

*Tribal Consultation: Draft Revisions to Federal  
Acknowledgment Regulations (25 CFR 83)*

---

*Afternoon Session  
July 23, 2013*



*Original File tribalconsult1pm.txt*

*Min-U-Script® with Word Index*

Public Meeting  
Draft Revisions to Federal Acknowledgment  
Regulations (25 CFR 83)

Seven Feathers Casino Resort  
Canyonville, Oregon

July 23, 2013

APPEARANCES:

LARRY ROBERTS, Deputy Assistant  
Secretary - Indian Affairs

KAITLYN CHINN, Office of the Solicitor -  
Division of Indian Affairs

ELIZABETH APPEL, Office of Regulatory  
Affairs - Indian Affairs

1 TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2013

2 2:05 P.M.

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4

5 LARRY ROBERTS: All right. Good  
6 afternoon, everyone. We're going to go ahead and  
7 get started here this afternoon for this public  
8 meeting on the discussion draft of the Part 83  
9 regulations.

10 My name is Larry Roberts. I'm a  
11 member of the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin, and I'm  
12 the principal deputy assistant secretary for Indian  
13 Affairs. I started at the department in September  
14 of last year, and I want to just start off by saying  
15 thank you to Cow Creek Tribe for hosting this  
16 consultation.

17 I'm going to let Liz and Katie  
18 introduce themselves, and then we're going to  
19 basically move forward with a PowerPoint that some  
20 of you in the audience have already heard, and then  
21 from there, we'll open it up to questions in terms  
22 of -- so I'm going to let Liz and Katie introduce  
23 themselves.

24 LIZ APPEL: Hi. I'm Liz Appel. I'm  
25 with the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Collaborative

1 Action, which is under the office of the assistant  
2 secretary of Indian Affairs.

3 KAITLYN CHINN: My name is Katie  
4 Chinn. I'm a citizen of the Wyandotte Nation of  
5 Oklahoma. I also work in the solicitor's office in  
6 the Division of Indian Affairs.

7 LARRY ROBERTS: Okay. So does  
8 everyone in their materials have a copy of the  
9 PowerPoint? So we're going to go through that. It  
10 should -- judging on the pace this morning, it will  
11 probably take about 20 minutes -- 20 minutes to a  
12 half an hour, and then we'll move forward with  
13 comments.

14 So just in terms of background for  
15 purposes of acknowledging and recognizing government  
16 relationship with tribes, there's essentially three  
17 ways in which the government can acknowledge a  
18 tribe. There's acknowledgments through the judicial  
19 branch, through the congressional branch and federal  
20 legislation and by the department itself,  
21 administratively.

22 Prior to 1978 the department, in terms  
23 of its acknowledgment of a tribe, would approach  
24 those on a case-by-case basis. There were no  
25 regulations prior to 1978. In 1978, the department

1 adopted final regulations that lay out the process  
2 for acknowledgment.

3 In 1994 those were amended. Certain  
4 changes, such as previous unambiguous federal  
5 acknowledgment were incorporated into regulations.  
6 And then since those changes in 1994, the department  
7 has issued guidance from time to time basically  
8 providing guidance to the Office of Federal  
9 Acknowledgment, petitioners and the public, in terms  
10 of how the process would move forward.

11 Of the 566 federally recognized tribes  
12 today, 17 of those have been recognized through the  
13 department under the Part 83 process. So in terms  
14 of why we're looking at the process and sort of the  
15 genesis of the discussion draft, we've heard from a  
16 number of folks that have criticized the process as  
17 being broken. The Senate Committee of Indian  
18 Affairs had a hearing with that title itself in  
19 terms of the Part 83 process being broken.

20 Some have criticized the process as  
21 being too long, burdensome, expensive, unpredictable  
22 in its results, and not transparent. And so the  
23 department has heard those criticisms. And when the  
24 Obama administration took office, Secretary Salazar  
25 committed to examining ways to improve the process

1 in 2009 in an oversight hearing with the Senate  
2 Committee of Indian Affairs.

3 Later that year, in November of 2009,  
4 the department testified that it would be putting  
5 out proposed changes of the Part 83 process in one  
6 year. The department acknowledged the need to  
7 revise the process and said that they were going to  
8 look at elimination of unnecessary steps, that the  
9 department was going to take a hard look at the  
10 standards, and that they thought it would take  
11 approximately one year from 2009 to put out a  
12 proposed rule and then another year to issue the  
13 final rule.

14 So in 2010 the department spent a lot  
15 of time developing potential improvements to the  
16 Part 83 process. In 2012 the department again  
17 testified before the Senate Committee of Indian  
18 Affairs and identified guiding principles in terms  
19 of what it would look at in terms of improving the  
20 process. And some of those guiding principles were  
21 transparency, timeliness, efficiency, flexibility,  
22 and integrity.

23 At that 2012 hearing before the Senate  
24 Committee of Indian Affairs, a number of members of  
25 the committee criticized the department for not

1 having adhered to its earlier testimony before the  
2 committee about the proposed rule and a final rule.

3           So last fall when the assistant  
4 secretary and I joined the department, this was one  
5 of the issues that had been at the department for  
6 some time. There had been a lot of work on  
7 attempting to improve the process internally. And  
8 so what we did when we joined the department is we  
9 built off the good work that those folks had already  
10 done, but also convening a smaller group of folks  
11 from the Office of Federal Acknowledgment, the  
12 solicitor's office, and the Indian Affairs office to  
13 develop potential approaches to improve the Part 83  
14 process.

15           And so the discussion draft that we're  
16 here to talk about today builds off of all of that  
17 work from over the years, from 2010 to the present.  
18 So broad brush -- and I'll talk about these in a  
19 little bit more detail in the following slides --  
20 but a number of changes that the preliminary  
21 discussion draft sets forth is eliminating a part of  
22 the process where it provides for the petitioner to  
23 submit a letter of intent.

24           The discussion draft sets forth  
25 processes for expedited favorable and negative

1 decisions. It attempts to clarify some criteria.  
2 It provides a mechanism for petitioners to withdraw  
3 after from the process, where before the withdrawal  
4 would have to occur before a proposed finding was  
5 issued.

6 It provides for automatic final  
7 determinations under certain circumstances.

8 Examines -- we're actually looking for public input  
9 as far as who should issue the final determination,  
10 whether that should be the assistant secretary, as  
11 it currently stands, or whether it should be the  
12 Office of Hearings and Appeals.

13 And then, finally, the discussions  
14 draft eliminates review of the Interior Board of  
15 Indian Appeals -- or the need for the appeals  
16 process there.

17 So in terms of the letter of intent,  
18 the idea would be that the process would no longer  
19 begin with a petitioner submitting just a letter  
20 stating their intent to petition, but the process  
21 would actually start once a petition is submitted by  
22 the group.

23 In terms of processing dates, we would  
24 still keep those petitioners that have submitted a  
25 letter of intent. Those dates would still hold, but

1 that basically we would continue to operate on a  
2 first in/first out basis in terms of when a petition  
3 is complete and ready for review.

4 In terms of expedited decisions, the  
5 discussion draft suggests a process for expedited  
6 denials, and those would be -- essentially once a  
7 complete petition was in, we would review the  
8 petition to see whether the petition satisfies  
9 Criteria E, descent from a historic Indian tribe; F,  
10 that its membership is comprised principally of  
11 members who are not already members of other  
12 federally recognized tribes; and G, that the group  
13 isn't subject to federal legislation terminating or  
14 forbidding that relationship.

15 If a petitioner failed any of those  
16 three criteria, the discussion draft proposes an  
17 expedited negative finding within six months after  
18 active consideration. If the petitioner meets these  
19 three threshold criteria, then it would be evaluated  
20 under a full evaluation of petition or expedited  
21 favorable process, if the petitioner is asserting  
22 that it satisfies those standards.

23 The expedited favorable would be done  
24 basically if the two criteria we have in the  
25 discussion draft that we're seeking comment on, or

1 if the petitioner has maintained since 1934 a  
2 reservation recognized by the state and continues to  
3 hold that reservation, or if the United States has  
4 held land for the group at any point in time since  
5 1934. Those would be a basis for expedited  
6 favorable decision.

7           And like an expedited negative  
8 determination, an expedited favorable would be  
9 issued within six months of active consideration.  
10 And if the petitioner does not satisfy the criteria  
11 or doesn't assert that they're entitled to an  
12 expedited favorable finding, then we would undertake  
13 a full evaluation of the petition.

14           In terms of adjustments to the  
15 criteria, the discussion draft proposes the leading  
16 criteria, A, which provides for external observers  
17 to identify the group as a tribe from 1900 to the  
18 present.

19           In terms of special Criteria B, and  
20 Criteria C, the analysis would -- it's proposing to  
21 change that time period from instead of time of  
22 first non-Indian contact from 1934 to the present to  
23 reflect the change in federal Indian policy with the  
24 enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act.

25           In terms of Criteria E, we're not

1 changing the time period for that, but we are  
2 allowing additional means of evidence to prove  
3 descent from historic tribes. So if -- right now we  
4 rely primarily on genealogists, and this would allow  
5 historians and anthropologists' conclusions as  
6 evidence of descent from a historic Indian tribe.

7           And as you'll see in the discussion  
8 draft, we've literally left placeholders for certain  
9 criteria to get public input on what those criteria  
10 should be. And so those are depicted as just  
11 basically a double XX on those points, and we're  
12 looking for input from the public as to what that  
13 should be. And we're also looking for input from  
14 the public in terms of what other objective criteria  
15 should be included within the process.

16           In terms of withdrawals, we have  
17 clarified in the discussion draft that a petitioner  
18 may withdraw a petition before a proposed finding is  
19 published. OFA would then cease consideration of  
20 that petition, but the consequence of withdrawing  
21 the petition would be it would be then placed in the  
22 bottom of the list, in terms of priority, and so the  
23 petitioner would lose their position there.

24           In terms of automatic final  
25 determinations, this is something that we're -- the

1 discussion draft is attempting to incorporate  
2 existing agency practice, which is if the proposed  
3 finding is positive and we don't receive comments  
4 from anyone in opposition to arguments or evidence  
5 of opposition to acknowledgment then typically those  
6 are moved to a final favorable finding.

7           This would specifically provide that  
8 if a federally recognized tribe located in the same  
9 state as the petitioner or the state or local  
10 government did not submit comments in opposition,  
11 then it would go to a final favorable finding.

12           In terms of who issues the final  
13 determination, we're seeking comment. In terms of  
14 the current practice, the Office of Federal  
15 Acknowledgment works on the draft and provides it to  
16 the assistant secretary. The assistant secretary  
17 issues both the proposed finding and the final  
18 determination.

