

Tribal Interior Budget Council
May 23-24, 2018
Washington Plaza, Washington, DC

Contents

Opening Remarks	1
Transportation Update	6
Public Safety and Justice Report	11
Education Subcommittee.....	13
Reorganization Discussion	16
Strategic Plan Update	21
BIE Update	25
2019 Update, 2020 Formulation Process	29
2020 Budget Formulation	31
First Net.....	33
Video of Tiwahe Program	38
Old Business	39
New Business	39
Meeting Adjourned.....	39

Invocation, Councilman Joe Garcia

Opening Remarks

Ron Allen, Co-Chair: We had a good set of meetings Monday to review the budget formulation process and come up with recommendations. And then the other meetings with regard to transportation, education, budget and public safety, they'll be reporting out. Other issues that we want to discuss include course the reorganization, restructuring of the Department, the regions, etc.

We're sending off a letter. It's an inter-tribal organization, NCAI and regional organizations, letter to the Secretary and to the appropriations committees to slow down. Primarily because of the importance of government to government consultation to make sure we are on the same page with regard to any new restructuring. How does it affect our interests and services of the tribes and so forth and so there's lots of unanswered questions that the tribes want to engage and it varies from region to region much less the national agenda.

We know about the request for a certain amount of money in order to prosecute it and that's of great concern to us so we want to talk about the analysis and whether or not it makes sense to us and it's not a unilateral decision in our opinion because of our government to government relationship and how it serves the Indian communities.

The strategic plan is important and we want to know how it reconciles its commitment to the tribes, our self-governance, self-determination and self-reliance agenda.

On appropriations we had the hearing and we had the markup which is good news for us. We were extremely disappointed in the dramatic cuts—three out of the top 10 and four out of the top 15—were eliminated in the President's budget. Why are we telling you these are our priorities when the

Department says, 'these are not priorities, we're going to zero them out.' We are delighted to know that the Congress restored them and has actually improved many of them including the loan guarantee program which got a substantial bump from the House side. We don't know what the Senate side's going to do but the good news from our perspective is that we're getting some meaningful bumps.

And we were talking about transportation guys gave us an update and we'll want to talk about that. They'll give a report on it but the increases we got last year or the last two years and what's being proposed in the '19 is very helpful on road maintenance activities.

On the legislative update in HHS, CMS with regard to the Office of Civil Rights is making the determination that the United States government obligation to Indian Country is race based and not political based and we absolutely object to it. Some of us are going over to talk to their Office of General Counsel and Office of Civil Rights tomorrow afternoon to have a conversation about that. We just don't want to see that kind of stuff overspill into the Department of Interior and it could be because BIA primarily is intended for the benefit of Indians but other programs in Fish and Wildlife or Parks or BOR, BLM, etc., there may be resources out there that we want an allocation as they affect the Indian tribes and we don't want that political versus race argument out there at all and we actually hope that Interior would be championing with us to stop that.

The Farm Bill is struggling but it's still alive and there's lots of provisions in there and we're looking for help and support from the Interior with regard to the Indian provisions in it.

Opiate issues is out there front and center at a number of different levels so it is over here too including Tiwahe initiative which we're delighted that is still moving forward and still alive, if you will. But the opiate problem and substance abuse problems and behavioral health issues are complicated in Indian Country and we want to make sure that any new resources being made available that we have access to them and that they're getting out to Indian Country.

Another one that we're continuing to look for support is the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. We lost the last vote on it but it's still alive from what our understanding is and we hope that the Department will continue to support our political standing how that bill...how that act should recognize tribal governments and our governmental authority and be treated with parity the same as other governments.

The Victims of Crimes Act, that's a nice increase that we just received because of the work of Congress.

Rick Harrison, Tribal Co-chair: One was healthcare in our prisons and jails, tribal and BIA, how that's being handled. We understand that Medicaid can't go in there, IHS says it's not their responsibility and we see it's a big liability issue. Another is I've been getting a lot of questions about the small and needy funding, how that's being allocated to each individual tribe.

Yes. As we're moving forward and then looking at the different angles of the budget committee on 2020 overall we're hoping that we can come to some consensus.

**Motion made by Joe Garcia, Ohkay Owingeh, for approving the agenda with some modifications.
Second, Great Plains. Motion carried.**

Minutes of the March 2018 meeting: Joe Garcia moved to approve and AJ Not Afraid seconded. Minutes approved.

Roll Call – quorum established.

Budget Officers acknowledged.

- Rayleta Sanchez, the Budget Analyst with Navajo Region.
- Rachel Larson, Alaska Region.
- Kelly Harjo, Eastern Oklahoma Regional Office, Budget Officer.
- Connie Wilkie with Pacific Region.
- Gerald Hampo, Southern Plains Region.
- Michael Nutter, Western Region.
- Randi Adams, Rocky Mountain.
- Julie Ration, OST Acting Budget Officer.
- Colette Tafua, Northwest Budget Officer.
- Delores Reeves, Midwest Region.
- Ernest Pullyer, Budget Officer, Great Plains.
- Cheryl Sakiestewa Southwest Region.
- Vandy Steve Eastern Region.
- Franda Flying Man and I'm with BIE.

Tribal representatives

- Kee Allen Begay, Jr., Navajo Nation Council, Navajo Region.
- Clara Pratt, Chief of Staff for President Russell Begaye and Vice President Jonathan Ness.
- Greg Pitcher, still the representative from Eastern Oklahoma.
- Ronnie Thomas, Southern Plains rep.
- Rocky Mountain, AJ Not Afraid.
- Herminia Frias, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Western Region.
- Travis Lane, Intertribal Council of Arizona, sitting as alternate in place of Councilman Dallas.
- Clint Wagon, Eastern Shoshone, Rocky Mountain Region.
- Roy Brown, Northern Arapahoe Business Council, Rocky Mountain Region.
- Rick Harrison, Co-Chair of Chickaloon Village Traditional Council, Alaska Region and Co-Chair TIBC.
- Ron Allen, Chair for the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe and tribal rep from the Northwest.
- Dave Connor, Red Lake and Midwest sitting for Chairman Darrell Seki who's recovering from eye surgery.
- Joe Garcia, Head Councilman from Ohkay Owingeh and the Southwest representative.
- Courtney Two Lance sitting in for Chairman Wright and Great Plains Region.
- Matthew Vogel, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe sitting in for Chairman Frazier, Great Plains Region
- Cheryl Andrews-Maltais, Chairwoman of the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah, Eastern Region.
- Kitcki Carrol, USET, Eastern Region.

Federal Representatives

- Jerry Gidner, Principal Deputy, Special Trustee.
- Joe Austin, Associate Chief Information Officer.

- Bart Stevens, Deputy Bureau Director, BIE.
- Darrell Laroche, Director of Facilities, Property & Safety Management, Indian Affairs.
- Jim James, Deputy Bureau Director, Field Operations.
- Eugenia Tyner-Dawson, Senior Advisor for the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, DC.
- George Bearpaw, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Indian Affairs.
- Jim Anderton, Chief Financial Officer, Indian Affairs.
- Sharee Freeman, Director of the Office of Self-Governance.
- Dennis Bodenchuk sitting in for Jack Stevens, the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development.
- Hankie Ortiz, Deputy Bureau Director, Office of Indian Services.

Opening Remarks continued, Ron Allen

I know that as we talk through all these different topics that we'll want to engage with you in terms of how fast things are moving, how we can improve communications with regard to what's going on and that we have a comfort level that the Bureau in its advocacy role for advancing the tribes' agenda and the mission of self-determination is moving constructively forward.

We know that for whatever reason Jim Cason is not comfortable or the Sixth Floor is not comfortable with the tribes identifying what the unmet needs are and so that is something that we want you to help us engage with Sixth Floor on that topic because if you don't know what the needs are of Indian Country, then how is it you can justify the needs or advocate for the needs we have categorically across the different programs, whether it's public safety, court systems and natural resources and what have you, social programs? So our feeling is that that initiative needs to be re-discussed, put back on the table and reengaged.

We've been working very hard over the last number of years with the budget officers and George Bearpaw's shop with regard to what is the criteria. So by field of expertise the issue is that what's the standard at which you'd measure whether or not that we are understaffed or under resourced to manage timber, to manage our public safety, to manage the social responsibilities we have, to manage our governance in terms of our governmental operation and you have to have a backdrop to know how well are you progressing towards those goals.

You'll hear the same kind of comment come from the transportation folks with regard to the data necessary to make a case for more resources on road maintenance for example. We talked about potential rescissions and concerns about rescissions. We worked hard with particularly the Congress to get our budgets increased.

The point that I regularly make when I'm out there advocating for money and funds for the tribes is that when we worked with OMB the last couple of years, they've identified probably in the range of \$20 to \$21 billion across all the federal programs and just under I think \$3 billion for the BIA, around \$6 for IHS. So the issue is that the need probably is north of \$200 billion and I don't think I'm being shy about you shoot from the hip on that kind of a number.

But in fairness the question is how do you measure that if you don't have the data to show what is going on with regard to these different fields of expertise in these areas of responsibility and management and you have to have data to have that. You have to have data to show how well the public safety is

performing. If we have greater violence because of drug abuse or opiate problems or other kinds of issues that go on in our community, then how do we make a case for more resources and we think that you're our advocate within the federal system with respect to the trust and treaty responsibilities to the tribes. So those kind of conversations came up.

We talked briefly about the concern we have over our incarceration and detention facilities and the liabilities around that. And so the question would be, what can we do to be able to use IHS resources for healthcare for Indians and then what can we do in order to make sure that we can access healthcare for the non-Indians that we may be incarcerating because of violence against Indian women, that kind of thing. So that's a liability and we need you to help us with that. Are there legal remedies that are necessary or statutory remedies, etc.?

Rick Harrison: One other thing we talked a lot about was the markup for FY19 budget. Also we talked about BIE not being in the priority survey last year and the importance of them being in there because they weren't prioritized with everything else and also they're developing a survey and how that should look and who that should go to. Those were some other discussions we had as well.

Kitcki Carroll: To the federal partners, do you view yourselves as customer service providers to Indian Country? The concern that I have is we are constantly being told we have to demonstrate performance and outcomes and to provide data to justify funding. We've had enough conversations around this table where you know that we principally disagree with that charge but it's the reality of what we have to deal with. Yet, ironically, on the federal side, you don't hold yourself to that same standard.

It is unacceptable that Department of Interior BIA would take the position that it is not their responsibility to know what the unfunded obligation is because if you don't know that number, how are you measuring and assessing how well you are doing your job? That's on the services that you provide directly. On the self-governance side, there's statutory language that requires reporting that there should be partnership in getting to that unfunded obligation so we really know what we're dealing with.

You layer on top of that their strategic planning process that Department of Interior just went through that didn't include Indian Country to the extent that it should have and we're talking about holding people accountable. Roads maintenance is listed as a target at 15 percent of need. And then you meet your 15 percent and then you go report to Congress that you met your goal at 100 percent. On our end what you're measuring is whether or not we had clean audits or not.

So the comments that were offered at that last TIBC meeting were very troubling because it highlights a hypocrisy that exists in a difference of approach and expectations. To equate fulfillment of trust and treaty obligations to leaky toilets and leaky roofs in National Parks as moral equivalents is not okay and it's an expression of a belief that this relationship is no different.

