Tribes play in the Central Puget Sound Region and the challenges they face in planning for growth on their Reservations.

Transit Focused Growth

The Tribes supports a transit focused growth alternative. Although the Tribes understand the reasons for Snohomish County Tomorrow requesting an adjustment on the percentage of population growth in rural and urban unincorporated areas of Snohomish County, we support keeping population growth in the rural areas of the County to less than 5% and would prefer to see a 2% population growth more in line with King County. It is important to protect the remaining forest lands, aquifers, wetlands and streams in these areas from development pressures and the well documented associated impacts to watersheds through increases in impervious surface area.

Vision 2050 Figure 6 on page 30 shows much less growth in Metropolitan and Core cities in Snohomish County than in Pierce and King Counties. Tulalip Tribes believes that Snohomish County growth allocations should be closer to allocations in those counties directing less to “High Capacity Transit Communities”, especially since some of the communities in Snohomish County do not have, nor are there plans for sufficient high transit to be provided, such as in Arlington, Marysville, and their MUGAs.

Snohomish County Tomorrow’s letter requests flexibility with UGA boundaries citing market forces. This seems antithetical to the Growth Management Act without which sprawl would be the dominant development pattern in this region. Development needs to be encouraged more where urban infrastructure supports it and less on vacant lands on the urban rural interface where critical areas, water quality, air quality, tree canopy,

The Tulalip Tribes are federally recognized successors in the interest to the Snohomish, Snoqualmic, Skykomish, and other allied tribes and bands signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott.
carbon storage capacity, aquifer recharge, and stream and river flows are often sacrificed due to lack of adequate transportation, water, and sewer infrastructure.

Reservation Lands and Coordination with Tribes

The 2050 Vision states on page 24 that “Tribal Lands are recognized in the Regional Growth Strategy, because of their unique importance to the region. However, neither type of place is allocated forecasted growth in the strategy because both plan outside of the GMA. Military Installations are governed by the federal government and Tribal lands are sovereign Native American Nations.”

To clarify, the term “Tribal lands” generally refers to lands in Tribal or Tribal member ownership, whereas “Reservations” or “Indian Reservations” refers to the areas that were reserved under Treaties made between the U.S. Government and federally recognized Tribes. In the case of the Tulalip Tribes it was the 1855 Treaty of Point Elliott that created the Tulalip Reservation. Due to shifting federal Indian policy in the late nineteenth century much of the Tulalip Reservation land was transferred out of Indian ownership, but the Tulalip Reservation boundaries have not been changed or diminished. Both Indian and non-Indian owned lands remain part of the Tulalip Reservation.

Tulalip Tribes strongly support the notion that Tribal lands not be allocated forecasted growth by Snohomish County Tomorrow, but rather that Tribes allocate this growth on the Tulalip Reservation through their own comprehensive planning and zoning process. Even though alienated lands on Reservations are in part subject to County land use laws, these laws have been guided by Tulalip Comprehensive Plans since the Tulalip Tribes adopted its first Comprehensive Plan for the entire Reservation in 1994. Long range planning on the Reservation is guided by the Tribes’ population and employment forecasts used to allocate land for economic growth and housing, as well as to preserve rural and protected resource lands.

Tulalip Tribes are also making investments in transportation, water, and sewer infrastructure, which service growth in economic centers such as Quil Ceda Village as well as in existing and new housing communities.

Accordingly the following figures in the 2050 Vision need to clarify the difference between Indian Reservations and Tribal lands.

Figure 5, page 29, Regional Geographies. To clarify that most Reservations include non-Tribal fee lands as well as Tribal owned lands “Tribal land” should be replaced with “Reservation land” in the Legend of this figure.
Figure 13, page 37, Rural Areas. For consistency the Reservations should be excluded from the rural areas.

Figure 16, page 42, Tribal Lands. For consistency "Tribal lands" should be replaced by "Reservation Lands".

In addition MPP-RC-4 should read “Consult” instead of “Coordinate”.

**Multi-County Planning Policies**

The Multi-County Planning Policies that comprise a significant part of VISION 2050, represent blending of past policies and some new ones. The Tribes fully supports the extra attention in VISION 2050 to climate change issues and to expanding the range of housing choices to increase housing affordability and transit mobility. In addition, the proposed new policies provide welcome clarifications about tribal lands (reservations) and military bases.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to comment in advance of determining a preferred alternative for VISION 2050.

Sincerely,

Julia Gold
Planning Manager
Tulalip Tribes
6406 Marine Drive NW
Tulalip, WA 98271
Dear Paul and Erika,

I somehow managed to not include the whole response from Tulalip in the earlier email. Please disregard that email and use the language in italics below and comments that follow:

“Ensure that tribes are engaged early in planning for any climate preparedness, mitigation or adaptation actions that may impinge upon their treaty reserved lands and resources in order to design solutions that support their rights and interests while avoiding potential harms to those rights and interests from climate solutions. Tribes must be consulted on actions that impinge upon them, and proposed actions must require their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). FPIC requirements for consultation will be set by the individual tribal sovereigns.” (this language fits with CC-Action 2, and could follow it as a new principle).

Tribes are affected both by climate change, and by actions taken to adapt to climate change (including maladaptation) and to mitigate climate change (including failed or mal-mitigation). Tribes have a unique status as sovereigns, and regional actions need to take this into account. The free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) language is consistent with the current policy of the State Attorney General’s Office. Consultation and consent requirements are the current gold standard for dealing with the tribes.

Ensure that whenever there is an indicative list of entities (county, municipal, city, etc.) that tribes are included. Tribes need to be integrated throughout the document, with specific call-outs where appropriate.

If you should have any questions regarding these comments please don’t hesitate to call or email.

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment on the draft of Vision 2050.

Warm regards,

Sono Hashisaki
(206) 300-5058
Dear Paul and Erika,

Terry Williams, Commissioner Tulalip Tribes Treaty Rights Office, has asked that I forward these comments regarding the Climate Change section of the Draft Vision 2050 from the Tulalip Tribes. The text below could follow the existing CC-Action 2.

“Ensure that tribes are engaged early in planning for any climate preparedness, mitigation or adaptation actions that may impinge upon their treaty reserved lands and resources in order to design solutions that support their rights and interests while avoiding potential harms to those rights and interests from climate solutions. Tribes must be consulted on actions that impinge upon them, and proposed actions must require their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). FPIC requirements for consultation will be set by the individual tribal sovereigns.”

If we can help locate the specific sections that this would apply to, please don’t hesitate to call or email with any questions.

Thank you,

Sono Hashisaki
(206) 300-5058

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.