19           In the discussion draft we're  
20 attempting to keep that primary process where the  
21 assistant secretary would issue the proposed  
22 finding. And what we're asking for comment on is  
23 once that proposed finding is issued, should the  
24 assistant secretary maintain review and issue the  
25 final determination, or should the process then

1 shift to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, and  
2 then the parties, whether it be the petitioner or  
3 local tribes or local governments or the public --  
4 should they then submit their materials and  
5 responses and proposed finding to the Office of  
6 Hearings and Appeals and the Office of Hearings and  
7 Appeals issue a final determination.

8           So we're looking -- there's literally  
9 brackets in our discussion drafts so you can comment  
10 on what approach makes sense or maybe there are  
11 other approaches out there that the public can come  
12 up with in terms of increasing the transparency and  
13 the integrity of the process itself.

14           Finally, the discussion draft deletes  
15 the review of the assistant secretary's  
16 determination by the Interior Board of Indian  
17 Appeals. The consequence of that deletion or that  
18 step would be if there is either a favorable finding  
19 or a negative finding, that any party wants to  
20 appeal, that appeal would go directly to federal  
21 district court.

22           In terms of if we issue a final rule  
23 that would modify the process, the discussion draft  
24 attempts to address how the rules would apply to  
25 petitioners currently in the process. So if the

1 discussion draft or some version of it -- if we  
2 issue a final rule here, the new version would apply  
3 to anyone who hasn't reached active consideration  
4 and anyone who was under active consideration at  
5 that time that chooses to leave the process under  
6 the new regulation, they could file a new document  
7 and petition.

8                   And then finally, if a petitioner that  
9 has been denied federal acknowledgment under the  
10 current regulations, they are -- the discussion  
11 draft provides an opportunity for that petitioner to  
12 re-petition. If it proves to the assistant  
13 secretary or the Office of Hearings and Appeals --  
14 that's sort of open here in the discussion draft --  
15 by a preponderance of the evidence that a change  
16 from the new version of the rights, whatever those  
17 are, from the older version, would warrant a  
18 reversal of the final determination. They would  
19 then be allowed to re-petition.

20                   So those are sort of broad-brush  
21 changes. I should say we're also seeking -- we're  
22 seeking comments on the entire discussion draft.  
23 And some of the areas that we'd like to highlight  
24 for folks is, you know, what definitions, if any,  
25 should be revised and if they should be revised,

1 ideas and concepts in terms of how they should be  
2 revised. Should the department issue a standard  
3 form for petitioners? Would that be helpful?  
4 Should it be made optional, so that there is some  
5 sort of template that petitioners can use if they  
6 want to use one?

7 In terms of -- we're also, as I  
8 mentioned earlier, seeking comment on the criteria  
9 and objective standards that we could include in the  
10 criteria that are not already there in terms of  
11 community. And we've left placeholders there in  
12 terms of what percentage should reside in a  
13 geographic area, what percentage of marriages should  
14 be between group members, those sort of things.

15 In terms of political influence and  
16 authority, again, we're looking for objective  
17 standards and criteria there. And in terms of  
18 descent, E, descent from a historic tribe, again,  
19 any objective standards or percentages of criteria  
20 that the department should be utilizing in a revised  
21 regulation.

22 We're also looking for comment on page  
23 limits. Should the petition be limited to a certain  
24 number of pages, not including actual primary source  
25 documents. But should there be page limits on the

1 proposed finding? And should there be page limits  
2 basically throughout the process? Sort of like if  
3 there was before the Office of Hearings and Appeals  
4 or federal court, a lot of times, you would --  
5 plaintiffs and defendants would have page limits in  
6 terms of their arguments and briefings.

7                   Comments are due on the draft rule on  
8 August 16th. You can email them or mail them.  
9 Please get them in by the 16th. Our next steps are  
10 to review the comments that were received from these  
11 public meetings and from the tribal consultations  
12 and then move forward with a proposed rule.

13                   We would then go through another round  
14 of tribal consultations and public comment and then  
15 issue a proposed rule in the Federal Register. I  
16 should note that the preliminary discussion draft --  
17 what we've done is redline the existing rule that  
18 was published in 1978 and then revised in 1994. We  
19 now have within the federal government a plain  
20 language requirement, where we have to post our  
21 regulations in plain language.

22                   And so my sense is that as we're going  
23 through the rule-making process, we may have to put  
24 this format into a plain language format. So it  
25 will be in the form of a question, that sort of

1 thing, so it's easier for the public and petitioners  
2 to understand the rule itself.

3 So with that, I will open it up to any  
4 questions and comments. And when and if you do make  
5 questions or comments, please introduce yourselves  
6 for our court reporter and speak slowly and clearly  
7 so that she can get down your name and where you're  
8 from. That would be helpful.

9 GARY RICKARD: Gary Rickard for Wintu  
10 Tribe of Northern California. You said the  
11 difference between the redline and the black lines  
12 in the preliminary draft was that the redline is the  
13 new proposed? Because I don't see it that way.

14 LARRY ROBERTS: Right. So the black  
15 text is the existing rule as it stands now, and the  
16 redline markings are the proposed changes in the  
17 discussion draft. And there are some changes in the  
18 discussion draft that are literally just moving --  
19 reorganizing various parts of the sections. And so  
20 we've tried to put them -- where we've done that,  
21 we've tried to capture that in brackets to make  
22 clear that we're just moving this particular  
23 definition or this particular subsection into this  
24 other subsection.

25 And we're actually asking for comment

1 on that. Does that make sense or does it make the  
2 rule more confusing? But the redline is the  
3 suggested changes.

4 SPEAKER: May I just drop this off?

5 SONNIE RUBIO: (Speaking in native  
6 language) Thank you for this day. My name is  
7 (native language). The village site in Crescent  
8 City, Ee-ju-let, California. And our council met  
9 and kind of -- we just went over this so I'm going  
10 to read it. I can leave it with the secretary, as  
11 well, because I have a copy.

12 We're Petition No. 85 with the  
13 government. We are active status at this time. And  
14 we proposed to stay with the current process right  
15 now. We've been with OFA for over 30 years. We've  
16 lost three generations already in our group. And  
17 with our history of many villages in Del Norte  
18 County, California, we've been transported  
19 everywhere from Eureka all the way up to Siletz,  
20 Oregon where our original area is in Oregon and  
21 California.

22 And our villages were massacred at  
23 that time, and we're still here today. And it was  
24 three generations ago that this happened within my  
25 family, at Ee-ju-let. And losing three generations

1 with our tribe now -- you know, it's a long process  
2 and it's kind of hard when in the beginning, when  
3 tribes were trying to survive during the first  
4 contact with the non-American Native American. And  
5 so we tried to survive the best we can.

6 My family itself has been in one area  
7 for 105 years already in the same village site. We  
8 can reach over and touch you. We own our village  
9 site. We pay taxes on it. And so this is just the  
10 history of just one village site and there's many  
11 more that were massacred in Del Norte County itself.

12 Our understanding with -- we got a  
13 letter from OFA and we're supposed to have -- they  
14 stated to have potential revisions on Part 83, but  
15 to recognize tribes it was potential for  
16 improvements of Part 83. And our questions that we  
17 have as a tribal council -- we have eight that sit  
18 on tribal council at this time.

19 Why consult with recognized tribes?  
20 What is the time limit for all of this? And when  
21 will petitioners receive -- to be able to attend  
22 open meetings. We didn't know that we could attend  
23 this meeting at this time. It was the federally  
24 recognized tribes that came to us and stated, you  
25 know, "Go to this meeting." And these are people

1 who are recognized by the government already. So we  
2 were glad that we did hear something because in our  
3 letter, it didn't say anything at all.

4 Also, after the proposed rules comes  
5 the formal comment period and then last the  
6 publication of the final rule. So it doesn't give  
7 the nonrecognized tribes an opportunity to speak  
8 about this, who are already with the government, you  
9 know, in active status. It doesn't give us an  
10 option to do anything either way. We have to abide  
11 by what the government is saying already.

12 And also we're given the option to  
13 suspend consideration and may later decide to resume  
14 the process when it left off regarding the rule  
15 making, so it doesn't matter. Even -- you know, we  
16 chose not to come to the new session of this because  
17 we already know the flaws as they are now, but we're  
18 just trying to deal with the government to the best  
19 of our ability and do that.

20 Also, the department will allowance  
21 its new rule. So when the new rule happens, they're  
22 going to come back to us already because all of this  
23 was done. And that will give us the opportunity,  
24 what it is that the government says we have to do,  
25 to continue on to be recognized. We have not seen a

1 draft as we are looking at it right now, but  
2 federally recognized tribes have already seen the  
3 draft.

4 And so to me that left us out again  
5 for not being able to respond to the government.  
6 All we could respond to is when the OFA said, "You  
7 can suspend your consideration." You know, that's  
8 all we were told. But recognized tribes were given  
9 the opportunity to August 16th.

10 Our tribe, Tolowa Nation, they told us  
11 we had to respond July 30th so that didn't give us  
12 no time at all to see a draft, look at a draft, to  
13 figure out anything of what was happening because we  
14 have to abide by what you say.

15 And then also, you know, our  
16 generations with our people were -- we're still  
17 here, you know, and (native language) on trauma.  
18 Our ancestors suffered a lot of hurt. Thank you.

19 LARRY ROBERTS: Thanks. So I want to  
20 just clarify a couple of points for you on some of  
21 the remarks here. One is in terms of the OFA letter  
22 and notice of the consultations.

23 On the OFA letter, what OFA has done  
24 is we've asked them to send letters to all the  
25 petitioners that are in the active status, and I

1 believe the petitioners that are in the  
2 ready-and-waiting status to send them a letter  
3 basically letting them know that, Hey, we're looking  
4 at the rule making and please let us know at your  
5 earliest convenience -- I think it was like the end  
6 of July -- you know, whether you want to proceed  
7 with your active consideration or whether you want  
8 this rule-making process -- whether you want to put  
9 it on hold.

10           You know, some of the comments that we  
11 got back were fair comments, which was: We haven't  
12 even seen a draft, so how can you ask us to decide  
13 whether to put something on hold or not?

14           And then the point of the letter was  
15 not to put a date certain by which each petitioner  
16 had to make a determination whether to do so or not,  
17 but to provide those petitioners the option that,  
18 Hey, this is going on, we don't know how the process  
19 is going to move forward. We don't know how long  
20 it's going to take, but if for whatever reason, you  
21 want to follow this process and would prefer to  
22 suspend your application, you could do so -- your  
23 petition.