Darryl LeCounte: We will carry that message back. What I would say is I do know my shortfalls. I do know unmet needs and they oftentimes don't mirror what the tribes in my region do. That's why I stay away from them formulating their priorities because that's their priorities. While I generally share their view, there are programs that I know are deficient and I think I can speak for every regional director, they know where there's unfunded needs. What I heard from Mr. Cason was that we will do our own and the tribes will do their own. That's what I heard. I didn't comment one way or the other on it but what I will say is the tool developed to track the data we did pay for and I believe it's still available but I think we all heard as feds and you heard the same message we did that we're not going to be involved

in that process at this point. We haven't had an opportunity to have a good discussion about that since that meeting but we will bring it up and I don't know what the outcome will be but we will take this message back, Kitcki.

Kitcki Carroll: So I would like to make a request then and if I can on behalf of this body. What we just got done doing was the fiscal year 2019 budget process and in the Administration's testimony they stated, 'The 2019 budget supports the Administration's commitment to help promote tribal nation building and self-determination, empower tribal communities, foster tribal self-sufficiency, create education and economic opportunities, ensure safety in Indian communities, preserve and foster cultural heritage and steward natural resources. Indian Affairs programs deliver community services, restore tribal homelands, fulfill commitments related to water and other resource rights, execute fiduciary trust responsibilities, support the stewardship of energy and other natural resources, create economic opportunity and expand access to education.' Very lengthy list. But the budget that it put forward, it's hard to see that in the numbers and the percentages that got proposed in the fiscal year '19 budget. So one of the things that's being stated publicly along with this in these same hearings is that the Department and the Bureau is returning to its core mission. So my request is, we would like to know what that means because there clearly is a difference of opinion if all these scale backs are occurring and budget reductions are being suggested and staff reductions and going down the list, what does returning to core mission mean and in saying that what are you getting rid of?

Darryl LaCounte: My understanding of that is in tight budget times the Administration looks to, what are we obligated to do from a treaty perspective, what are we obligated to do from a legislative perspective, what are we obligated to do from the trustee perspective and those programs become the priority in low budget times. Now, we haven't got there, Congress did what they did and hopefully we don't but that's as good an answer as I can give you. That's my understanding of what that means. If it's one of those three things. If it's a treaty obligation, if it's a legislative obligation, if it's a trustee obligation and no, they're not defined, they never have been defined. Indian Country has been reluctant to define what the trust is for the same reasons we're having this discussion and I don't know if it's better left undefined or defined and that's probably for you guys to decide. But that's my understanding and I'm being as honest with you as I can be.

I have one more thing. We have a new person from OMB is here. Her name is Faride A. Kraft, Program Examiner, Interior Branch, Office of Management and Budget.

Transportation Update

Leroy Gishi, Division of Transportation

I'll have the two co-chairs of the subcommittee introduce themselves. We have a presentation. We mainly want to follow up on one of our big priorities we had back in November and that was a survey to continue to support what we've been talking about earlier and that's data collection. Very unique circumstance in the road maintenance program, different from the construction program where we're required by statute to collect a certain amount of information which is limited in the road maintenance program. So with that I'll turn time over to the two gentlemen from the committee.

Dakota Longbrake, Director of Transportation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe in South Dakota. I've been on the committee as a co-chair when we started in 2016 with Leroy.

David Kelly, Director of Transportation for the Oglala Sioux Tribe. I also sit on the Tribal Transportation Program Coordinating Committee as a member from the Great Plains and I'm also an alternate member on the Negotiated Rulemaking for Self-Governance.

The workgroup started in March of 2016. Our initial goal when we started this workgroup was to try to get road maintenance out of the back of the books per se and more up into more conversations and out into light and I feel like we've done a pretty good job over that last couple years. Our budgets are going up which is always a good thing and we will hopefully continue our support and our momentum going into 2019 and then into years moving forward.

The 2018, after all the continuing resolutions we have a 2018 budget. It's a total of \$34,653,000 which is an increase of approximately \$6 million over the President's request as far as last year and \$4 million over last year's 2017. But it's broken out in several ways. We have available \$33,600,000 and we have a unique feature in which we have an act that was passed in 2016 called the Native Act that pertains strictly with tourism, particularly for awareness of tourism on tribal lands. The Division of Transportation has been involved in recreation travel and tourism promoting it and staffing, having a staff member in our office that has worked with it as it relates to transportation infrastructure since 1992 and so this is right in line with that concept of what was in the 2018 budget. It is an increase. Primarily one million dollars specifically of this \$34 million is to go toward unpaved roads and bridges that also provide a mechanism for school buses to get to transporting students to school. We've seen over the past three years provisions in the budget that specifically talked about that--\$3.6 million last year, \$2 million the year before so it is one of the areas that Congress has seen as a real need to continue to emphasize the need to maintain roads which provide access to schools for school children.

In addition to that, mentioned the Native Act which is Public Law 114-221. That allows the Bureau of Indian Affairs to go out and begin a number of activities that support workforce training, allowing tribes to be able to express their tourism needs in terms of projects, any number of different projects. As an example, we talked about one, interpretive signage, bilingual signage, anything that supports in a safe manner the ability for tribes to promote that on their tribal lands. And although it's very new, we're getting started with this and it's something that we're looking forward to. There are some additional funds that also are provided under economic development for related purposes to the Native Act also. So in total we're talking about \$3.4 million that are available this year for that purpose. And also they want us to give a report on the GAO Report which is something that we've spoken of here in the past three or four meetings. The GAO Report that talked about improving data on roads on tribal lands specifically as it impacts school children attendance and performance in schools.

Question: Leroy, that report includes feedback on the GAO recommendations? That report?

Leroy Gishi: Yes. There are six specific recommendations that pertain to transportation. Three of those recommendations are related to the actual inventory of all public roads on tribal lands that can participate in the program and three recommendations are associated with the deferred maintenance and reporting which is consistent with what the TIBC folks have been working on, particularly the subcommittee. In fact, GAO did attend a couple of the TIBC meetings and subcommittee meetings and so a lot of their recommendations came from what this subcommittee was actually in the process of trying to accomplish.

It's consistent with that and some of that we'll report on today with regard to the survey that was put together and supported by the Great Plains Region and developed by the tribes in the Great Plains

Region. In November, the last time we met, these were some of our points of emphasis that we wanted to push. We're always pushing to get more people involved and into the RFTA system. Number two, P2 is the big one that we met and talked about yesterday. That's what we'll go into more. We will get into number three a little bit too at the end of our presentation. A tribally driven, tribally developed road maintenance survey we've been...it's probably a year or a little over a year it took us to get this survey out to the people, a year and a half. That survey went out in April. We had it announced for a closing date for Friday, the 18th so in about a month's time we had 115 tribes respond and report back to that survey. I think that's very good. I wasn't expecting that many in that small amount of time so I want to applaud all the tribes that helped us. It shows the interest and the importance of road maintenance out there. There were tribes who don't receive TPA road maintenance money that actually filled out the survey and responded. So road maintenance, it's definitely a priority. This is just the first page of the survey that went out. This was a web-based survey.

Part of our delay in getting this is going through the process of approval. That's really important to be able to get for uniformity. We want to thank the Great Plains Region, BIA staff and the folks here in leadership here in DC for helping to push that and of course certainly the tribes in the Great Plains Region to make that happen so thank you.

Again, there were 115 respondents. We're just going to go through some examples. We just got this data Friday so Tuesday was the first time that most of us here even got a look at it so we gleaned some stuff off the top of it and we'll give you some examples of what the survey had. One of the first questions is: is road maintenance data in electronic form and sharable? 70 percent of the applicants said no and the main reason for that is it's all in paper form or it doesn't exist even out there. So this was just a big point that come up there. 70 percent response have no sharable road maintenance data to report.

There were eight different road maintenance activities. We asked tribes to list them from one to eight. Snow and ice was the first one. Pavement management—potholes, pavement marking, things of that nature—was number two. Gravel maintenance was number three. Signing number four. Remedial work on improved earth roads followed by right of way maintenance, mowing the ditches for snow removal and other things, culverts. I guess culverts was actually the last one. Pavement ceiling and then culverts. The big thing that jumped out at least from my perspective of this is snow and ice being number one.

Another question is, do you maintain the roadway asset database to track items such as signs, surface conditions, guardrails, signals and other roadway features? And this got a little bit better but it was still around half. 58 percent said no they don't have any kind of database to keep track of these things as far as road maintenance goes.

Do you provide training to assess your roadway surface conditions? This is where the level of service comes in if it's good, failing, poor. This was a big one that just jumped out. One of the first things Ernie said when he looked at the data. 78 percent says, no, there's not training out there to do level of service. That was one of the first things that Ernie said is just by looking at this data I can see two things. We need to concentrate on snow and ice removal and some more training for road maintenance staff for this type of stuff. When was the last time training was provided to assess it? 17 percent within a year, 13 percent...no, eight percent in two years. A lot of it was...42 percent said they've never ever had a training for level of service. To me that's a very alarming stat. Level of service, if you were doing inventory updates, is something you do during your inventory update. Level of service is supposed to be done quarterly and reported back to...for road maintenance. To have 42 percent not go to a training

ever I guess, alarmed me. It's something you can do but it's definitely not being done consistently throughout the whole United States either.

These are Individual responses. This was sent out to all the tribes. We don't really I guess know right now who. It was mostly filled out by tribal transportation planners but there's other people involved. BIA maintenance guys have filled out some of these and things like that but we haven't really got that much into detail on who all did the filling out of the questions yet.

The purple and green is kind of an alarming deep concern. What would it cost to diminish those to turn them into the blue and orange?

It's important to know because when the committee was established in 2016, this is the first question that this larger body asked us. What are the needs out there and our response was, 'Well, we think we have a number that describes the national number but we don't know specifically when we start looking at individual tribes, region, locations,' and this really substantiates that and it's showing that as far as not only being able to assess it but the training, having the tools to do that are just not available. And so it confirms what we responded to back a couple years back and now the next steps are as you indicated, what do we do to improve that.

Courtney Two Lance: Another thing to support the survey, I've always brought it up about the two GPRA questions that are in the Green Book for road maintenance and that didn't tell you what this survey is telling from the different tribes that responded. We've had a response from every region. It may have been five tribes from Alaska or it might be two tribes from somewhere else but every region did respond and so this tells us that...it tells us more information than two questions. All the questions are just basically what are the needs so this is the justification data for us.

Leroy Gishi: I'll just go quickly here. Do you have methods in place to evaluate accuracy and completeness of the road surface condition? 52 percent said yes they do have methods in place or they do not, excuse me and then 47 do. This is going back to level of service and the training and it kind of follows up to the last question. Do you have a policy that ensures the proper nighttime visibility of road maintenance signs? 63 percent, no. I don't remember how many they asked but this question asks, what are your major priorities for road maintenance? The top three were funding, equipment needs and winter activities. Another kind of surprising one in this one is lack of certified operators or lack of qualified operators to run road maintenance equipment, truck drivers and that. That had a fairly high ranking in this too which jumped out at me a little bit but it was a concern. Just some more quick questions. Is the road maintenance data in electronic form and sharable? We showed you that before. 80 percent said no. 80 percent of the tribes that keep track of their road maintenance data right now responded that they do it on paper. Training, 89 responses out of the 115 said no, they don't do any of the training.