24           In terms of these consultations and  
25 the discussion draft itself, we posted that

1 information in the Federal Register. And I know  
2 maybe some folks don't follow the Federal Register,  
3 but we've also posted it on the Bureau of Indian  
4 Affairs website, in terms of the consultation dates  
5 and the discussion draft. You can download it  
6 there. And I think as we moved forward with the  
7 proposed rule, that these are helpful comments that  
8 you've given us in terms of how we can do better  
9 outreach.

10 In terms of the deadline, the  
11 August 16th deadline applies to everyone, federally  
12 recognized tribes, petitioners, the public -- we're  
13 looking for everyone's comments -- and that deadline  
14 is August 16 for everyone.

15 In terms of why we are consulting with  
16 federally recognized tribes, President Obama issued  
17 an executive order requiring consultation with  
18 federally recognized tribes on issues that involve  
19 Indian country, and that builds off an earlier  
20 executive order from -- issued during the Clinton  
21 administration, and that's why we are consulting  
22 with federally recognized tribes. But we've also --  
23 given the interest from both petitioners and the  
24 public, we want to have these forums as well.

25 We invite comment in terms of how

1 we're doing in consultation and public meetings. We  
2 had a tribal consultation this morning with  
3 federally recognized tribes. There were a couple of  
4 people from nonfederally recognized tribes that were  
5 here. And we asked the group if anyone objected  
6 that they sit in on that consultation, and there  
7 were no objections, and so we moved forward. So if  
8 there are ways that we can improve, not only the  
9 tribal consultation process, but the public  
10 component of this in our proposed rule-making, we  
11 would urge you to send your ideas to us by the  
12 August 16th deadline.

13           And so we'll look internally, in terms  
14 of how we can do a better job of circulating the  
15 discussion drafts and the proposed rules to the  
16 public, so that everybody is working on the  
17 framework, but that's why we've tried to put a bolt  
18 on this, that public comments -- just get them in by  
19 August 16th and we'll consider them.

20           LIZ APPEL: Under the current  
21 deadline, petitioners who are on active  
22 consideration, according to the regulations, you  
23 would have the option of going under the old  
24 regulations or the new regulations.

25           SONNIE RUBIO: Yeah. We stated that

1 to OFA, that we chose to stay with the current one  
2 right now, because our understanding from the letter  
3 is it doesn't matter if we go for or against, it's  
4 what OFA is going to make the final decision on all  
5 the comments. Then it will be brought back to us,  
6 where we're going from that point, so we chose to  
7 stay with the old one.

8 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you --

9 SAMI JO DIFUNTORUM: Hi, my name is  
10 Sami Jo Difuntorum. I'm with the Butte Valley  
11 Indian Community, and first I'd like to thank you  
12 for having this meeting and giving us the  
13 opportunity to show up and share our opinions with  
14 you on the proposed regulations.

15 My family descends from the Kewkahekke  
16 band of Shasta Indians from Upper Klamath River  
17 Canyon, and I support the proposed changes. I'll  
18 submit a very detailed written comment in writing,  
19 but my observation -- I volunteer for my tribe for  
20 probably over 30 years, maybe more than that. I  
21 hate to do the math.

22 My observation over the years is that  
23 nonfederally recognized tribes, particularly the  
24 ones in California that I'm more familiar with,  
25 really lack the resources and sophistication to

1 navigate the current process, so I think that the  
2 change is long overdue, and we support the changes.  
3 We'll submit written comments that are fairly  
4 detailed before the August 16th cutoff. And also, I  
5 wanted to thank you for the opportunity to provide  
6 comment and having a public meeting. I think that's  
7 it.

8 CLARENCE SIVERTSEN: Good afternoon,  
9 everyone. My name is Clarence Sivertsen. I'm the  
10 first vice chairman of the Little Shell Tribe of  
11 Chippewa Indians of Montana. I want to thank you  
12 for this opportunity to address you today on the  
13 subject of consideration of revisions of the federal  
14 acknowledgment regulations. This is a matter of  
15 utmost importance to my tribe and many other tribes.  
16 We commend you for undertaking this process,  
17 something that has been needed for many years.

18 My tribe is presently not federally  
19 recognized, even though we've had treaty relations  
20 with the federal government. We have a petition for  
21 recognition pending which has not yet received a  
22 final and effective determination, as it is now  
23 pending before the Secretary of the Interior, on  
24 referral from the Interior Board of Indian Appeals.

25 The fact that it is not yet final and

1 effective is amazing, given that the Little Shell  
2 Tribe first sent a letter to the Bureau of Indian  
3 Affairs petitioning for federal acknowledgment in  
4 1978. To put that in perspective, the process has  
5 spanned all or part of five decades and is still  
6 ongoing. It has cost well over \$2 million, and that  
7 is surely the low end of costs for the process.

8           It is clear that the process is  
9 broken. It is too costly, time consuming, and  
10 complex. The process cannot be saved by minor  
11 tweaks to the present regulations. In that regard,  
12 we are pleased to note that the preliminary  
13 discussion draft regulations contemplate some major  
14 revisions. Some of these proposed major changes are  
15 what we have argued for in documents filed with the  
16 Office of Federal Acknowledgment, with the IBIA, and  
17 with the Secretary of Interior, and in testimony  
18 before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, so we  
19 are appreciative that our words have not fallen on  
20 deaf ears.

21           First, we've argued that Criteria A  
22 should be eliminated. That criterion requires  
23 recognition by outsiders of an Indian entity on a  
24 regular basis since 1900. That cannot possibly be a  
25 mandatory criterion, at most it can be evidence of

1 existence as a tribe. Imagine that a tribe meets  
2 all of the substantive requirements to be a tribe.  
3 Can it be true in this day and age that the tribe  
4 would not exist because outsiders did not recognize  
5 that they were not looking at just the individual  
6 Indians, but an Indian entity? Essentially, this  
7 criterion requires interaction between outsiders and  
8 the tribal community sufficient to produce a  
9 document identifying the tribal community every ten  
10 years.

11 In the case of the Little Shell, the  
12 final determination against recognition recognizes  
13 that there were many references from 1900 to 1935 to  
14 landless Indians, breeds garbage dump Indians, and  
15 other uncomplimentary names, but concludes that  
16 there were not references to Indian entities and  
17 that therefore the criterion was not met. Little  
18 Shell ancestors have avoided contact with the  
19 dominant society because that contact subjected them  
20 to open and blatant discrimination. They survived  
21 as a migratory people off the official radar screen.  
22 By its nature, this lifestyle does not produce the  
23 paper trail required by Criteria A. Nor, if the  
24 subjective requirements of the regulations are met,  
25 can lack of identification by outsiders render a

1 tribe a nontribe? We're very pleased to see that  
2 our argument has apparently been accepted in that  
3 Criteria A is proposed to be deleted.

4           Second, we note that on July 14, 2000,  
5 Kevin Gover, the assistant secretary of Indian  
6 Affairs signed a proposed finding for federal  
7 acknowledgment of the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa  
8 Indians of Montana. After summarizing the evidence  
9 under each of the criteria, the assistant secretary  
10 concluded that the petitioners should be  
11 acknowledged to exist as an Indian tribe.

12           On November 3, 2009, the acting  
13 principal deputy assistant secretary of Indian  
14 Affairs published in the Federal Register a final  
15 determination against recognition of the Little  
16 Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, thereby  
17 reversing the favorable proposed finding. This was  
18 done despite the facts that no negative comments  
19 were received and that the State of Montana, all  
20 effective local governments, and all Montana tribes,  
21 as well as others supported recognition. We've  
22 argued repeatedly that to reverse the favorable  
23 proposed finding in the absence of any negative  
24 comments in response to the finding is arbitrary,  
25 capricious, and contrary to law.

1           We note that the draft regulations  
2 propose changing the regulations to provide for an  
3 automatic positive final determination if the  
4 preliminary determination is positive and no  
5 negative comments are received from relevant state  
6 or local government or from any recognized tribe in  
7 the state where the petition is located. This is a  
8 common sense change required by law and is welcomed.

9           We've also argued that Criteria B,  
10 community, and C, political influence, must be  
11 modified. At present they required proof of  
12 community and political influence from historic  
13 times to the present. It's unduly burdensome. The  
14 BIA requires proof of relationships -- in the case  
15 of community, relationships among tribal members --  
16 and in the case of political influence,  
17 relationships between tribal members and their  
18 political leaders.

19           Self-identification of leaders and  
20 oral tradition are not sufficient for a tribe to  
21 carry its burden of proof. There must be a  
22 documentary evidence or alternatively statistics --  
23 example, on marriage rates -- from which the BIA is  
24 willing to presume the existence of interaction.

25           Obviously, such documents are not

1 likely to exist for a tribal community that survived  
2 historically in the traditional way, and in modern  
3 times, by avoiding the dominant society. We were  
4 largely a buffalo hunting tribe throughout much of  
5 our history, and despite producing tens of thousands  
6 of documents, we have been told it's not enough.  
7 Much of our difficulty in meeting the unreasonable  
8 criteria is owing to federal policy toward and  
9 treatment of us. Yet rather than taking into  
10 account, it's held against us.

11           The process is too paper driven and  
12 extends over too long a period of time. We have  
13 previously suggested 1934, the year of passage of  
14 the Indian Reorganization Act, when congress and the  
15 executive actively addressed issues of tribal  
16 existence in a comprehensive way, and but for the  
17 lack of funds for tribal lands would have recognized  
18 the Little Shell tribe, as a much better time period  
19 on which to focus, although even there, the IRA  
20 itself contemplated action to be taken after that  
21 time which would result in recognition.

22           We note with satisfaction that the  
23 draft regulations focus on 1934 and contemplate  
24 changes in what must be shown to establish B and C,  
25 and what type of evidence will establish what does

1 need to be shown. We will have more to say on these  
2 matters in our written comments.

3 Fourth, there are parts of the process  
4 that violate due process. In the case of Little  
5 Shell, three weeks of on-site interviewing of 71  
6 people occurred at the end of the process, and the  
7 tribe was not given a chance to review and comment  
8 on these interviews before the final determination.  
9 The tribe had to do a FOIA request and pay nearly  
10 \$5,000 to get the documents for the appeal to the  
11 IBIA. It puts the tribe in a much different  
12 position to try and overturn a decision than to be  
13 able to argue a point before final determination.

14 The draft regulations do not address  
15 this issue, and that is a defect which we will  
16 address in written comments within the comment  
17 period. The draft regulations do address the need  
18 for a hearing, but once again, do not go far enough,  
19 in that the calling of OFA staff for testimony and  
20 cross-examination is discretionary. We will also  
21 submit comments on this issue.

22 Fifth, the regulations attempt to  
23 simplify matters for tribes who can show  
24 acknowledgment of previous existence.  
25 Unfortunately, the regulations confuse and conflate

1 previous existence with a government-to-government  
2 relation. If previous existence is established,  
3 that should be sufficient to allow a petitioner to  
4 avail itself of the lower standards to establish  
5 other criteria. We will submit written comments on  
6 this issue also.

7           These proposed changes, and other  
8 proposed changes we will suggest in writing, will  
9 make the process more reasonable, time- and  
10 money-wise, and will allow the flexibility needed to  
11 do right by the unrecognized tribes of this country.

12           Finally, it has come to our attention  
13 that other petitioners who do not have a final and  
14 effective determination have been offered the option  
15 of choosing to have their petitions suspended  
16 pending adoption of the new regulations. The draft  
17 regulations provide they can re-file under the new  
18 regulations if that's their choice. That offer has  
19 not been made to my tribe, but that is what is  
20 provided by the draft regulations and we should be  
21 given the same option.

22           We should be treated equally with  
23 other petitioners whose petitions are not yet final  
24 and effective. For those petitioners who have  
25 received a final and effective negative

1 determination, we strongly support the provision in  
2 the draft regulations that allows re-petitioning if  
3 the petitioner can show that being recognized under  
4 the new regulations would lead to a different  
5 outcome.

6 And I thank you for your time and your  
7 attention.

8 ROBERT KENTTA: Robert Kentta from  
9 Siletz Tribe. I can't remember if in the morning  
10 discussion, in the part where it's talking about  
11 expedited favorable finding, if that criteria, that  
12 the U.S. has held land for the group at any point in  
13 time since 1934, whether that's specifically land  
14 held for the group or whether it can include  
15 individual allotment lands or other lands not  
16 specifically held for the group itself.

17 LARRY ROBERTS: Right now the  
18 discussion draft is for group individuals.

19 ROBERT KENTTA: Thanks.

20 SONNIE RUBIO: We will be able to hear  
21 what the recognized tribes recommended as well  
22 somewhere on the internet or where do you --

23 LARRY ROBERTS: So what we'll do is,  
24 once we get a transcript of these meetings,  
25 including the tribal consultations, as a matter of

1 course those go up on our website. And so that way  
2 both federally recognized tribes and the public,  
3 petitioners, they can see what concepts and ideas  
4 were being discussed at the other consultations and  
5 other public meetings. And so I think our -- if I  
6 remember correctly, our last tribal consultation and  
7 public meeting is August 5th -- I believe it's  
8 either the 5th or the 6th, so about ten days before  
9 the public comment period closes. I don't know that  
10 we will have the transcripts up on the website that  
11 quickly, but they'll certainly be able to see the  
12 comments being made before the proposed rule goes  
13 out.

14 (Pause.)

15 LARRY ROBERTS: Well, I think what  
16 we'll do is for those of you were here this morning,  
17 we'll do the same thing. At this point we'll take  
18 about a ten-minute break, come back around 2:00,  
19 2:05, and get restarted. If folks have any  
20 comments, that will give a little time to think  
21 through things and we'll see you back in about ten  
22 minutes. Thanks.

23 (Recess: 1:53 to 2:03 p.m.)

24 LARRY ROBERTS: All right. So if  
25 there's no additional comments here, we appreciate

1 everybody coming today, but we're -- we don't have  
2 any additional comments, so we're going to wrap it  
3 up and let everybody be on their way home.

4                   So anyone here have additional  
5 comments?

6                   (Pause.)

7                   Okay. Well, thank you for attending  
8 today, and we hope that we'll be able to get the  
9 transcript up on our website soon. Thank you. Safe  
10 travels home.

11                   (The Tribal Consultation was  
12 concluded at 2:04 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE OF OREGON )  
 ) ss.  
County of Lane )

I, Deborah M. Bonds, CSR-RPR, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Oregon, do hereby certify that at the time and place set forth in the caption, I reported all testimony and other oral proceedings in the foregoing matter; that the foregoing transcript consisting of 36 pages contains a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me to the best of my ability on said date.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand and CSR seal this 8th day of August 2013, in the City of Eugene, County of Lane, State of Oregon.



|.....  
Deborah M. Bonds, CSR-RPR  
CSR No. 01-0374

	<p><b>allowing (1)</b> 10:2 <b>allows (1)</b> 33:2 <b>alternatively (1)</b> 29:22 <b>although (1)</b> 30:19 <b>amazing (1)</b> 26:1 <b>amended (1)</b> 4:3 <b>American (1)</b> 18:4 <b>among (1)</b> 29:15 <b>analysis (1)</b> 9:20 <b>ancestors (2)</b> 20:18; 27:18 <b>anthropologists' (1)</b> 10:5 <b>apparently (1)</b> 28:2 <b>appeal (3)</b> 12:20,20; 31:10 <b>Appeals (10)</b> 7:12,15, 15:12;1,6,7,17;13:13; 15:3;25:24 <b>APPEL (3)</b> 2:24,24; 23:20 <b>application (1)</b> 21:22 <b>applies (1)</b> 22:11 <b>apply (2)</b> 12:24;13:2 <b>appreciate (1)</b> 34:25 <b>appreciative (1)</b> 26:19 <b>approach (2)</b> 3:23; 12:10 <b>approaches (2)</b> 6:13; 12:11 <b>arbitrary (1)</b> 28:24 <b>argue (1)</b> 31:13 <b>argued (4)</b> 26:15,21; 28:22;29:9 <b>argument (1)</b> 28:2 <b>arguments (2)</b> 11:4; 15:6 <b>assert (1)</b> 9:11 <b>asserting (1)</b> 8:21 <b>assistant (13)</b> 2:12; 3:1;6:3;7:10;11:16, 16,21,24;12:15; 13:12;28:5,9,13 <b>attempt (1)</b> 31:22 <b>attempting (3)</b> 6:7; 11:1,20 <b>attempts (2)</b> 7:1; 12:24 <b>attend (2)</b> 18:21,22 <b>attending (1)</b> 35:7 <b>attention (2)</b> 32:12; 33:7 <b>audience (1)</b> 2:20 <b>August (8)</b> 15:8;20:9; 22:11,14;23:12,19; 25:4;34:7 <b>authority (1)</b> 14:16 <b>automatic (3)</b> 7:6; 10:24;29:3 <b>avail (1)</b> 32:4 <b>avoided (1)</b> 27:18 <b>avoiding (1)</b> 30:3</p>		<p>25:2;26:14;30:24; 32:7,8 <b>changing (2)</b> 10:1; 29:2 <b>CHINN (2)</b> 3:3,4 <b>Chippewa (3)</b> 25:11; 28:7,16 <b>choice (1)</b> 32:18 <b>chooses (1)</b> 13:5 <b>choosing (1)</b> 32:15 <b>chose (3)</b> 19:16;24:1, 6 <b>circulating (1)</b> 23:14 <b>circumstances (1)</b> 7:7 <b>citizen (1)</b> 3:4 <b>CLARENCE (2)</b> 25:8, 9 <b>clarified (1)</b> 10:17 <b>clarify (2)</b> 7:1;20:20 <b>clear (2)</b> 16:22;26:8 <b>clearly (1)</b> 16:6 <b>Clinton (1)</b> 22:20 <b>closes (1)</b> 34:9 <b>Collaborative (1)</b> 2:25 <b>comes (1)</b> 19:4 <b>commend (1)</b> 25:16 <b>comment (15)</b> 8:25; 11:13,22;12:9;14:8, 22;15:14;16:25;19:5; 22:25;24:18;25:6; 31:7,16;34:9 <b>comments (27)</b> 3:13; 11:3,10;13:22;15:7, 10;16:4,5;21:10,11; 22:7,13;23:18;24:5; 25:3;28:18,24;29:5; 31:2,16,21;32:5; 34:12,20,25;35:2,5 <b>committed (1)</b> 4:25 <b>Committee (7)</b> 4:17; 5:2,17,24,25;6:2; 26:18 <b>common (1)</b> 29:8 <b>community (8)</b> 14:11; 24:11;27:8,9;29:10, 12,15;30:1 <b>complete (2)</b> 8:3,7 <b>complex (1)</b> 26:10 <b>component (1)</b> 23:10 <b>comprehensive (1)</b> 30:16 <b>comprised (1)</b> 8:10 <b>concepts (2)</b> 14:1; 34:3 <b>concluded (2)</b> 28:10; 35:12 <b>concludes (1)</b> 27:15 <b>conclusions (1)</b> 10:5 <b>conflate (1)</b> 31:25 <b>confuse (1)</b> 31:25 <b>confusing (1)</b> 17:2 <b>Congress (1)</b> 30:14 <b>Congressional (1)</b></p>	<p>3:19 <b>consequence (2)</b> 10:20;12:17 <b>consider (1)</b> 23:19 <b>consideration (10)</b> 8:18;9:9;10:19;13:3, 4;19:13;20:7;21:7; 23:22;25:13 <b>consult (1)</b> 18:19 <b>consultation (9)</b> 2:16; 22:4,17;23:1,2,6,9; 34:6;35:11 <b>consultations (6)</b> 15:11,14;20:22; 21:24;33:25;34:4 <b>consulting (2)</b> 22:15, 21 <b>consuming (1)</b> 26:9 <b>contact (4)</b> 9:22;18:4; 27:18,19 <b>contemplate (2)</b> 26:13;30:23 <b>contemplated (1)</b> 30:20 <b>continue (2)</b> 8:1; 19:25 <b>continues (1)</b> 9:2 <b>contrary (1)</b> 28:25 <b>convenience (1)</b> 21:5 <b>convening (1)</b> 6:10 <b>cost (1)</b> 26:6 <b>costly (1)</b> 26:9 <b>costs (1)</b> 26:7 <b>Council (3)</b> 17:8; 18:17,18 <b>County (2)</b> 17:18; 18:11 <b>couple (2)</b> 20:20;23:3 <b>course (1)</b> 34:1 <b>court (3)</b> 12:21;15:4; 16:6 <b>Cow (1)</b> 2:15 <b>Creek (1)</b> 2:15 <b>Crescent (1)</b> 17:7 <b>criteria (26)</b> 7:1;8,9, 16,19,24;9:10,15,16, 19,20,25;10:9,9,14; 14:8,10,17,19;26:21; 27:23;28:3,9;29:9; 30:8;32:5;33:11 <b>criterion (4)</b> 26:22,25; 27:7,17 <b>criticisms (1)</b> 4:23 <b>criticized (3)</b> 4:16,20; 5:25 <b>cross-examination (1)</b> 31:20 <b>current (6)</b> 11:14; 13:10;17:14;23:20; 24:1;25:1 <b>currently (2)</b> 7:11; 12:25 <b>cutoff (1)</b> 25:4</p>
<p><b>§</b> <b>\$2 (1)</b> 26:6 <b>\$5,000 (1)</b> 31:10</p>		<p><b>B</b></p>		
<p><b>A</b></p>		<p><b>background (1)</b> 3:14 <b>band (1)</b> 24:16 <b>basically (7)</b> 2:19;4:7; 8:1,24;10:11;15:2; 21:3 <b>best (2)</b> 18:5;19:18 <b>better (3)</b> 22:8;23:14; 30:18 <b>BIA (2)</b> 29:14,23 <b>bit (1)</b> 6:19 <b>black (2)</b> 16:11,14 <b>blatant (1)</b> 27:20 <b>Board (3)</b> 7:14;12:16; 25:24 <b>bolt (1)</b> 23:17 <b>bottom (1)</b> 10:22 <b>brackets (2)</b> 12:9; 16:21 <b>branch (2)</b> 3:19,19 <b>break (1)</b> 34:18 <b>breeds (1)</b> 27:14 <b>briefings (1)</b> 15:6 <b>broad (1)</b> 6:18 <b>broad-brush (1)</b> 13:20 <b>broken (3)</b> 4:17,19; 26:9 <b>brought (1)</b> 24:5 <b>brush (1)</b> 6:18 <b>buffalo (1)</b> 30:4 <b>builds (2)</b> 6:16;22:19 <b>built (1)</b> 6:9 <b>burden (1)</b> 29:21 <b>burdensome (2)</b> 4:21; 29:13 <b>Bureau (2)</b> 22:3;26:2 <b>Butte (1)</b> 24:10</p>		
<p><b>abide (2)</b> 19:10;20:14 <b>ability (1)</b> 19:19 <b>able (6)</b> 18:21;20:5; 31:13;33:20;34:11; 35:8 <b>absence (1)</b> 28:23 <b>accepted (1)</b> 28:2 <b>according (1)</b> 23:22 <b>acknowledge (1)</b> 3:17 <b>acknowledged (2)</b> 5:6;28:11 <b>acknowledging (1)</b> 3:15 <b>acknowledgment (13)</b> 3:23;4:2,5,9;6:11; 11:5,15;13:9;25:14; 26:3,16;28:7;31:24 <b>acknowledgments (1)</b> 3:18 <b>Act (2)</b> 9:24;30:14 <b>acting (1)</b> 28:12 <b>Action (2)</b> 3:1;30:20 <b>active (9)</b> 8:18;9:9; 13:3,4;17:13;19:9; 20:25;21:7;23:21 <b>actively (1)</b> 30:15 <b>additional (4)</b> 10:2; 34:25;35:2,4 <b>address (5)</b> 12:24; 25:12;31:14,16,17 <b>addressed (1)</b> 30:15 <b>adhered (1)</b> 6:1 <b>adjustments (1)</b> 9:14 <b>administration (2)</b> 4:24;22:21 <b>administratively (1)</b> 3:21 <b>adopted (1)</b> 4:1 <b>adoption (1)</b> 32:16 <b>Affairs (14)</b> 2:13,25; 3:2,6;4:18;5:2,18,24; 6:12;22:4;26:3,18; 28:6,14 <b>afternoon (3)</b> 2:6,7; 25:8 <b>against (4)</b> 24:3; 27:12;28:15;30:10 <b>age (1)</b> 27:3 <b>agency (1)</b> 11:2 <b>ahead (1)</b> 2:6 <b>allotment (1)</b> 33:15 <b>allow (3)</b> 10:4;32:3, 10 <b>allowance (1)</b> 19:20 <b>allowed (1)</b> 13:19</p>		<p><b>C</b> <b>California (5)</b> 16:10; 17:8,18,21;24:24 <b>calling (1)</b> 31:19 <b>cannot (2)</b> 26:10,24 <b>Canyon (1)</b> 24:17 <b>capricious (1)</b> 28:25 <b>capture (1)</b> 16:21 <b>carry (1)</b> 29:21 <b>case (4)</b> 27:11;29:14, 16;31:4 <b>case-by-case (1)</b> 3:24 <b>cease (1)</b> 10:19 <b>Certain (5)</b> 4:3;7:7; 10:8;14:23;21:15 <b>chairman (1)</b> 25:10 <b>chance (1)</b> 31:7 <b>change (5)</b> 9:21,23; 13:15;25:2;29:8 <b>changes (14)</b> 4:4,6; 5:5;6:20;13:21; 16:16,17;17:3;24:17;</p>		