We haven't even reached out to the remainder of the tribes who haven't responded. We only asked 54 tribes to respond that have BIA road maintenance, a TPA allocation and we come up with 115. So there's actually a justifiable need to what we do and what we're doing presently to increase the road maintenance. I think we've made leaps and bounds over the 15 years I've been doing this. We've come from \$26 million that sat stagnant for 20 plus years and we're up to \$34 million and I'm hearing that there possibly could be a little bit more coming.

We decided to keep the survey open. Originally we were going to close it on Friday. We're going to keep it open until September 30th.

And for you folks that are under...tribal transportation under federal highways, a link has been sent out through them also through Adam Larson, the Safety Engineer for federal highways. So it's been distributed nationally so there's an advantage out there and let's take advantage of it because the more data we have the more data we can provide to you folks here to push forward.

Dakota Long Brake: There's two sets of funds now that you can do road maintenance with. There's the TPA funds that come out of here and tribes are allowed to use 25 percent of their road construction dollars, their TTP funds for road maintenance. Cheyenne River is a very good example. We haven't 638'd our road maintenance program. So road maintenance at home is done by the BIA. But the tribe puts money from its TTP program out to do road maintenance and we have a tribal crew that does road maintenance. So the reporting on that type of stuff is still done by the BIA road maintenance but there is still a tribal road maintenance crew. So Cheyenne River filled out two of these surveys. The BIA folks did and the tribal road maintenance crew. The tribes in Alaska, they're using TTP money for their road maintenance because they don't get any TPA road maintenance money. It goes back to what you were talking to with education. Different people filling out this report are definitely going to give you different answers and we will look at who was filling out the report and see what the responses are. I filled it out as a tribal employee not using any BIA maintenance money when the questions came in there how much TPA money I used, my answer was zero. I don't use any TPA money. For our tribal road maintenance side I use TTP construction dollars. But there's a lot of different stuff to look at in this survey data and glean.

The original thought back home and I can just talk for Cheyenne River is the tribe did not feel it wanted to take on a severely underfunded program like BIA road maintenance. So the tribe stance at home was to leave road maintenance in the hands of the BIA. If you're only going to get \$500 a mile to do road maintenance, leave it to the Bureau. If we take it as a tribe, we're taking on a failing program and the council at home decided to leave it with the BIA. But it is a headache that I deal with every day having two different road maintenance crews doing two different things and schedule and everything else but that's a choice that my council made and my tribe made and that's the way we're doing it currently at home.

Ideally no tribe should be spending any of its road construction dollars on road maintenance. That's the ideal situation. From the road construction side of it, in 2016 \$35 million of road construction money was used as road maintenance. So the road maintenance budget was \$26 million, tribes used \$34 million of construction dollars to do maintenance. So more than what the original pot was. Our last years' numbers, that went up to \$47 million. So tribes used another \$14 million from the previous year of construction dollars on road maintenance. The pot of money went up \$4 million but tribes chose to use \$14 million more of their construction dollars towards road maintenance. It's a problem. The best way to make a bad road better is to reconstruct it, build it up, get it designed, get it done and that's construction. But if you've got to supplement your road maintenance budget with construction money, you're losing out on the construction side. So ideally that's the goal is to get back to that so road maintenance is road maintenance and road construction is road construction.

David Kelly: Even though we're from the same region, our issues are a little bit different. He supplements his road maintenance program, I don't. I don't feel it's right and Leroy's heard me say this publicly several times that I don't feel it's right that I have to take my construction dollars to fill the

obligation of another federally funded program. But on the other hand I've got such a maintenance backlog over there, I've got 560 some miles and 22 bridges that need to be maintained. So in lieu of that I turn around and buy them a new snowplow here and there, things that they do actually need to get the job done. It's a little bit different. Each reservation you go to they all have their own methods of how to get maintenance where it should be and whether we have to supplement it in different ways, the job's still got to get done. What it boils down to is lives. Lives should matter. There should be no reason for somebody to avoid three stagnant potholes that are all in the same lane and hit a bus coming. So what do you do? You supplement it.

Ron Allen: Some tribes don't get road maintenance monies and so they have to use the construction money for road maintenance. In some of our areas, like our area we, a lot of us have C stores and we have gas tax compacts. We use the gas tax in our area to add money, it's almost unrestricted money to help deal with road maintenance. But not every state will be that sensitive. They want all that money for their own priorities, whatever it might be.

the sooner we can finish and get your work done, which includes the survey in a pilot area to design a system that gets us accurate data so we can provide that to OMB and to the Congress it's going to help us all to champion more resources.

Public Safety and Justice Report

Kee Allen Begay, Jr.

The purpose of the workgroup was to continue analyzing the funding, the funding methodologies, the collection mechanism both by BIA and DOJ and consolidate funding and the recommendation and also if there needs to be any statutory change or any administrative change that we could recommend.

We have a pot of money in the BIA and we have a pot of money in the Department of Justice. We want to streamline and effectively get the funding that is needed at each of the tribal governments to funnel it down to their tribal public safety program. Yesterday Ms. Virginia Davis also made a presentation on behalf of the Department of Justice.

This is the current funding that's being provided for the fiscal year '18. The appropriation from '18-'19 what was proposed and what's being presented at the Congress level.

Comment: The most important message to take away is that all that funding from the VOCA tribal set-aside has to be obligated by September 30th.

They're going to be rolling that out really quickly and all the tribes need to be aware of that and try to spread the word to get that money spent because if it doesn't get spent then it's going to look like we don't have the need and so we need to make sure to get the word out and get that spent. There's enough money for all the tribes to get something. They're talking about there may be a cap on it, a \$600,000 cap. If that's true, 222 tribes can get \$600,000 or if every tribe in the country get applied they could still get over \$200,000. So there's a lot of money there for a lot of people and we've got to do our best to make sure we get our applications in and get it obligated by September 30th.

Kee Allen Begay: Last, I think each of us across the United States are aware that there's a program that was rolled out called First Net, a first responder network. This particular program was initiated because of the 9/11 that happened over in New York City.

AT&T was selected to be the carrier. So since then each of the states through the single point of contact, each of the state governors had to make a decision to either opt in or opt out of what was presented by the plan. So for Navajo, for the states of Utah, Arizona and New Mexico, that's where our Navajo Nation lies into so we have to deal directly with three of the state's governors to get information from them. But eventually they did opt in and I think all the 50 states and certain other territories that did opt in with this plan.

So coming back around, the purpose of the First Net is to provide a broadband service for a first responder—police officer, firefighters and EMS and so on. The Navajo Nation had passed a resolution that we sent a resolution to First Net and AT&T because the First Net they have a tribal consultation policy.

Comment: Jason Thompson shared with us and it was an example of need. He talked about there's 180 some schools that are served and he only has 18 officers for security around those schools. School resource officers. And in this day and age with the recent history of school shootings and school violence, that's a very alarming statistic. So I just wanted to share that with you guys. That's something that should be very disconcerting and something that needs to be looked at.

Cora White Horse: I'm from the Oglala Sioux Tribe. My issue is that there's no real funding formula for any tribe. Everybody has something different when you ask about a funding formula. We have 34 offices funded on our reservation. We have 49,000 members. We have three million acres to cover. And I've met with Jason several times. But I think that there needs to be some kind of action taken by this body to request a more realistic amount. I know that these seem like large amounts but for areas like ours they're not. Maybe each tribe needs to pull their statistics together. Maybe each tribe needs to come up with a more realistic number because right now we have the highest crime rate on any reservation and we only have 34 police officers and one school resource officers for 12 schools. We can't apply for the DOJ grants because we've cycled through all of them for law enforcement. We don't qualify any more to get the extra funding. I think the only DOJ grant we still qualify for is for equipment and that's less than a million dollars. We have no way to pay for police officers. We're not supplemented by anybody. Our casino doesn't make money. There has to be a way for tribes like ours to get the funding for law enforcement. We have drug dealers who use our reservation to traffic from Colorado to North Dakota. And we have a huge land base so it's easy to hide there. But there has to be some way to help tribes like ours. I understand that some tribes work with their states but we can't. We wouldn't. So there needs to be some way to come up with more realistic funding amounts. There needs to be some way to come up with...I don't know, it's just really frustrating. We just have to find a way to fix it and how do we do it? I'm open to suggestions from anybody except don't tell me to apply for DOJ grants and don't tell me to work with the state because this is BIA's responsibility. Thank you.

Rick Harrison: I agree with you, especially coming from Alaska. We have a unique problem there. We don't get any DOJ money. My tribe is one of the few that has its own police department and we struggle with those same things and it's a very vast land base. And one of the only things we can do is try to get that budget increased so that more money can go out and to do that we have to go to our appropriators. We're not having much luck with our Administration but right now that's our main avenue.

Matt Vogel: There's organizational challenges with at least the Great Plains Region. When we go to our regional director, they have no oversight over our OJS department and so if we did want to push budget

increases or things like Cora's saying here, our regional director wouldn't have that authority to do so. So I would have to go to DC and talk to Addington to push these. It doesn't make sense that a regional director has no authority over our OJS at the region.

Response: To your point, we've got a special agent in charge in every one of the regional offices or most all the regional offices and any of those issues that you've got you can take directly to them. They've got the same ability to bring those issues forward as a regional director would have.

Education Subcommittee

Matt Vogel

So the Education Subcommittee met yesterday afternoon. Neither of the co-chairs were at the meeting. Myself, Joe Garcia and Cora were the delegated or sitting elected officials in that meeting. We did have a lot of great discussion and I think we pushed a better mission for the subcommittee. First and foremost I think that we need to know what our unmet needs are in education, specifically ISEP dollars, our K-12 schools because right now ISEP and BIE are not being prioritized at all. To some extent with the survey BIE has absolutely no chance to get into the preferred programs. There were two TPA programs on there—Johnson O'Malley and scholarships. Those were the only two options in BIE that you could select if you wanted to select BIE as a priority. And those have significant effects on the budget.

If you look at the budget handout that was given, those two preferred programs got significant increases and I think that was largely in part due to the prioritization in this body. I think we need a survey to find out what education needs to get us back up to where we need to be to start giving our children quality education and giving them a chance in life to have the education and the skills they need to succeed as adults.

The second issue that came up was our ISEP dollars. We know it's formula driven but, I'll use Joe's analogy. ISEP has this pie of funding and every slice is for each individual student. As we grow more students and our ISEP funding stays stagnant or doesn't increase, our slices get smaller and smaller every year for our children. So how do we address the formula to better advocate for increases to our kids' individual units?

A point that was brought to the subcommittee from Oglala Sioux Tribe was the shortfalls that are coming from education from not being prioritized in this budget process is affecting how they carry out their ISEP dollars. For example, shortfalls in facilities is causing them to use up to 25 percent of their ISEP dollars for facilities, school supplies and I believe employee benefits. That's 25 percent of ISEP dollars not making it to the classroom for instruction. So not being able to fund our K-12 schools at the levels that they need to be is starting to affect our ability to use the money that was allocated to us for instruction and in turn affecting the children's education.

I think we need to address in either this meeting or the July meeting would be to obviously get all of our BIE programs back into the preferred survey and allow them the option to be selected for consideration of top 10 listing. And some of these are more subcommittee issues that we can address at the next meeting but we need to have a better understanding of the TIBC structure just as a subcommittee to provide suggestions and actions at the appropriate times.

Oglala had come with a request for a 30 percent increase in ISEP to make up for their shortfalls but obviously it's the preferred program section TIBC has passed already so it seems that we won't be able to get those types of requests until next year.

Advance notice in communication. I think we need to really look towards using technical experts in the education field. I'm obviously not an expert when it comes to ISEP formulas or anything like that so I think having organizations like NIEA and having folks from Tony Dearman and the BIE provide us with advance documentation to come up with a better, more comprehensive agenda is a big issue with our subcommittee. I know the window's small with the budget formulation workgroup but I believe that education's a prime example of how a critical program is not being addressed or how it's...how we're suffering in the budget formulation process due to either some regions not having BIE schools and how do we counteract that.

How do we address a program that's never been on the top 10 list for the last 15 years? If there's any way we can get this BIE issue addressed by the budget formulation group and see if they can work a solution or a suggestion out of their process. Like I said, we'll need clarification on how these BIE formulas are comprised and what goes into it and how we could possibly change it to increase our funding levels and I'll work with Bart and his folks for the next subcommittee meeting on that.

Comment: I was also part of the Education Subcommittee but there was an action item that was placed on the TIBC chart for action back in March and that item is that TIBC recommended that the BIE school become part of the survey along with all of the other tribal programs in terms of needs and I think this is what you're saying is that it should have been included as part of the process.

And while we did hear from Bart yesterday morning that BIE was in the process of developing a survey the question arose about who the target would be in terms of who would fill out that survey and so the suggestion answers were that if it's a tribal leader filling out the survey they would have a different perspective versus if it was a school administrator filling out the survey.

Courtney Two Lance: Idea to move JOM and Scholarships to Economic Development. JOM and scholarships in BIE kind of loses identity with all of the other activities under BIE. And that's probably the main reason why it was proposed. They were proposed to be eliminated because there was no activity or no support even though they were one of our top 10 priorities for TIBC. It still was eliminated. But the other is adult education and scholarships, they support your adult members of your tribes to become employable. And JOM, they don't really go into the classrooms. One other suggestion that I didn't bring up right away but it was suggested to me was with ISEP because that is the biggest part of BIE why not make that a permanent priority instead of kind of forgetting BIE, make ISEP a permanent priority for the process. It'll dwindle us down to nine but at least it's there. But that was a suggestion.

Darrel LaCounte: On these action items, I will defer to my budget folks.

Jeannine Brooks: In order for us to move a line item within the budget we have to get authority to do that through OMB and through Congress in order to move it because we have...our budget activities are outlined within our budget and those are sub-activities of that activity so in order for us to move it it has to be a formal request and they have to honor that and we have to be able to justify and have a really good reason why we want to move it from one to point to another. It's not an easy task to do. I'm not saying it's impossible to do but it is not easy to do. It's not just a matter of us moving it. If it was a matter

of us moving it on the table we could do it next week and it wouldn't be a problem but it's not up to us. The budget tables are established within Congress and that's what they appropriate to.

The request would have to come from the Assistant Secretary up through Secretary to do that because it's part of their appropriation. This body can request it but the formal request has to come out of Interior.

Kitcki Carroll: So I am just hearing about this suggestion now so I'm not speaking to support or opposition for the suggestion that's on the table. The only thing I would caution is through the Budget Formulation Process Workgroup there are many similar type suggestions that might be made along the way and I would argue that we would want to make a package suggestion because one of the things we talked about on Monday was going through the existing tribal priority allocations list and whether that needs to be modified by increases or decreases, whether there are other things that need to be moved around in more appropriate categories beyond the suggestion on the table.

So I think if we're going to be making such a high level request rather than piecemealing that request that that request be part of the Budget Formulation Workgroup process as a piece to consider as an overall package submission of whatever ultimate recommendations that we want to see happen.

The challenge with the education discussion that's going on right now, we've long contended that because of the limited relevance that BIE schools, brick and mortar, have with many tribes, it never gets elevated as a priority and we discussed back in I think it was FY13 that got exemplified when then Assistant Secretary went before Indian Affairs committee...Senate Indian Affairs Committee and was asked by the members why Indian education wasn't a priority and his response was that the TIBC process, budget process didn't identify it as such. And we've long used that as an example of a failure of the process because it wasn't that it wasn't a priority just because of the limited number you're never going to get that to elevate. So that's why we've long contended and we talked about it on Monday, you need each issue to stand alone and then have priorities within each one of those issues addressed. So whether it's education, whether it's public safety and justice, whether it's economic development. Each one of those nine primary issue areas within the BIA structure need to have that opportunity. If we go the route, Mr. Chairman, that we talked about on Monday where the percentage doesn't really matter like we talked about, then you can do that. You can start to prioritize with each one of those siloes and not be having this same old tired conversation that we're having about things that don't get elevated because of a numbers game.

Matt Vogel: So I just want to note that the largest line items in OIP is not a priority and that's our ISEP formula. That's pretty alarming to me that we're allocating the most money to a line item and it's not even a priority. And I think we're starting to see what happens when you don't get prioritized. The Administration starts to look at that program as not needed or not important and as an example in the 2019 budget seven programs in BIE were projected to be zeroed out. Is that due to lack of advocacy? I would think that BIE would work a little harder to not get their program zeroed out but they work for the President so if the President wants to zero them out they really can't voice opposition to that. So how do we fix that? How do we get our voice in there to keep things like that happening? You would hope it would be this TIBC body but if regions don't want to vote for it that's sort of the name of the game and we're feeling the effects back home with our kids and their education. I think that's why Chairman Frazier created the subcommittee was to actually get down to the meat and potatoes of the ISEP formula and how do we improve that and how do we start advocating for increases for our school kids? Thank you.

Reorganization Discussion

Darryl LaCounte: Good morning. First and foremost let's talk a little bit about what we know about the reorganization. I don't know if you all got the 'Dear Tribal Leader' letter announcing consultation for the reorganization but it went out May 27, 2018 and the locations are New Buffalo, Michigan on Tuesday June 19; Billings, Montana Thursday June 21; Albuquerque, Monday June 25; Jackson, California Thursday June 28; Cabazon, California Tuesday July 24; Juneau, Alaska Thursday August 2nd; Oklahoma City, Tuesday August 7; and Choctaw, Mississippi Thursday August 9. If you need the locations, you can talk to me or check for your 'Dear Tribal Leader' letter. What I'd like to say is both Jim and I and several others in this room attended the initial meeting that Secretary Zinke called on the reorganization and he made it very clear that he was not certain whether or not Indian Affairs would fit into this model and he said, 'we will find that out during and after consultation'. And so while we have met one time since that, Mr. Tahsuda met with the regional directors to discuss preliminary things, that's about the extent of what we have done in the organization because we were wanting consultation to occur before we took that head on. We didn't want to get out in front of you guys and the rest of the tribes and we look forward to hearing what your thoughts are. And again, Secretary Zinke made it very clear that consultation would occur and that he wasn't certain that the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the USGS were going to fit into the model. Are there any questions about that right now? Very good. Next I'll address a little bit about Fee to Trust.

Kitcki Carroll: Just one thing because I notice that my colleague is not here but he did mention to me yesterday that if reorganization does have the potential of impacting the BIA then that there should be a consultation within all of the 12 BIA regions. He was expressing to me yesterday that he was unhappy that the Plains did not have a consultation scheduled for their region so I just want to offer that on his behalf.

Kee Allen Begay, Jr. with the Navajo Nation. There's two resolutions that I forwarded yesterday specifically who would... I want to be acknowledged that the Navajo Nation are by council resolution that they're opposing the reorganization and the reassignment of the regional directors. So I just wanted to get copies and forward them to you.

Kitcki Carroll: I would assume that the Department is going to issue something via writing in detail that tribes are in a position to respond to when these consultations happen.

Darryl LaCounte: I don't know the answer to that question, but if you've seen the map, you have seen as much as we have seen.

Kitcki Carroll: The consultation isn't had about a map so there has to be details about why that's being proposed, what the cost benefits analysis of that is being proposed, what the timeline for rollout is going to be proposed, what the impact to regional service provision is going to be proposed, how rotating leadership that we've heard about is going to be implemented. There are a variety of things that we've heard verbally that we have seen nothing substantively about. So again, if there's going to be a consultation, regardless of what anybody has seen, if they are at the point where they're rolling out consultations they should be providing the substance that tribes can review and then respond to.

Darryl LaCounte: Initially plans were done on watersheds and after input from states, I presume some tribes, they changed it to political boundaries. We as the Bureau of Indian Affairs really know as much as you know and the consultation piece of it was to get your ideas. Oftentimes we go out and we put something in your lap and you say, 'You already had a plan.' Well, we truly don't have a plan. The Department does and again, to caveat it was, 'We're not sure that Indian Affairs is going to fit into this model'.

Jackie Pata: I hear what both of you are saying and I have to remind us that for many, many years we have always been saying in consultation, 'Don't come to us after the plan is baked. Come to us when it's an idea and a concept and so that we have input into the concept,' and I think Kitcki you have some really valid questions and I think that at the consultations those are the kinds of questions that tribes need to be asking. So if they don't have a plan to share with us and it's not baked, which is exactly what we've asked them not to do in the past was come to us with a baked plan, then we need to say the kinds of stuff that we need to have from them and also tell them where we think there can be changes or where we think there shouldn't be any changes. If this truly is a first start consultation for at least how the tribes are going to be engaged in a restructuring, then let's make sure that we're asking those questions about the kind of information that we're going to need, the further consultations that we're going to need as well as like what ideas that we have and put something on the table.

Matt Vogel, Great Plains Region, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe. Yes, we are a region, still a region and I would like to know who you worked with in your department to set up the consultation locations. Seems to be that Great Plains is either forgotten or missed or maybe someone who remembers that the Great Plains is a region was out of the office that day but we would like a consultation location in the Great Plains. We've been skipped for a second time and at first I thought it was just oversight and maybe someone just was moving quickly and forgot the Great Plains but this is the second time now and it's a little concerning to us.

Darryl LaCounte: It's going to come up again strategic plan session most likely so I'd like to say a few more things. Number one, Fee to Trust. The only thing that has changed at this point is that off-res fee to trust applications come to the Central Office. That has in fact changed. That being said, in the first year of this Administration 10,000 more acres came in than the first year of the last Administration. To date, over 23,000 acres have come into Trust since this Administration began.

Tribes are lighting them up on the Sixth Floor down the Assistant Secretary's hallway and also HEARTH Act regulations are a significant priority as well. Not an excuse but in the leadership changes, some of those things got set aside. We have a system in Interior called the Document Tracking System which is not necessarily the most user friendly system in the world and some of those things got lost within the system but we have made a concerted effort to find them and address them. And so hopefully that's occurring at a much greater rate of speed than it had been for awhile.

Maybe you have seen the new guidance that came out regarding NEPA. This Administration has made a determination that with very few exceptions they want EIS's no longer than 150 pages; if it's a complex EIS no longer than 300 pages and to have those completed within one year. The Deputy Secretary has put that in effect and he has reserved the right to grant waivers on certain ones but he said he is very reluctant to do that. Hopefully this will improve economic development prospects out there for tribes and it's been a struggle not only for the Bureau of Indian Affairs because we had some very complex ones in the works when this guidance came out so we have several that far exceed those particular guidelines and so we're working with the Deputy Secretary and with our solicitors to try and get those to

either be waived or fit within there. But moving forward I think now that we know that rule I think we'll be fine. Again, other bureaus within the Department are struggling more so than us it appears to me with the new guidance. I would like to talk a little bit about what's happening. Ron, you mentioned the Albuquerque move. At this point that is on hold until we make some decisions right around mid-July, late July. We're going to reevaluate what's going on there. It's not a done deal. We received some new guidance and so we're reevaluating that situation. And that's about really all I have to say about it.