	11:1,19;12:9,14,23; 13:1,10,14,22;15:16; 16:17,18;21:25;22:5; 23:15;26:13;33:10, 18	<b>established (1)</b> 32:2 <b>Eureka (1)</b> 17:19 <b>evaluated (1)</b> 8:19 <b>evaluation (2)</b> 8:20; 9:13	11,12,17,25;12:7,22; 13:2,18;19:6;24:4; 25:22,25;27:12; 28:14;29:3;31:8,13; 32:13,23,25	23 <b>hearing (4)</b> 4:18;5:1, 23;31:18 <b>Hearings (6)</b> 7:12; 12:1,6,6;13:13;15:3
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <p><b>date (1)</b> 21:15 <b>dates (3)</b> 7:23,25; 22:4 <b>deadline (5)</b> 22:10, 11,13;23:12,21 <b>deaf (1)</b> 26:20 <b>deal (1)</b> 19:18 <b>decades (1)</b> 26:5 <b>decide (2)</b> 19:13; 21:12 <b>decision (3)</b> 9:6;24:4; 31:12 <b>decisions (2)</b> 7:1;8:4 <b>defect (1)</b> 31:15 <b>defendants (1)</b> 15:5 <b>definition (1)</b> 16:23 <b>definitions (1)</b> 13:24 <b>Del (2)</b> 17:17;18:11 <b>deleted (1)</b> 28:3 <b>deletes (1)</b> 12:14 <b>deletion (1)</b> 12:17 <b>denials (1)</b> 8:6 <b>denied (1)</b> 13:9 <b>department (19)</b> 2:13; 3:20,22,25;4:6,13,23; 5:4,6,9,14,16,25;6:4, 5,8;14:2,20;19:20 <b>depicted (1)</b> 10:10 <b>deputy (2)</b> 2:12;28:13 <b>descends (1)</b> 24:15 <b>descent (5)</b> 8:9;10:3, 6;14:18,18 <b>despite (2)</b> 28:18; 30:5 <b>detail (1)</b> 6:19 <b>detailed (2)</b> 24:18; 25:4 <b>determination (18)</b> 7:9;9:8;11:13,18,25; 12:7,16;13:18;21:16; 25:22;27:12;28:15; 29:3,4;31:8,13; 32:14;33:1 <b>determinations (2)</b> 7:7;10:25 <b>develop (1)</b> 6:13 <b>developing (1)</b> 5:15 <b>difference (1)</b> 16:11 <b>difficulty (1)</b> 30:7 <b>DIFUNTORUM (2)</b> 24:9,10 <b>directly (1)</b> 12:20 <b>discretionary (1)</b> 31:20 <b>discrimination (1)</b> 27:20 <b>discussed (1)</b> 34:4 <b>discussion (29)</b> 2:8; 4:15;6:15,21,24;8:5, 16,25;9:15;10:7,17;</p>	<p><b>discussions (1)</b> 7:13 <b>district (1)</b> 12:21 <b>Division (1)</b> 3:6 <b>document (2)</b> 13:6; 27:9 <b>documentary (1)</b> 29:22 <b>documents (5)</b> 14:25; 26:15;29:25;30:6; 31:10 <b>dominant (2)</b> 27:19; 30:3 <b>double (1)</b> 10:11 <b>download (1)</b> 22:5 <b>draft (42)</b> 2:8;4:15; 6:15,21,24;7:14;8:5, 16,25;9:15;10:8,17; 11:1,15,19;12:14,23; 13:1,11,14,22;15:7, 16;16:12,17,18;20:1, 3,12,12;21:12,25; 22:5;26:13;29:1; 30:23;31:14,17; 32:16,20;33:2,18 <b>drafts (2)</b> 12:9;23:15 <b>driven (1)</b> 30:11 <b>drop (1)</b> 17:4 <b>due (2)</b> 15:7;31:4 <b>dump (1)</b> 27:14</p>	<p><b>everybody (3)</b> 23:16; 35:1,3 <b>everyone (5)</b> 2:6;3:8; 22:11,14;25:9 <b>everyone's (1)</b> 22:13 <b>everywhere (1)</b> 17:19 <b>evidence (8)</b> 10:2,6; 11:4;13:15;26:25; 28:8;29:22;30:25 <b>Examines (1)</b> 7:8 <b>examining (1)</b> 4:25 <b>example (1)</b> 29:23 <b>executive (3)</b> 22:17, 20;30:15 <b>exist (3)</b> 27:4;28:11; 30:1 <b>existence (6)</b> 27:1; 29:24;30:16;31:24; 32:1,2 <b>existing (3)</b> 11:2; 15:17;16:15 <b>expedited (11)</b> 6:25; 8:4,5,17,20,23;9:5,7, 8,12;33:11 <b>expensive (1)</b> 4:21 <b>extends (1)</b> 30:12 <b>external (1)</b> 9:16</p>	<p><b>finally (4)</b> 7:13;12:14; 13:8;32:12 <b>five (1)</b> 26:5 <b>flaws (1)</b> 19:17 <b>flexibility (2)</b> 5:21; 32:10 <b>focus (2)</b> 30:19,23 <b>FOIA (1)</b> 31:9 <b>folks (6)</b> 4:16;6:9,10; 13:24;22:2;34:19 <b>follow (2)</b> 21:21;22:2 <b>forbidding (1)</b> 8:14 <b>formal (1)</b> 19:5 <b>format (2)</b> 15:24,24 <b>forth (2)</b> 6:21,24 <b>forums (1)</b> 22:24 <b>forward (7)</b> 2:19;3:12; 4:10;15:12;21:19; 22:6;23:7 <b>Fourth (1)</b> 31:3 <b>framework (1)</b> 23:17 <b>full (2)</b> 8:20;9:13 <b>funds (1)</b> 30:17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b></p> <p><b>IBIA (2)</b> 26:16;31:11 <b>idea (1)</b> 7:18 <b>ideas (3)</b> 14:1;23:11; 34:3 <b>identification (1)</b> 27:25 <b>identified (1)</b> 5:18 <b>identify (1)</b> 9:17 <b>identifying (1)</b> 27:9 <b>Imagine (1)</b> 27:1 <b>improve (4)</b> 4:25;6:7, 13;23:8 <b>improvements (2)</b> 5:15;18:16 <b>improving (1)</b> 5:19 <b>in/first (1)</b> 8:2 <b>include (2)</b> 14:9; 33:14 <b>included (1)</b> 10:15 <b>including (2)</b> 14:24; 33:25 <b>incorporate (1)</b> 11:1 <b>incorporated (1)</b> 4:5 <b>increasing (1)</b> 12:12 <b>Indian (27)</b> 2:12;3:2, 6;4:17;5:2,17,24; 6:12;7:15;8:9;9:23, 24;10:6;12:16;22:3, 19;24:11;25:24;26:2, 18,23;27:6,16;28:5, 11,13;30:14 <b>Indians (7)</b> 24:16; 25:11;27:6,14,14; 28:8,16 <b>individual (2)</b> 27:5;</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></p> <p><b>earliest (1)</b> 21:5 <b>ears (1)</b> 26:20 <b>easier (1)</b> 16:1 <b>Ee-ju-let (2)</b> 17:8,25 <b>effective (6)</b> 25:22; 26:1;28:20;32:14,24, 25 <b>efficiency (1)</b> 5:21 <b>eight (1)</b> 18:17 <b>either (3)</b> 12:18; 19:10;34:8 <b>eliminated (1)</b> 26:22 <b>eliminates (1)</b> 7:14 <b>eliminating (1)</b> 6:21 <b>elimination (1)</b> 5:8 <b>email (1)</b> 15:8 <b>enactment (1)</b> 9:24 <b>entire (1)</b> 13:22 <b>entities (1)</b> 27:16 <b>entitled (1)</b> 9:11 <b>entity (2)</b> 26:23;27:6 <b>equally (1)</b> 32:22 <b>essentially (3)</b> 3:16; 8:6;27:6 <b>establish (3)</b> 30:24, 25;32:4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>F</b></p> <p><b>failed (1)</b> 8:15 <b>fair (1)</b> 21:11 <b>fairly (1)</b> 25:3 <b>fall (1)</b> 6:3 <b>fallen (1)</b> 26:19 <b>familiar (1)</b> 24:24 <b>family (3)</b> 17:25;18:6; 24:15 <b>favorable (12)</b> 6:25; 8:21,23;9:6,8,12; 11:6,11;12:18;28:17, 22;33:11 <b>federal (21)</b> 3:19;4:4, 8;6:11;8:13;9:23; 11:14;12:20;13:9; 15:4,15,19;22:1,2; 25:13,20;26:3,16; 28:6,14;30:8 <b>federally (12)</b> 4:11; 8:12;11:8;18:23; 20:2;22:11,16,18,22; 23:3;25:18;34:2 <b>Fifth (1)</b> 31:22 <b>figure (1)</b> 20:13 <b>file (1)</b> 13:6 <b>filed (1)</b> 26:15 <b>final (27)</b> 4:1;5:13; 6:2;7:6,9;10:24;11:6,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>G</b></p> <p><b>garbage (1)</b> 27:14 <b>GARY (2)</b> 16:9,9 <b>genealogists (1)</b> 10:4 <b>generations (4)</b> 17:16,24,25;20:16 <b>genesis (1)</b> 4:15 <b>geographic (1)</b> 14:13 <b>giving (1)</b> 24:12 <b>glad (1)</b> 19:2 <b>Gover (1)</b> 28:5 <b>government (13)</b> 3:15,17;11:10; 15:19;17:13;19:1,8, 11,18,24;20:5;25:20; 29:6 <b>governments (2)</b> 12:3;28:20 <b>government-to-government (1)</b> 32:1 <b>group (12)</b> 6:10;7:22; 8:12;9:4,17;14:14; 17:16;23:5;33:12,14, 16,18 <b>guidance (2)</b> 4:7,8 <b>guiding (2)</b> 5:18,20</p>	
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p><b>half (1)</b> 3:12 <b>hate (1)</b> 24:21 <b>hear (2)</b> 19:2;33:20 <b>heard (3)</b> 2:20;4:15,</p>		