Question: I thought I heard a movement about OST shifting so some of its functions will be shifted back to the BIA. Is that true?

Jerry Gidner: So the answer to that specific question is no. The proposal is to move OST under ASIA but it would be moving it intact as a freestanding, essentially a third entity under ASIA with BIA, BIE and OST. So it's not being reincorporated into BIA but all under the Assistant Secretary Indian Affairs. So it will retain its current areas of responsibility, it's just a third area under the ASIA.

Question: Okay. And location wise it will stay primarily in Albuquerque still.

Jerry Gidner: Yeah, the plurality of our employees are in Albuquerque. We have 50 field locations. We've got a much smaller group up in DC. But none of that will change.

Darryl LaCounte: I'd like to talk a little bit about what's going on out in the regions. A selection has been made for the Alaska Regional Director. It is currently pending at OPM for clearance. The Northwest Regional Director will be selected shortly. The Southwest Region is advertised currently. The Deputy Director for Trust Services is also out on the street with a duty location of Washington, DC. In the last shuffle it went out to Albuquerque but it was advertised this time in DC. It closes at the end of this month. In the interim, Johnna Blackhair will come in in a 120 day acting stint in DC beginning June 3rd. I had the opportunity to work with Johnna the last three months while she was the Acting Associate Deputy Secretary and nothing but admiration for the work that she did and I've known Johnna a long time.

Comment: For the record that we want Johnna back. We had longstanding regional challenges and until Director Maytubby and Johnna showed up it was an entirely 180 degree shift in our reality in our region. So I understand that there are needs in other regions and you need skillsets but what often happens, we had this happen with our IHS director, they get reassigned for short term stints and they never come back. So we want her back.

Jim James: I'm actually pleased to announce that we have selected Tim LaPointe to be the Regional Director for the Midwest Region. That doesn't become effective until June the 10th. So as of June the 10th he's still at Great Plains. As Darryl said, the Northwest Region is right now being prepared for an interview panel. So we have a list of finalists, and then they will be interviewed and then once we get down to probably the top two or three I'd like to share those with probably the board of AT&I so that I can get some input from tribal leadership on that. As Darryl said, Southwest is out. I think that closes on June 13th. Joe, I think there was a message that was delivered by John Halliday who's Acting Southwest Regional Director at the moment to the All Pueblo Governor's Council last week just basically asking if you have some candidates or interest please let me know for that position. And then Alaska, we're just waiting for OPM's clearance. We're hoping that we get that relatively shortly. But our goal really is to align all of the positions with talent, with management capacity, with the type of quality that we think Indian Country deserves. And so we're being very careful about selection. We want your input. I know

that Navajo has raised a concern about reassignments. We visited with President Begay and a number of council delegates and we're thinking about whether or not this is the right thing to do but we will keep everybody informed as we go. That's kind of where we are for now with the regional director positions. I know James Schock was recently appointed a couple of months ago to Southern Plains Regional Director position. So far I've heard nothing but good things and I think that's a good sign of kind of how we want to realign things. So unless you have any questions for me, that's kind of where we are with the field and the RDs.

Native American Child Safety Act

Hankie Ortiz: The Native American Children's Safety Act has a couple of requirements on tribes. Before a tribe can place a child into foster care, it requires two things—a criminal records check including a fingerprint based check of national crime databases of all the adults in a home and also it requires a check of tribal and state abuse, neglect registries. So this includes a check of all states where the individual has lived in the past five years. And this law was enacted on June 3rd, 2016 and when it was enacted it had a two year requirement for the BIA to put guidelines in place. So we were required by the act to put guidelines in place by June, 2018 and I'm really happy to announce that the Assistant Secretary issued the act's guidance on May 18th, 2018. So just a few days ago we issued the guidance, it's published in the Federal Register so it's available. You can take a look at all that. The key categories for NCSA guidance include examining the procedures for a criminal records check of covered individuals, self-reporting requirements for foster care homes or institutions in which any covered individual resides, promising practices used by Indian tribes to address emergency foster care placement procedures and procedures for certifying compliance with this act. So all of that is included in the guidelines so I encourage you to take a look at those and read them.

Question: Could you give us an update on what is the status of the Tiwahe program or project?

Hankie Ortiz: Tiwahe was funded in FY18 and so Tiwahe is actually continuing. Right now we have six tribes in Tiwahe and those six tribes are continuing. They have great plans developed. They developed measurements that are for the Tiwahe initiative overall and for each individual tribe has their own measurements that they're looking at and they're really doing well in carrying out their plans. So that's kind of the status. It was funded in Social Services in ICWA for '17 and that's what we're looking at funding for '18.

We just completed and submitted our report this month and we have all of that information documented and we have the trends over the years and the different measurements that we were looking at so we do have some good data that's available. And that is going through the approval process. It went out of Indian Services last week and I'm not sure where it is, if it's with the BIA director, I have to check. It's at the Department Jeannine's telling me. Its targeted to Congress. It was a requirement for the Tiwahe funding to provide this report.

Once it's sent to Congress it can be shared openly. Right now it's in draft form because it's still going under the review process. Once it clears the Department and they say it's available for Congress then we can share it more widely.

Question: One other question that's in your program that came up in our tribal caucus is that small and needy program and the frustration of the tribes. Most of them are in the Alaska and California but

what's the challenge of that program to get those tribes that are too...the \$160,000 and the \$200,000 range?

The small and needy is intended for those tribes that do not have base funding. They have small numbers and there was intended to bring them up to a base which is \$160,000 for tribes in the Lower 48 small tribes and \$200,000 for Alaskan tribes.

And so they're having a...many of them are frustrated over not getting those monies one timely but not even knowing how's the process even work to know how they...how that program is even working.

Hankie Ortiz: I think that the delay has been through the budget process. We had many CRs and then we had to get the spending plan in place and then we got the funding. It's not that... There's no formula for it. It's like you said, it was...the tribes have a base amount. Whatever that is, we try to look at that base and see how much they need to bring them up to \$160,000 or \$200,000 depending on whether they're in the Lower 48 or Alaska. So really it's just...that's kind of a lump sum base funding amount that's established for them but it really hasn't... There's not a big complication. It's just getting the money to us so that we can get the money out.

Question: Okay, one last question. This might roll over into the budget conversation. I'm assuming that you have...for those tribes you have a list of the...let's say it's 200 tribes that are under the \$160,000 and the \$200,000 and so you would know...you should know where they are and then you should know what the difference is between where they are currently versus the \$160,000 and the \$200,000. Does the budget request include the number there or is it less than what's needed to accomplish that goal?

Hankie Ortiz: In FY17 and in FY18 we haven't made the distribution yet but anticipate that we'll have enough to bring everyone up to those levels. It's supplemental.

Question: Are you saying it's a temporary adjustment?

Hankie Ortiz: Yes, small and needy is not base funding since it's distributed that way each year. They'll continue to get it to bring them up to that norm until they receive base funding in another form just like ICWA just had more base funding go out, so did Social Services. Once their base gets up over that level then they will no longer be part of the small and needy distribution. But each year it has to be re-looked at for population, for total base dollars. They do have to reevaluate it each year to see where they're standing. So those dollars themselves do not become base funding.

Dave Conner: I also just wanted to add regarding the Tiwahe initiative that if it's funded in 2019 that will be the fifth year of the pilot portion. There's still the other portion where for each year since 2015 about \$10 million has been distributed nationwide to all tribes but then you had the pilot portion with six pilot sites although 52 tribes are involved in the Alaska pilot but in the fifth year, in 2019, of the pilot component, the tribes and the Bureau working together, well, as Hankie said, we'll publish a final report but that is to include specific measures and guidelines that would serve as a model for all tribes to implement. So you're going to be kind of heading into a fifth year and for the pilot tribes in some ways it'll be a little scary to try and really pull everything together that they've been doing to be able to show and provide models on...that are applicable to tribes across the country. I just wanted to add a more complete picture including actual guidelines are going to be in the works over the course of the next year.

AJ Not Afraid: We want to make a statement regarding Tiwahe. There was only one tribe that was part of the initial six and that was Spirit Lake and it helped with especially their child social services issues. When it was eliminated, although we tried, our tribes in our region, to become a part of Tiwahe as pilot projects because we have the five components we were never selected for it. And when it was eliminated, it was the decision of Great Plains, 'Let's support it because of Spirit Lake. They still need it.' But we also testified and I did get copies of the testimonies of our chairmen, that we wanted to be part of the project because we have issues that we want to address under this initiative. But it still went back to those six tribes. It wasn't expanded as when in the beginning, by year three, you were to expand and add more tribes and it's not happening, even with our support putting it back into that. So what we're still saying is we still want to be a part of the project because of our components that we have. I think they'll speak to that today too on the Tiwahe initiative.

Hankie Ortiz: We didn't expand in '17 but the decision has not been made for '18 yet on what's going to happen and that will be discussed with leadership. We have actually a list of tribes that are interested in Tiwahe so we've been asking tribes that were interested in it just to let us know so we could make...gather the list and compile that information so that if there's a decision to expand then we can go to those tribes and follow up with them.

Strategic Plan Update

Richard Beck

I'm the Director of Planning and Performance Management. My office works across the Department with all the different bureaus and all the offices and such and we're responsible for pulling together the strategic plan and all the planning and performance products that go along with that.

Conceptually the strategic plan, a lot of the principles that are in the Government Performance and Results Act Modernization Act that was signed in early 2011, we use a lot of the principles that are in that to put together our strategic plan and our performance products that go along with it. Like I mentioned, we're doing this from a Department level perspective. We're trying to show how all the activities fit together. It's a capstone of what goes on across the board. In the Modernization Act basically now we're on a more routine schedule where we put the plan together for five years and we're asked to do that one year after the President's inaugurated.

We started the planning process in 2016 and then worked through most of 2017 and finalized the plan in early 2018 to get it out there. What we do in it is that we use the goals. It is strategic and we really are serious about that. A lot of the tactical details and such we hope that the bureaus are following through with their...they may have implementation plans and such to identify those details that hopefully tier off of the goals that we put in the strategic plan itself. We provide key performance indicators in the plan. I'll tell you that when I first came to the Department 14 years ago, we had something like 600 performance measures that we were working. There were 600 performance measures and what that meant was we'd go through the process but nobody would really do much of anything with them. We're down to about 120 is what we cover in the strategic plan itself. The performance information, that performance information is targeted for two years in advance and then we carry that along with five years of history and put an annual performance plan and report together that we post about the same time that the budget is being released so we look at that as the performance component of what goes along with the budget.

While the budget that gets released focuses really on only the one year, we like to put the performance in the perspective of seven years so we'll run along and we'll show what's been happening over the last five years and then what's going to happen in the next two years so you get a sense because a lot of what we do across the Department doesn't happen in a 12 month period, it really is the reflection of what happens over multiple years.

As we went through the process, we want to make sure that the bureaus have ownership in the strategic plan so as we're going through the planning process, we look for the bureaus to give us the information, their input on the goals and also particularly they give us what performance measures they think best reflect what's happening at the overall Bureau perspective and the overall Department level.

These are kind of the key areas, the key priorities that the Secretary set forth. We sat down with him and asked what are the key areas that he thinks we should be pursuing. And then what's in those blue boxes, those form the goals, the strategic goals that we use in trying to achieve those mission objectives that were set forward by the Secretary. So use the strategic plan framework to use that through the planning process to try to get a sense so we take that, we work with the bureaus, the assistant secretaries and we find out how the details for implementation would in a sense kind of feed up and inform what's happening here at this upper level.

I wanted to reflect that in working with the bureaus, these are the key performance indicators that were brought up into the planning process. What you'll see is that they don't necessarily all reflect into that fourth mission area about fulfilling our trust and insular responsibilities. Some of them are in the some of the other mission areas as well. You'll see that we have metrics relative to some of the water projects, we'll have some of it as far as like allowable cut relative to the timber, we'll have a metric on grazing and then you run into what we're used to, some of the metrics that have to do with self-governance and self-determination. And then we have some of our fiduciary trust.

We don't try to capture everything, we just try to capture some things that give a sense of basically what's happening across a lot of these areas.

Indian Education. We have some metrics that are still evolving in the Indian Education area that we're excited about seeing how the results actually come out on them. And then we adjusted the Public Safety metric as requested and then with the emphasis on infrastructure we do have a collection of metrics on infrastructure. You'll notice that some of the metrics may affect the Bureau but they are some of the historic structures and such that are in the DOI inventory and then we basically have some of the other. We do have roads and we do have bridges and we do have I believe the BIE schools is in there as well.

We look for things that are measurable, we look for things that are targetable. When I talk about targeting is that as we start going through the 2020 budget formulation process what we'll be asking the Bureau for is to give us whatever they ask for in the budget for 2020 we'll ask what do you think is the target that you would want to set along with what you're asking for that we would basically put with the performance metric so we can then at the end of the year, at the end of 2020 we can see how well we did against that projection.

Great Plains: I have questions. You said you went from 300 or something down to 120 performance measures. Did you use the baseline numbers from each program to do that? Is there a follow up report we could look at?

Richard Beck: You could look in the annual performance plan and report. You can find it at www.doi.gov/bpp. That's our budget and performance portal. I'd look at the annual performance plan and report. The strategic plan has a metrics and a goal for 2022 but I think what you're looking for is you want to see what's been going on for the last five years with these metrics relative to what's being projected for the next two and that's what we try to do.

Kitcki Carroll: Let's just pick up with that process comment. We submitted comments multiple times and those were not incorporated into this. Then there was supposed to be an Indian Affairs specific plan. There was a session scheduled in our region for August of last year and that was cancelled only to then find out that in October or November of last year a draft of the 18-22 plan got sent to OMB and then only to find out that in March of this year the Secretary signed off on it.

So the process failed in terms of adequately consulting with tribes about their input and hear why that is relevant because you made the comment earlier about would love to have had input. Well, that's what consultation is for is to gather that...for tribes to include. On content, the challenge is the strategic plan out of the gate speaks to self-determination and self-governance but it doesn't speak to self-determination and self-governance in the sense of fully funding those contracts and compacts. It says nothing about federal direct service provision. And the problem with that is if this is a strategic plan for the federal government and you're talking about performance and measurement indicators, then you should have right out of the gate how well is the federal government providing those services, whether it's in the direct service base that have not been contracted or compacted away or whether they are inherently federal functions that can't be contracted or compacted away. So it's silent on that and holding itself accountable to that. And the challenge with not having a goal in the self-governance space that speaks to adequately funding contracts and compacts, later in the strategic plan it says specifically 'securing unsubsidized employment reduces dependency on federal subsidized programs'. So the importance of that in that section of the report where it talks about tribes and insular territories together, that's the language it uses for us but then for insular territories it talks about capital investments, stable economies, strong economies, gross domestic product.

So we're being framed as social welfare recipients when the reality on the self-governance contracting/compacting side is we are subsidizing the federal trust responsibility. So it's flipping the way that this is actually happening right now. So it's missing a lot in terms of how...and this is why I'm raising my comments is because this is one of the things we said repeatedly. The federal government should be measuring how well it is providing services to tribes and fulfilling obligations and then how dollars get used by tribes is an entirely separate matter, to Dave's point. So the audits being the measurement for tribes. They should be looking for those same sorts of things from tribal nations as they are looking for from insular territories—strong economies, healthy economies, GDP, capital investments in capacity and infrastructure. But that's not there. It's painting a social welfare recipient sort of mindset. It says, 'Talking about increasing percentage of submitted fee to trust applications with a determination by 40 percent.' So is the Department taking the position that it wants to see a 40 percent increase in fee to trust applications because up to that point we've heard nothing about what the goals of this Administration are for fee to trust applications. So I would like some clarity on that, not only about submissions which it can't control but it talks about with determinations. That's significant if the Administration is really taking that position from a prior goal of 500,000 acres being put into trust. The last thing I just have is a question too because when I'm looking at the key performance indicators under the tribal and insular territories section of the strategic plan, they are not as plentiful as the key performance indicators I'm seeing on the slide. So I'm assuming that has to do with that link you just directed us to which is a yearly thing versus the one that's in here. We do organizational strategic

planning, I get a five year plan is up here, you don't get into all the details and all the weeds in a five year, it's a basic framework and then you do annual short term strategic plans based upon that longer one. So I'm assuming that that is embedded in the shorter version that pulls from that longer term. Is that correct?

Richard Beck: Well, you can try it. You can try to see if it is. Again, I think you bring up a good point is that when I mentioned that there's about four or five criteria that filter into creating a performance metric and one is that there has to be a program that's related to it. Not necessarily a dedicated program but there has to be a programmatic activity. So the kind of items that you talked about to the extent that I know that Insular Affairs does pay attention to GDP, things along those lines. Now they have to get those factors from Commerce but those are the kind of things that maybe need to go into program planning to see is that the way that the Bureau is identifying its programs and how it's expressing the results of its programs. So that's something that I think you all could basically discuss with the Bureau and try to see to what extent those things could be viable.

Kitcki Carroll: So my final comment, I just wish that the process would allow for more of that exchange because one of the things that we talk around this table about a lot is changing the language that we use. So fulfilling trust and treaty obligations is a different mindset than fulfilling needs which is a welfare mentality and why is that significant, because now we have a strategic plan that speaks to social welfare and subsidy programs. You're not subsidizing anything. You're fulfilling trust and treaty obligations and in fact the only subsidy that's incurring is when the federal government doesn't do that adequately and the tribe has to kick money in, the tribe is subsidizing the federal trust responsibility is actually what's happening and not the reverse. So language is everything and the strategic plan is a document that is a foundation to how you move forward with your planning.

Jackson Brossy with the Navajo Nation: I want to echo the comments that the process was flawed. Second, last week we had a contingent of Navajo police officers and families of our police officers come out for the Police Week and Secretary of the Interior spoke to them and he let them know that he wanted to make sure that they have the proper resources that they needed. And I'm concerned when I read through the strategic plan that really the only place where public safety is mentioned is public safety with respect to securing the borders with Mexico. There is very little with respect to the problem of public safety in Indian communities and I think this is just not with the Navajo Region, there are other regions. I think there is a lot of data and if we're looking for key performance indicators here there's a ton of data that we could parse and create some goals there and I think that was an opportunity that was missed, whether it's how many tribes have an adequate of staffing. Right now the Navajo has about half of what most cities...half the amount of police officers per capita as most cities do. The Navajo Nation has a homicide rate comparable to very large cities and as a result our police officers that are on the front line have to respond with less resources and less backup and backup hours away that has a real impact on their families. And so I think that was a missed opportunity.

Richard Beck: Yeah. I'm an old budget guy once upon a time so what you're saying makes sense. To be able to have some of this performance information to be able to support what we're asking for but the penalty, that's one of the things I'd like to try to do. So to the extent that you can make that information available with the Bureau so that then they can include it in their recommendations to us as far as what we're putting in the strategic plan. And I would say we don't have to wait for the strategic plan. Some of this information could be made available in this annual performance plan and report that I was talking about because while the strategic plan we'll use as an overarching guide for five years, the annual performance plan and report is something that we update every year and we try to tie that with the

budget process. So that would be the place that I would say that you should make that information available so that we could use it.

BIE Update

Mr. Deputy Director Stevens

Mr. Dearman, the Director of BIE is not here so in his stead I will be sharing a little bit of information. We had several robust discussions these last couple of days, Monday and Tuesday, specifically with both the formulation group as well as the Education Subcommittee. I wanted to first mention about the ISEP based funding that was brought up several times in the two referenced meetings regarding ISEP based funding for our K-12 programs and how that amount or that appropriation gets rolled out into our schools by formula with WSU amounts and so forth. And our WSU amounts are at or above WSU amounts at public schools and those of you that don't know, our ISEP funds appropriated dollars have direct impact on the overall operation and functions of the instructional program at our BIE funded schools and our BIE funded school's WSU amount, weighted student unit, is put into a formula that generates the amount based on student population, ADM, average daily membership and average daily attendance to then calculate a funding amount for our schools.

And these calculations of ADM and ADA are done in a three year rolling average on student population sizes and those populations count ISEP eligible students which are those that are members of federally recognized tribes. Some of the discussion we've had these last couple of days is having TIBC become more active in understanding that formulation process and then be able to comment or provide feedback on that process if definitely that is something that needs to be discussed.

Changing the process will take more effort, probably a recommendation from this body similar to what was addressed before with changing line items. The formula could also take that approach with the approvals that need to be in place that are at the ASIA and Department level. Mr. Not Afraid mentioned briefly a little bit about TCUs, tribal colleges and universities which include Haskell and SIPI in our opinion which receive base funding as well and other funds from foundations and other grants that they receive.

The BIE receives a significant amount of Department of Education funding, roughly about \$250 million annually which all but 1.6 percent flows directly through us out to our schools for special education programs, title programs to provide those direct services to students. And the 1.6 that's withheld is for administrative costs for compliance monitoring that the BIE does annually at our schools along with fiscal monitoring at our schools just to make sure that we're compliant with the directions from the Department of Ed for those funds.

Public schools who receive or any school that receives Department of Ed funding are held by the same rules and regulations of use of specific funding for students with disabilities or title programs and their state education agency is also responsible for monitoring compliance and holding those schools accountable. In our organization it applies to both tribally controlled and Bureau operated programs.

Regarding the Department of Ed, it was also mentioned these last couple of days or it came up about the Department of Ed tribal consultations that are being held. One was held several weeks ago in Albuquerque and it was asked why the BIA was not there or was not part of that and it certainly wasn't because of lack of preparation or lack of short notice. It was because there was a breakdown in what our role was in what they were talking about.

The question to tribes is about that 1.6 percent of Department of Ed funding that I mentioned earlier that cover admin costs. And from what I understand the question was being asked with that 1.6 percent off the top, would that be better managed by tribes or managed by BIE and again that covers administrative costs for compliance monitoring of Department of Ed programs. There is another tribal consultation scheduled for Sunday, June 3rd NCAI in Kansas City. The BIE is a part of this process. We're at the table with planning the activity as well as being a panel member at the consultation which is different from what it was in Albuquerque several weeks ago. So we're anxious to be a part of that and would encourage all of you to be a part of that activity as well and to bring your comments too regarding that question of the 1.6 percent Department of Ed admin costs that the BIE currently receives and manages through the Division of Performance and Accountability within BIE.