<p>33:15  <b>individuals (1)</b> 33:18  <b>influence (4)</b> 14:15;  29:10,12,16  <b>information (1)</b> 22:1  <b>input (4)</b> 7:8;10:9,12,  13  <b>instead (1)</b> 9:21  <b>integrity (2)</b> 5:22;  12:13  <b>intent (4)</b> 6:23;7:17,  20,25  <b>interaction (2)</b> 27:7;  29:24  <b>interest (1)</b> 22:23  <b>Interior (5)</b> 7:14;  12:16;25:23,24;  26:17  <b>internally (2)</b> 6:7;  23:13  <b>internet (1)</b> 33:22  <b>interviewing (1)</b> 31:5  <b>interviews (1)</b> 31:8  <b>introduce (3)</b> 2:18,22;  16:5  <b>invite (1)</b> 22:25  <b>involve (1)</b> 22:18  <b>IRA (1)</b> 30:19  <b>issue (12)</b> 5:12;7:9;  11:21,24;12:7,22;  13:2;14:2;15:15;  31:15,21;32:6  <b>issued (6)</b> 4:7;7:5;  9:9;11:23;22:16,20  <b>issues (5)</b> 6:5;11:12,  17;22:18;30:15</p>	<p><b>lands (3)</b> 30:17;  33:15,15  <b>language (6)</b> 15:20,  21,24;17:6,7;20:17  <b>LARRY (10)</b> 2:5,10;  3:7;16:14;20:19;  24:8;33:17,23;34:15,  24  <b>law (2)</b> 28:25;29:8  <b>lay (1)</b> 4:1  <b>lead (1)</b> 33:4  <b>leaders (2)</b> 29:18,19  <b>leading (1)</b> 9:15  <b>leave (2)</b> 13:5;17:10  <b>legislation (2)</b> 3:20;  8:13  <b>letter (12)</b> 6:23;7:17,  19,25;18:13;19:3;  20:21,23;21:2,14;  24:2;26:2  <b>letters (1)</b> 20:24  <b>letting (1)</b> 21:3  <b>lifestyle (1)</b> 27:22  <b>limit (1)</b> 18:20  <b>limited (1)</b> 14:23  <b>limits (4)</b> 14:23,25;  15:1,5  <b>literally (3)</b> 10:8;12:8;  16:18  <b>Liz (5)</b> 2:17,22,24,24;  23:20  <b>local (5)</b> 11:9;12:3,3;  28:20;29:6  <b>located (2)</b> 11:8;29:7  <b>lose (1)</b> 10:23  <b>losing (1)</b> 17:25  <b>lost (1)</b> 17:16  <b>low (1)</b> 26:7  <b>lower (1)</b> 32:4</p>	<p><b>meeting (7)</b> 2:8;  18:23,25;24:12;25:6;  30:7;34:7  <b>meetings (5)</b> 15:11;  18:22;23:1;33:24;  34:5  <b>meets (2)</b> 8:18;27:1  <b>member (1)</b> 2:11  <b>members (6)</b> 5:24;  8:11,11;14:14;29:15,  17  <b>membership (1)</b> 8:10  <b>mentioned (1)</b> 14:8  <b>met (3)</b> 17:8;27:17,24  <b>migratory (1)</b> 27:21  <b>million (1)</b> 26:6  <b>minor (1)</b> 26:10  <b>minutes (3)</b> 3:11,11;  34:22  <b>modern (1)</b> 30:2  <b>modified (1)</b> 29:11  <b>modify (1)</b> 12:23  <b>money-wise (1)</b> 32:10  <b>Montana (5)</b> 25:11;  28:8,16,19,20  <b>months (2)</b> 8:17;9:9  <b>morning (4)</b> 3:10;  23:2;33:9;34:16  <b>move (5)</b> 2:19;3:12;  4:10;15:12;21:19  <b>moved (3)</b> 11:6;22:6;  23:7  <b>moving (2)</b> 16:18,22</p>	<p><b>Obama (2)</b> 4:24;  22:16  <b>objected (1)</b> 23:5  <b>objections (1)</b> 23:7  <b>objective (4)</b> 10:14;  14:9,16,19  <b>observation (2)</b> 24:19,  22  <b>observers (1)</b> 9:16  <b>Obviously (1)</b> 29:25  <b>occur (1)</b> 7:4  <b>occurred (1)</b> 31:6  <b>OFA (10)</b> 10:19;  17:15;18:13;20:6,21,  23,23;24:1,4;31:19  <b>offer (1)</b> 32:18  <b>offered (1)</b> 32:14  <b>Office (16)</b> 2:25;3:1,  5;4:8,24;6:11,12,12;  7:12;11:14;12:1,5,6;  13:13;15:3;26:16  <b>official (1)</b> 27:21  <b>Oklahoma (1)</b> 3:5  <b>Oneida (1)</b> 2:11  <b>ones (1)</b> 24:24  <b>ongoing (1)</b> 26:6  <b>on-site (1)</b> 31:5  <b>open (5)</b> 2:21;13:14;  16:3;18:22;27:20  <b>operate (1)</b> 8:1  <b>opinions (1)</b> 24:13  <b>opportunity (7)</b> 13:11;  19:7,23;20:9;24:13;  25:5,12  <b>opposition (3)</b> 11:4,5,  10  <b>option (6)</b> 19:10,12;  21:17;23:23;32:14,  21  <b>optional (1)</b> 14:4  <b>oral (1)</b> 29:20  <b>order (2)</b> 22:17,20  <b>Oregon (2)</b> 17:20,20  <b>original (1)</b> 17:20  <b>outcome (1)</b> 33:5  <b>outreach (1)</b> 22:9  <b>outsiders (4)</b> 26:23;  27:4,7,25  <b>overdue (1)</b> 25:2  <b>oversight (1)</b> 5:1  <b>overturn (1)</b> 31:12  <b>owing (1)</b> 30:8</p>	<p><b>pay (2)</b> 18:9;31:9  <b>pending (3)</b> 25:21,23;  32:16  <b>percentage (2)</b> 14:12,  13  <b>percentages (1)</b>  14:19  <b>period (7)</b> 9:21;10:1;  19:5;30:12,18;31:17;  34:9  <b>perspective (1)</b> 26:4  <b>petition (17)</b> 7:20,21;  8:2,7,8,8,20;9:13;  10:18,20,21;13:7;  14:23;17:12;21:23;  25:20;29:7  <b>petitioner (16)</b> 6:22;  7:19;8:15,18,21;9:1,  10;10:17,23;11:9;  12:2;13:8,11;21:15;  32:3;33:3  <b>petitioners (19)</b> 4:9;  7:2,24;12:25;14:3,5;  16:1;18:21;20:25;  21:1,17;22:12,23;  23:21;28:10;32:13,  23,24;34:3  <b>petitioning (1)</b> 26:3  <b>petitions (2)</b> 32:15,23  <b>placeholders (2)</b>  10:8;14:11  <b>plain (3)</b> 15:19,21,24  <b>plaintiffs (1)</b> 15:5  <b>Please (3)</b> 15:9;16:5;  21:4  <b>pleased (2)</b> 26:12;  28:1  <b>PM (3)</b> 2:2;34:23;  35:12  <b>point (6)</b> 9:4;21:14;  24:6;31:13;33:12;  34:17  <b>points (2)</b> 10:11;  20:20  <b>policy (2)</b> 9:23;30:8  <b>political (5)</b> 14:15;  29:10,12,16,18  <b>position (2)</b> 10:23;  31:12  <b>positive (3)</b> 11:3;29:3,  4  <b>possibly (1)</b> 26:24  <b>post (1)</b> 15:20  <b>posted (2)</b> 21:25;22:3  <b>potential (4)</b> 5:15;  6:13;18:14,15  <b>PowerPoint (2)</b> 2:19;  3:9  <b>practice (2)</b> 11:2,14  <b>prefer (1)</b> 21:21  <b>preliminary (5)</b> 6:20;  15:16;16:12;26:12;  29:4</p>
<b>J</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>P</b>	
<p><b>JO (2)</b> 24:9,10  <b>job (1)</b> 23:14  <b>joined (2)</b> 6:4,8  <b>judging (1)</b> 3:10  <b>judicial (1)</b> 3:18  <b>JULY (4)</b> 2:1;20:11;  21:6;28:4</p>	<p><b>mail (1)</b> 15:8  <b>maintain (1)</b> 11:24  <b>maintained (1)</b> 9:1  <b>major (2)</b> 26:13,14  <b>makes (1)</b> 12:10  <b>making (2)</b> 19:15;  21:4  <b>mandatory (1)</b> 26:25  <b>markings (1)</b> 16:16  <b>marriage (1)</b> 29:23  <b>marriages (1)</b> 14:13  <b>massacred (2)</b> 17:22;  18:11  <b>materials (2)</b> 3:8;12:4  <b>math (1)</b> 24:21  <b>matter (4)</b> 19:15;24:3;  25:14;33:25  <b>matters (2)</b> 31:2,23  <b>maybe (3)</b> 12:10;  22:2;24:20  <b>mechanism (1)</b> 7:2</p>	<p><b>Nation (3)</b> 2:11;3:4;  20:10  <b>native (4)</b> 17:5,7;  18:4;20:17  <b>nature (1)</b> 27:22  <b>navigate (1)</b> 25:1  <b>negative (8)</b> 6:25;  8:17;9:7;12:19;  28:18,23;29:5;32:25  <b>non-American (1)</b>  18:4  <b>nonfederally (2)</b> 23:4;  24:23  <b>non-Indian (1)</b> 9:22  <b>nonrecognized (1)</b>  19:7  <b>nontribe (1)</b> 28:1  <b>Norte (2)</b> 17:17;18:11  <b>Northern (1)</b> 16:10  <b>note (5)</b> 15:16;26:12;  28:4;29:1;30:22  <b>notice (1)</b> 20:22  <b>November (2)</b> 5:3;  28:12</p>	<p><b>pace (1)</b> 3:10  <b>particular (2)</b> 16:22,  23  <b>particularly (1)</b> 24:23  <b>parties (1)</b> 12:2  <b>party (1)</b> 12:19  <b>passage (1)</b> 30:13  <b>Pause (2)</b> 34:14;35:6</p>	
<b>K</b>		<b>O</b>		
<p><b>KAITLYN (1)</b> 3:3  <b>Katie (3)</b> 2:17,22;3:3  <b>KENTTA (3)</b> 33:8,8,  19  <b>Kevin (1)</b> 28:5  <b>Kewkahekke (1)</b>  24:15  <b>Klamath (1)</b> 24:16</p>				
<b>L</b>				
<p><b>lack (3)</b> 24:25;27:25;  30:17  <b>landless (1)</b> 27:14</p>				