Another item that was brought up over the last couple of days was the BIE survey. I can't speak for what it was in the past, why the BIE didn't complete the survey or why it wasn't included but I agree wholeheartedly that a survey needs to be done. Now we're working with Indian Affairs on getting our piece completed. It's near complete with the questions that we need to ask.

First of all, should the survey be attached to the BIA survey or should it be a standalone separate document and there's pros and cons to both. Some say the BIA document is long enough and adding another piece to that would discourage participation because it is so lengthy and tedious to complete by tribes. Another piece is if it's a standalone will one be preferred to the other. The other piece of that is who should the BIE survey roll out to? Should it be tribes that have BIE funded programs, should it be all tribes because scholarships and JOM which is now part of the BIA survey goes to all tribes? It was suggested in some of our smaller groups that it roll out to all tribes so that all tribes would have an understanding of what BIE funds and doesn't fund in terms of our K-12 programs and Haskell and SIPI and TCUs. So we want to definitely engage in that conversation more with some suggestion how that should roll out as either a part of the BIA survey or not and then the targeted audience is the other question within tribes.

Should it be the tribal governing body, should it be school leaders, should it be school boards? And those of you familiar with the BIE know that all those groups carry different authorities within BIE, whether they're tribally controlled or Bureau operated school programs so that is something else that needs to be...that the Director I'm assuming will determine where that rolls...who that rolls to and who...how those questions will be targeted to those specific audiences. The BIE is rolling out regional trainings. It's been a concern of ours only because we have significant turnover in some of our programs, both tribally controlled and Bureau operated and we certainly want to keep that knowledge level to where it needs to be so that our schools can be successful. Those activities we have the week of June 10th in Salem, Oregon. June 17th is in Santa Fe. June 24th is in Cherokee, North Carolina. July 8th is in Flandreau, South Dakota. July 15th is in Phoenix. And July 2nd in Bismarck. So we're hitting areas that we feel are hubs for our schools to get to rather quickly and tribes as well. We're also dividing it into Bureau operated specific topics. These are federal employees, federal run school programs and then also strands for tribally controlled schools which are tribally run and tribal employees there and then a section with Title V employees for those that are not contract educators within the BIE school system. Other pieces. We're partnering with OIMT, DFMC and others to provide the pieces that they provide in terms of services and reporting requirements within our school system so they'll definitely be at the table with these activities to provide that training as well for their pieces that they specialize in. So we're anxious for that to move forward. As I said, the first one is next week in Chemawa and then it rolls out from there almost every week to get this completed. We did first propose a large national conference but just because of cost

and the approval of larger costs and the process for that didn't give us the time we needed to pull it all together and get approval and roll it out. So it was suggested that we roll out these more regional, which decreases cost for school and tribal participation and then we're able to have smaller groups activities and these were the sites that were determined by the committee that was put in charge of this activity to pull it all together. That's all I have in terms of an update but certainly I'm here to answer any questions that I can regarding the BIE.

Question: A question was asked on construction and facilities.

Darrel Laroche: I'm the Director of the Facilities, Property and Safety Management for Indian Affairs. The construction side is under the construction appropriation and it's under Education Construction. We work closely with BIE on that as far as the needs and the lists and so forth of the priorities so I would say moving forward we have a plan to work together a work group on our side between facilities and BIE to bring that together, the educational needs as well as the facilities. So I think moving forward that would be kind of a joint effort that we can report on.

Question: How are we doing with the school replacements? When I left we were in the process of getting those BIE schools up and replaced and up to standards. How are we doing with that particular project?

Darrel Laroche: We have the 10 schools that are on the list in 2016 that were announced. I'm happy to say Laguna Elementary School is our first one that we actually signed a couple of weeks ago the 297 grand amendment with them to carry out their replacement. They're going to be doing it as a design build meaning that the design and construction will be done together. They're looking at about an 18 month performance period on that. And we have the next ones in line, one through four, ready to be funded. With the funding that we received this year we should be able to fund into about the fourth one that was on the list. And then the other six, by the end of the year they should all be out of the planning process and ready to move forward. And I will say the Bug-O-Nay-Ge-Shig High School replacement project, that'll be ready for this coming school year and should be ready for occupancy at the end of July this year.

Beatrice Rafferty in Maine and then Cove Davy School on Navajo, both of those we did the 100 percent design review comments and had sent those back. Beatrice Rafferty, I think everything went back with just comments that needed to be addressed but nothing serious so Beatrice Rafferty actually should be ready to be advertised for construction soon.

Joe Garcia: How much more effort do we need to make and how much more effort does BIE need to make in order to bring the facilities up to par in terms of broadband?

Bart Stevens: We recently brought two schools up to 100 MB which is, without it being fiber, is a great achievement. One of them was Taos Day School and the other is Havasupai Elementary School that will later this month be at 100 MB, which is great with some of the pieces that education uses IT for with high stakes testing and so forth and then our other student information systems that we use. There are challenges with some of the contracts that are in place with local phone companies and with Verizon and other pieces that all have to gel together to get either be fiber or DS3 lines or whatever that looks like in terms of building broadband capacity at local schools.

We're working through those challenges and are gaining some ground. So those are the challenges when we look towards a school. For instance in the Dakotas we have issues with local phone companies that don't see the profitability of running a fiber line from the main highway two miles down the road just for a school that isn't going to be a large customer base that they're going to profit from to run that fiber. So oftentimes that's a large challenge because then they want us to come back with these exorbitant costs to lay that fiber two miles down the road. So we're working through those challenges but definitely... And I must say, with both these gentlemen, I think the rapport that we've built with BIE, with OIMT and with Darrell's shop I believe is the best it's ever been. We're collaborating more frequently, we're on the same page, we're moving forward with...like with the construction piece and with the IT piece, we're engaged almost daily with the Albuquerque office, whether it be Dan Galvin's shop or me directly with Joe Austin and being able to solve some of these problems.

Joe Austin: The definition that we're working on from a broadband perspective is a circuit that's at least 25 meg. So what we've done is set a baseline to try to get all the schools to 100 meg service. Most of the schools are there or getting there. We've got orders in place for a lot of those places. Bart eluded to Havasupai which has been one of our hardest schools to get anything in place at that school but we're definitely making some good headway there. We do have some struggles with some of the costs being upwards of a million dollars sometimes just to drag a circuit to a school because of those return on investments that the local carriers don't...they don't see the investment being profitable for them so they come back to us to try to make those investments. Those are just some of the struggles that we're coming across. We're also in the contract cycle getting ready to issue a new contract through DOI and GSA that will move us off of the current networks contract so we're working on that to hopefully incorporate some of our struggles into that new contract so that they'll be more easily addressed.

Just a suggestion. With technology advancing every day, there is new technology that is affordable at this point, was not affordable just last year and that's Satview. Satview is a third and fourth satellite that have been released and it's serving the northern part of the United...in fact all of the United States. And so there's opportunity but that's one of the things that's happening is that we...they're looking for places where there are challenges in order to get broadband kinds of services and so the BIE facilities might be a challenge and as I understand what you already said and what I already know, I think that may be an approach but maybe we need to talk a little bit more about what might be some good opportunities for BIE. Thank you.

Matt Vogel: I'd like to request how much our Indian students are getting per student, get a dollar figure on that and comparative to state schools. I know with road maintenance, that was one of our biggest pushing factors was the cost comparison between miles or dollars per mile when it comes to BIA roads compared to state roads and I think we need those figures for students. If state... If students at a state school are getting funded eight times higher than a tribal school, then that's an alarming figure and we need adjustment factors to get our students back up to a comparative level. I don't know if you'd have to do that by state...per state and work with Department of Education on getting those figures. I know you can pull out the BIE students but I'm figuring that Education could help you with the other figures.

Bart Stevens: Yeah, we'd probably have to reach out to the 23 different states that we're in and all we would need and I'm sure it's public information. It might even be posted on their websites so it would just take us time to pull those numbers and then we can compare them to ours and certainly provide that information.

Matt Vogel: If we could have that for the July meeting that would be great.

[Break]

2019 Update, 2020 Formulation Process

Jeannine Brooks: For 2018 we all saw the omnibus. All of the programs were restored to their '17 enacted levels so all those cuts are gone. The notable funding increases that we are looking at here are road maintenance \$4.3 million, real estate programs, \$3.7 million, opioids \$7.5 million, detention \$3.9 million, tribal justice support \$5 million, ISEP formula funds, \$2.6 million, dam projects got \$10.7 million, irrigation projects under the guise of WIIN Act got \$18.6 million, public safety and justice construction \$6 million and education construction \$104 million. The only place in looking at the comp table that we did hand out to everybody yesterday you might see what looks like a decrease under natural resources TPA but that was actually an internal transfer that was done so it is not a reduction. The money was moved elsewhere within the budget so it's not a reduction. The \$7.5 million for opioids, what was profiled to us was going to be done that that supports 41 additional drug enforcement officers out in the field and that program of course will determine how those are going to be distributed.

I know you guys have been waiting for the money to actually get here. We had to go through an exercise with the Department. In Secretary Zinke's words, he wanted to ensure that we were using the funds as Congress intended so we have laid that out. We have put our proposals forward and it was cleared effective Monday so funds are going out. By the time all your regional budget officers get back on Monday the funds will be there at the region ready for them...your base funding will be there anyway, TPA, ROP.

The funds that are distributed from Central Office such as RPI, tribal management development program, water resources, your HIP, those kinds of things, they are at Central Office this week. They'll go to those programs this week as well and those programs, we have a commitment. I gave you this table yesterday which is a spend plan of milestones and we are going to try to keep to those committed milestones that the central programs will take no more than five days to get their distributions together and send them forward to my office to move out to the regions.

We're trying to do our best to streamline the process and get you the money, particularly this year when all the funds are coming so late. We'll be processing all of them. We hope to have everything out at maximum another 30 days everything should be in everybody's hands. If we're falling short, by all means give me a call and let me know and we'll do some kicking around and get things moving if they're getting held up..

Another document we gave you yesterday is called our Red and Green table. So that's a snapshot and looking at '19 dollars and it shows you for what we requested everything in red is a reduction, everything in the green column is an increase so needless to say it's pretty sad that we have just about all red and just a couple green lines but I just wanted to explain what that was for you. So that's a quick way for you to look at where the increases and decreases fell for the '19 request. We do have a House mark. Their report proposes to restore all of the eliminated programs for actual program dollars. The reductions to executive direction remain. They left everything that we proposed to take out of our administrative programs -- according to the House, would still come out.

Contract support is proposed for an increase and in line with the funds that they restored back. This time they understood that they also had to restore funds to contract support. Last year it was kind of

regional stuff, they will get the Central Office program stuff, they will get everything from the Budget Subcommittee.

All of that will be provided to them so that they can look at it and see what the priorities are for everybody and when they're sitting at the table they'll have that information to use as they make decisions in preparing a budget for Interior. Our DOI submit is due in June. We haven't gotten any formal guidance but we're assuming that's when it's going to come. There's Philip in the back smiling at me. We don't have any formal guidance yet but we know it's coming and it'll probably come and they'll say, 'Okay, you've got seven days to give us a budget,' so we're trying to get ahead of that so we're not rushing to jam everything together like we usually are. Trying to be proactive instead of reactive. The OMB submit is usually around August sometime when we have to get that into OMB. Once we go through all the deliberations with the Department and we agree to where we're going to be, it goes up to OMB somewhere around August. We get pass back in early December from OMB and then Green Book release comes in early February. So that's our timeline going forward. If you want to throw in two cents anywhere along the line and go and meet with OMB, you know when to go and meet with them. It's after August. That's when they'll have our budget in their hand and you can influence. If you want to come in and visit our folks at the Department, they'll be looking at our stuff sometime after June.