<p><b>preponderance (1)</b> 13:15  <b>present (6)</b> 6:17;9:18, 22;26:11;29:11,13  <b>presently (1)</b> 25:18  <b>President (1)</b> 22:16  <b>presume (1)</b> 29:24  <b>previous (4)</b> 4:4; 31:24;32:1,2  <b>previously (1)</b> 30:13  <b>primarily (1)</b> 10:4  <b>primary (2)</b> 11:20; 14:24  <b>principal (2)</b> 2:12; 28:13  <b>principally (1)</b> 8:10  <b>principles (2)</b> 5:18,20  <b>Prior (2)</b> 3:22,25  <b>priority (1)</b> 10:22  <b>proceed (1)</b> 21:6  <b>process (48)</b> 4:1,10, 13,14,16,19,20,25; 5:5,7,16,20;6:7,14, 22;7:3,16,18,20;8:5, 21;10:15;11:20,25; 12:13,23,25;13:5; 15:2,23;17:14;18:1; 19:14;21:8,18,21; 23:9;25:1,16;26:4,7, 8,10;30:11;31:3,4,6; 32:9  <b>processes (1)</b> 6:25  <b>processing (1)</b> 7:23  <b>produce (2)</b> 27:8,22  <b>producing (1)</b> 30:5  <b>proof (3)</b> 29:11,14,21  <b>propose (1)</b> 29:2  <b>proposed (30)</b> 5:5,12; 6:2;7:4;10:18;11:2, 17,21,23;12:5;15:1, 12,15;16:13,16; 17:14;19:4;22:7; 23:10,15;24:14,17; 26:14;28:3,6,17,23; 32:7,8;34:12  <b>proposes (2)</b> 8:16; 9:15  <b>proposing (1)</b> 9:20  <b>prove (1)</b> 10:2  <b>proves (1)</b> 13:12  <b>provide (5)</b> 11:7; 21:17;25:5;29:2; 32:17  <b>provided (1)</b> 32:20  <b>provides (6)</b> 6:22;7:2, 6;9:16;11:15;13:11  <b>providing (1)</b> 4:8  <b>provision (1)</b> 33:1  <b>public (22)</b> 2:7;4:9; 7:8;10:9,12,14;12:3, 11;15:11,14;16:1; 22:12,24;23:1,9,16, 18;25:6,34;2,5,7,9</p>	<p><b>publication (1)</b> 19:6  <b>published (3)</b> 10:19; 15:18;28:14  <b>purposes (1)</b> 3:15</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Q</b></p> <p><b>quickly (1)</b> 34:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>R</b></p> <p><b>radar (1)</b> 27:21  <b>rates (1)</b> 29:23  <b>rather (1)</b> 30:9  <b>reach (1)</b> 18:8  <b>reached (1)</b> 13:3  <b>ready-and-waiting (1)</b> 21:2  <b>reason (1)</b> 21:20  <b>reasonable (1)</b> 32:9  <b>receive (2)</b> 11:3; 18:21  <b>received (5)</b> 15:10; 25:21;28:19;29:5; 32:25  <b>Recess (1)</b> 34:23  <b>recognition (6)</b> 25:21; 26:23;27:12;28:15, 21;30:21  <b>recognize (2)</b> 18:15; 27:4  <b>recognized (24)</b> 4:11, 12;8:12;9:2;11:8; 18:19,24;19:1,25; 20:2,8;22:12,16,18, 22;23:3,4;24:23; 25:19;29:6;30:17; 33:3,21;34:2  <b>recognizes (1)</b> 27:12  <b>recognizing (1)</b> 3:15  <b>recommended (1)</b> 33:21  <b>redline (5)</b> 15:17; 16:11,12,16;17:2  <b>references (2)</b> 27:13, 16  <b>referral (1)</b> 25:24  <b>re-file (1)</b> 32:17  <b>reflect (1)</b> 9:23  <b>regard (1)</b> 26:11  <b>regarding (1)</b> 19:14  <b>Register (4)</b> 15:15; 22:1,2;28:14  <b>regular (1)</b> 26:24  <b>regulation (2)</b> 13:6; 14:21  <b>regulations (27)</b> 2:9; 3:25;4:1,5;13:10; 15:21;23:22,24,24; 24:14;25:14;26:11, 13;27:24;29:1,2; 30:23;31:14,17,22, 25;32:16,17,18,20;</p>	<p>33:2,4  <b>Regulatory (1)</b> 2:25  <b>relation (1)</b> 32:2  <b>relations (1)</b> 25:19  <b>relationship (2)</b> 3:16; 8:14  <b>relationships (3)</b> 29:14,15,17  <b>relevant (1)</b> 29:5  <b>rely (1)</b> 10:4  <b>remarks (1)</b> 20:21  <b>render (1)</b> 27:25  <b>Reorganization (2)</b> 9:24;30:14  <b>reorganizing (1)</b> 16:19  <b>repeatedly (1)</b> 28:22  <b>re-petition (2)</b> 13:12, 19  <b>re-petitioning (1)</b> 33:2  <b>reporter (1)</b> 16:6  <b>request (1)</b> 31:9  <b>required (3)</b> 27:23; 29:8,11  <b>requirement (1)</b> 15:20  <b>requirements (2)</b> 27:2,24  <b>requires (3)</b> 26:22; 27:7;29:14  <b>requiring (1)</b> 22:17  <b>reservation (2)</b> 9:2,3  <b>reside (1)</b> 14:12  <b>resources (1)</b> 24:25  <b>respond (3)</b> 20:5,6,11  <b>response (1)</b> 28:24  <b>responses (1)</b> 12:5  <b>restarted (1)</b> 34:19  <b>result (1)</b> 30:21  <b>results (1)</b> 4:22  <b>resume (1)</b> 19:13  <b>reversal (1)</b> 13:18  <b>reverse (1)</b> 28:22  <b>reversing (1)</b> 28:17  <b>review (7)</b> 7:14;8:3,7; 11:24;12:15;15:10; 31:7  <b>revise (1)</b> 5:7  <b>revised (5)</b> 13:25,25; 14:2,20;15:18  <b>revisions (3)</b> 18:14; 25:13;26:14  <b>RICKARD (2)</b> 16:9,9  <b>rights (1)</b> 13:16  <b>River (1)</b> 24:16  <b>ROBERT (3)</b> 33:8,8, 19  <b>ROBERTS (10)</b> 2:5, 10;3:7;16:14;20:19; 24:8;33:17,23;34:15, 24  <b>round (1)</b> 15:13  <b>RUBIO (3)</b> 17:5; 23:25;33:20</p>	<p><b>rule (20)</b> 5:12,13;6:2, 2;12:22;13:2;15:7, 12,15,17;16:2,15; 17:2;19:6,14,21,21; 21:4;22:7;34:12  <b>rule-making (3)</b> 15:23;21:8;23:10  <b>rules (3)</b> 12:24;19:4; 23:15</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S</b></p> <p><b>Safe (1)</b> 35:9  <b>Salazar (1)</b> 4:24  <b>SAMI (2)</b> 24:9,10  <b>satisfaction (1)</b> 30:22  <b>satisfies (2)</b> 8:8,22  <b>satisfy (1)</b> 9:10  <b>saved (1)</b> 26:10  <b>saying (2)</b> 2:14;19:11  <b>screen (1)</b> 27:21  <b>secretary (16)</b> 2:12; 3:2;4:24;6:4;7:10; 11:16,16,21,24; 13:13;17:10;25:23; 26:17;28:5,9,13  <b>secretary's (1)</b> 12:15  <b>sections (1)</b> 16:19  <b>seeking (5)</b> 8:25; 11:13;13:21,22;14:8  <b>Self-identification (1)</b> 29:19  <b>Senate (5)</b> 4:17;5:1, 17,23;26:18  <b>send (3)</b> 20:24;21:2; 23:11  <b>sense (4)</b> 12:10; 15:22;17:1;29:8  <b>sent (1)</b> 26:2  <b>September (1)</b> 2:13  <b>session (1)</b> 19:16  <b>sets (2)</b> 6:21,24  <b>share (1)</b> 24:13  <b>Shasta (1)</b> 24:16  <b>Shell (8)</b> 25:10;26:1; 27:11,18;28:7,16; 30:18;31:5  <b>shift (1)</b> 12:1  <b>shown (2)</b> 30:24;31:1  <b>signed (1)</b> 28:6  <b>Siletz (2)</b> 17:19;33:9  <b>simplify (1)</b> 31:23  <b>sit (2)</b> 18:17;23:6  <b>site (4)</b> 17:7;18:7,9, 10  <b>SIVERTSEN (2)</b> 25:8, 9  <b>six (2)</b> 8:17;9:9  <b>slides (1)</b> 6:19  <b>slowly (1)</b> 16:6  <b>society (2)</b> 27:19;30:3  <b>solicitor's (2)</b> 3:5;6:12  <b>somewhere (1)</b> 33:22</p>	<p><b>SONNIE (3)</b> 17:5; 23:25;33:20  <b>sophistication (1)</b> 24:25  <b>sort (7)</b> 4:14;13:14, 20;14:5,14;15:2,25  <b>source (1)</b> 14:24  <b>spanned (1)</b> 26:5  <b>speak (2)</b> 16:6;19:7  <b>SPEAKER (1)</b> 17:4  <b>Speaking (1)</b> 17:5  <b>special (1)</b> 9:19  <b>specifically (3)</b> 11:7; 33:13,16  <b>spent (1)</b> 5:14  <b>staff (1)</b> 31:19  <b>standard (1)</b> 14:2  <b>standards (6)</b> 5:10; 8:22;14:9,17,19;32:4  <b>stands (2)</b> 7:11;16:15  <b>start (2)</b> 2:14;7:21  <b>started (2)</b> 2:7,13  <b>state (6)</b> 9:2;11:9,9; 28:19;29:5,7  <b>stated (3)</b> 18:14,24; 23:25  <b>States (1)</b> 9:3  <b>stating (1)</b> 7:20  <b>statistics (1)</b> 29:22  <b>status (4)</b> 17:13;19:9; 20:25;21:2  <b>step (1)</b> 12:18  <b>steps (2)</b> 5:8;15:9  <b>strongly (1)</b> 33:1  <b>subject (2)</b> 8:13; 25:13  <b>subjected (1)</b> 27:19  <b>subjective (1)</b> 27:24  <b>submit (7)</b> 6:23; 11:10;12:4;24:18; 25:3;31:21;32:5  <b>submitted (2)</b> 7:21,24  <b>submitting (1)</b> 7:19  <b>subsection (2)</b> 16:23, 24  <b>substantive (1)</b> 27:2  <b>suffered (1)</b> 20:18  <b>sufficient (3)</b> 27:8; 29:20;32:3  <b>suggest (1)</b> 32:8  <b>suggested (2)</b> 17:3; 30:13  <b>suggests (1)</b> 8:5  <b>summarizing (1)</b> 28:8  <b>support (3)</b> 24:17; 25:2;33:1  <b>supported (1)</b> 28:21  <b>supposed (1)</b> 18:13  <b>survive (2)</b> 18:3,5  <b>survived (2)</b> 27:20; 30:1  <b>suspend (3)</b> 19:13; 20:7;21:22</p>
--	--	---	---	---

suspended (1) 32:15	18:1;20:10;24:19; 25:10,15,18;26:2; 27:1,1,2,3;28:1,7,11, 16;29:6,20;30:4,18; 31:7,9,11;32:19;33:9	<b>Wisconsin (1)</b> 2:11 <b>withdraw (2)</b> 7:2; 10:18 <b>withdrawal (1)</b> 7:3 <b>withdrawals (1)</b> 10:16 <b>withdrawing (1)</b> 10:20 <b>wrap (1)</b> 35:2 <b>written (5)</b> 24:18; 25:3;31:2,16;32:5 <b>Wyandotte (1)</b> 3:4		
<b>T</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>7</b>	
taxes (1) 18:9	tribes (25) 3:16;4:11; 8:12;10:3;12:3;18:3, 15,19,24;19:7;20:2,8; 22:12,16,18,22;23:3, 4;24:23;25:15;28:20; 31:23;32:11;33:21; 34:2	<b>XX (1)</b> 10:11	<b>71 (1)</b> 31:5	
template (1) 14:5	<b>true (1)</b> 27:3	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	
ten (3) 27:9;34:8,21	<b>TUESDAY (1)</b> 2:1	<b>1:53 (1)</b> 34:23 <b>105 (1)</b> 18:7 <b>14 (1)</b> 28:4 <b>16 (1)</b> 22:14 <b>16th (7)</b> 15:8,9;20:9; 22:11;23:12,19;25:4 <b>17 (1)</b> 4:12 <b>1900 (3)</b> 9:17;26:24; 27:13 <b>1934 (6)</b> 9:1,5,22; 30:13,23;33:13 <b>1935 (1)</b> 27:13 <b>1978 (5)</b> 3:22,25,25; 15:18;26:4 <b>1994 (3)</b> 4:3,6;15:18	<b>83 (8)</b> 2:8;4:13,19; 5:5,16;6:13;18:14,16 <b>85 (1)</b> 17:12	
ten-minute (1) 34:18	<b>U</b>	<b>2</b>		
tens (1) 30:5	unambiguous (1) 4:4 uncomplimentary (1) 27:15	<b>2:00 (1)</b> 34:18 <b>2:03 (1)</b> 34:23 <b>2:04 (1)</b> 35:12 <b>2:05 (2)</b> 2:2;34:19 <b>20 (2)</b> 3:11,11 <b>2000 (1)</b> 28:4 <b>2009 (4)</b> 5:1,3,11; 28:12 <b>2010 (2)</b> 5:14;6:17 <b>2012 (2)</b> 5:16,23 <b>2013 (1)</b> 2:1 <b>23 (1)</b> 2:1		
terminating (1) 8:13	undertake (1) 9:12 undertaking (1) 25:16 unduly (1) 29:13 Unfortunately (1) 31:25 United (1) 9:3 unnecessary (1) 5:8 unpredictable (1) 4:21 unreasonable (1) 30:7 unrecognized (1) 32:11 Upper (1) 24:16 urge (1) 23:11 utilizing (1) 14:20 utmost (1) 25:15	<b>3</b>		
terms (38) 2:21;3:14, 22;4:9,13,19;5:18,19; 7:17,23;8:2,4;9:14, 19,25;10:14,16,22, 24;11:12,13;12:12, 22;14:1,7,10,12,15, 17;15:6;20:21;21:24; 22:4,8,10,15,25; 23:13	<b>V</b>	<b>3 (1)</b> 28:12 <b>30 (2)</b> 17:15;24:20 <b>30th (1)</b> 20:11		
testified (2) 5:4,17	Valley (1) 24:10 various (1) 16:19 version (4) 13:1,2,16, 17 vice (1) 25:10 village (4) 17:7;18:7, 8,10 villages (2) 17:17,22 violate (1) 31:4 volunteer (1) 24:19	<b>5</b>		
testimony (3) 6:1; 26:17;31:19	<b>W</b>	<b>566 (1)</b> 4:11 <b>5th (2)</b> 34:7,8		
text (1) 16:15	warrant (1) 13:17 website (4) 22:4;34:1, 10;35:9 weeks (1) 31:5 welcomed (1) 29:8 willing (1) 29:24 Wintu (1) 16:9	<b>6</b>		
thank (10) 2:15;17:6; 20:18;24:8,11;25:5, 11;33:6;35:7,9		<b>6th (1)</b> 34:8		
Thanks (3) 20:19; 33:19;34:22				
thing (2) 16:1;34:17				
thousands (1) 30:5				
threshold (1) 8:19				
throughout (2) 15:2; 30:4				
time- (1) 32:9				
timeliness (1) 5:21				
title (1) 4:18				
today (6) 4:12;6:16; 17:23;25:12;35:1,8				
Tolowa (1) 20:10				
touch (1) 18:8				
toward (1) 30:8				
tradition (1) 29:20				
traditional (1) 30:2				
trail (1) 27:23				
transcript (2) 33:24; 35:9				
transcripts (1) 34:10				
transparency (2) 5:21;12:12				
transparent (1) 4:22				
transported (1) 17:18				
trauma (1) 20:17				
travels (1) 35:10				
treated (1) 32:22				
treatment (1) 30:9				
treaty (1) 25:19				
tribal (16) 15:11,14; 18:17,18;23:2,9;27:8, 9;29:15,17;30:1,15, 17;33:25;34:6;35:11				
Tribe (33) 2:15;3:18, 23;8:9;9:17;10:6; 11:8;14:18;16:10;				