Those are your timelines. And that guys is a very quick '18, '19, '20. And you also got the updated comp table with the House mark in it that we passed out yesterday is another piece that we gave you. The one other thing we did give you was your chart of the comparisons that everybody wants. One thing that we did not end up having time to do which we were going to do is for the tables like we usually do. We did put the dollar amounts in like was requested the last time so that you can see the actual dollar figures associated with each of the priorities. What we haven't been able to do yet is put in the Budget Subcommittee tribal budget amount. That's the next thing we wanted to do. I know Jack was starting on that but we must have run out of time trying to dig back to the prior years to find out what the budget submissions were back to 2010 and forward. So once we get that, I'm hoping by July we'll be able to give you this and it'll have another bar in there for all of the tribal budget proposals will be in here as well. That's me.

Rick Harrison: I'll give a quick update on the formulation workgroup process and where we're at. There's a timeline in the packet. We are right on time with where we're at in that timeline. Our last meeting on Monday, there's eight different areas that we're looking at—two-way vertical communication, formulation methodology and tribal workload, buy in and participation, TIBC protocol and management, comprehensiveness of the budget exercise, impact of TIBC's recommendations.

There was a couple process changes that we talked about and the whole workgroup liked elements of both of them and so they're taking that back to rework some of those options. And we also talked about the increase and decrease methodology options. They're an outline of an idea of what it can be. Our next meeting is June 25th and 26th and hopefully we'll be finalizing those recommendations and they'll be ready to present to the TIBC body at the July meeting. Any questions?

Jeannine Brooks: There are some really good ideas coming out of this, we just don't want to have a spoiler and all of that. But I think you guys will be happy with some of the recommendations. The group has come up with some really good ideas, I think. Raina Thiele has done a good job. But we'll get materials before we get to the Minneapolis meeting in July.

First Net

Theron Rutyna: I'm the IT Director for the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the frozen iceberg field middle of nowhere Wisconsin. It's nice to be down here in DC today where the flaming yellow ball in the sky is heating up the ground. I'm here today with Adam Geisler from First Net, the First Responders Network Authority and I'll be presenting, after him, on what the Red Cliff Tribe has done with First Net and First Net's vendor AT&T and Adam will be covering the First Responders Network Authority itself.

Adam Geisler: I'm a citizen of the La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians where I served nearly a decade as a tribal leader for my tribe before jumping ship and coming to work for the federal government for a little while. I have to say I'm pretty proud to be working where I'm at today. I'm working on the largest public safety broadband initiative that we've ever seen come across the United States and Indian Country is going to be participating in this \$46.5 billion rollout and partnership that we have with AT&T. Okay. So I'm not going to kill you guys by PowerPoint but I did want to give a quick overview of the history of the organization and why we actually are here. So 9/11 happened and obviously there was a 9/11 commission report. A lot of folks died because of the lack of interoperable communications amongst public safety. As a result of that, public safety lobbied Congress for nearly a decade where we received our enabling legislation in 2012. In 2012 we received two things in that legislation. We received money and we received spectrum. Through that allocation we also spent time doing direct engagement through the state's single points of contact to understand what the needs for services were for public safety across the United States. We did not follow the traditional consultation process. A number of you have weighed in and voiced those issues as well as I did when I was a tribal leader before coming to work with the organization. I will address shortly that we do have a tribal consultation policy today but I do want to highlight that the planning leading up to the deployment of the network up to this point through legislation was housed with the states and their single points of contact. And so all of you have had different experiences depending on what state you're in and how the state engaged through this planning process. So we went through a planning process with each of the states from 2012 to 2015 to understand what the needs were, understand where the calls for service were at and then we went out to bid. So I hear a lot of comments sometimes as I go into the field.

I travel nearly 38 of the 52 weeks a year engaging Indian Country and one common thread is how did AT&T end up with the contract? There's a lot of misnomers out there. So I want to point out that the federal government did procure AT&T as a vendor. They are a vendor to the United States government. It's a public/private partnership for the next 25 years. But we did procure their services through a request for proposal process where they were the selected and winning bidder as a result of that process. So we hired AT&T to come onboard and we issued our first task order and our first task order was to come up with a five year build plan to deploy First Net across all 56 states and territories to include Indian Country. So to date, while we have a 25 year relationship, I think if I were to ask any of you in the room where are you going to be in 25 years, you have a general concept but if I asked you to put the nuts and bolts to it I think you'd be hard pressed. We recognized that so what we did ask for was a five year build plan and we have that today through a state plan portal and Theron's going to hit on that a little bit later. So that's where we're at. We selected AT&T as our partner. We have a five year build plan that we're deploying across all 56 states and territories to include Indian Country and we are now working through a variety of different processes with our partner including new greenfield sites which you'll hear about in a second as well as co-location and different types of partnerships as a result. So a couple things that I want to highlight that...what each of the parties bring to the table. The \$46.5 billion that I mentioned, \$6.5 billion of that is coming from the federal government and it doesn't come

through an annual appropriation. It comes through a single time funding mechanism as a result of a spectrum auction. So we actually received our enabling dollars from a spectrum auction. The auction actually was supposed to happen...we were supposed to get our money over the course of three auctions. We got it in one. The auction went for \$46 and change billion. So we received our \$6.5 billion through that process. AT&T is bringing not only \$180 billion of existing infrastructure but they're investing another \$40 billion into their existing network.

So what is First Net's role? As I mentioned, we brought our 20 megahertz of spectrum to the table but we also bring a level of project management capabilities. Our organization is not made up of a bunch of traditional suits from DC and I'm going to say that publicly. Our organization is made up of practitioners that have fought fires, saved lives, locked up criminals, have managed emergencies first and foremost and just like myself in this instance come from Indian Country.

I live on my reservation and telework every single day. I also think they have us traveling so much there's no point in putting us in an office in DC. So in addition to that we do have an oversight function with the contract as well and that's another thing that we're bringing to the table as well as our knowledge and expertise in the space. AT&T's a subcontractor to the federal government and there are requirements and deliverables like any other contract that you would execute and engage within your tribal governments.

If it doesn't work for you, do not buy it. The last thing that we would ever want is for you to transition to a service that is there to save lives and property and it doesn't work for you. If it doesn't work, I want to know why and I want to have those conversations but I want to say this again—if it doesn't work for you, don't buy it. Have a conversation with us about why it doesn't work and what you need in order to make that transition. You'll see two different logos sitting out there. First Net is the First Responder Network Authority. That's formally how we're called out in the legislation. You'll see our logo here on the left hand side, you'll see it on my lapel. The First Net built with AT&T is this top bubble here on the right hand side. So there is a separation between us. There's us, the feds, who have an oversight responsibility and a management responsibility to making sure the public safety's needs are met including in Indian Country. And then there's the AT&T portion.

There's two types of users on the network. There's primary users. So you have badge sworn public safety practitioners—fire, law enforcement, EMS, emergency managers, people that do this day in day out, save lives and property. There are also extended primary users on the network—your utilities department, your roads department, folks that have a responsibility of supporting public safety functions and sometimes they do take the lead—EPA, hazmat, you guys can think of the variety of incidents that occur on your communities and in your communities so we have made sure that we have a way for them to also actualize and benefit from the network. So when I say priority and preemption, does that make any sense to you or does that just kind of sound like random words thrown out in space?

Here's the bottom line on why our network exists. How many of you have ever gone to a football game, community gathering, a pow wow and you're looking at your phone and you have full bars but the things is slow and you get buffering and your applications don't work.

So what's happening there is you have a cell tower, we'll call this a cell tower. All of us in this room are pinging off this cell tower. Guess who else is pinging off this cell tower—law enforcement in the back of the room. If he has a call that's coming through or he needs to access data, he's competing with all of us

and the resources that are coming off of this tower. That's the problem. He doesn't have priority, the ability to float over everybody else's traffic or preemption, the ability to boot everybody else off the network for a second so they can go do their job and save lives and property. That is what First Net does in a nutshell.

We are giving public safety priority so that they don't have to deal with network congestion and if there's such a big incident going on that they need to bump people off the network for a second, we call that preemption. First Net is not some ancillary thing inside of AT&T. There's a commercial core which is AT&T. That's like the brains. So when you make a phone call from your tower, it goes through the fiber and it goes to a core, right now every commercial provider out there has a commercial core and their tower, their fiber, their core. Those are the basic pieces. What First Net is doing is we're adding our own core for public safety.

So when you make a phone call over the First Net network, when you send data or when you send a video or you have traffic, it doesn't come through the tower, go through the fiber and come to the AT&T commercial core, we're going to call this the other core. It comes through the tower, through the fiber, but it doesn't go here, it goes to the public safety specific core. Here's why that's important. The size of the public safety core is the same size as the commercial core. In a nutshell, the commercial core is built for almost 200 million people.

The public safety core is also built for 200 million people but there's only about seven million projected public safety practitioners that are going to be using that.

We have a Public Safety Advisory Committee and a tribal working group. Brian Howard...I don't know how many of you guys have worked with Brian Howard in the past through NCAI as a policy analyst. He's actually the chair of our Public Safety Advisory Committee tribal working group. He has done an amazing job. He's taken on the leadership and championed to bring on a full blown tribal consultation policy as well as done a lot to influence the thinking around Indian Country within our organization and he was recently elevated to the executive committee. So he sits in the inner circle of our leadership now. It's good to see somebody as knowledgeable as him sitting there and advocating and sharing what needs to be shared. In addition to NCAI who chairs the working group, we have regional representation from all the large organizations out there—AT&I, UCET, Navajo is an exception. Because of the number of states that their community resides in and is around and the working group decided to open that up to them specifically.

We also have some Alaska tribes, village corporation representations, some California representation. We're still working on some Montana, Midwest representation so we're excited to see that coming online here into the future. So some of the issues that are real as we're deploying a infrastructure project across the United States worth \$46.5 billion so there's a lot of issues related to Indian Country—procurement, contracting, rights of way, identifying dedicated tower locations and making sure we're complying with Section 106, tribal specific policies and procedures. We are not going to come in and eminent domain our way into your reservation. I want to make that really clear. We're here to work within the policies and regulations and laws that you have and operate under within your respective governments. So we look forward to engaging you at a government to government level as the time comes to deploy this network. And then another piece that the working group is working on is cybersecurity. So I have a couple more slides then I'll get out of the way. First Net tribal consultation, if you go to firstnet.gov and go to the consultation tab, you will see everything you need to about how to engage us for tribal consultation if you want to do a request. The other thing I'm going to say is I asked

that you treat that more as a nuclear option because if you need us to come out, we'll come out. If you need us to bring resources, we'll bring resources. If you're having problems, absolutely. Trigger what you need to do and do what you need to do on behalf of your tribal government to get things on a record or do what you need to do. We're here to work with you either way. But, what I will ask is that we get two things from you. One, a resolution. So something on letterhead stating who is allowed to actually request consultation. I was going out to a lot of tribes early and I would talk to the fire chief, the police chief, the council member and then the chairman and all four of them said something different. So we want to make sure that who has the authority to speak on behalf of the tribe's government and request an engagement has that actual authority.

So we're asking for that in a resolution or letter form as well as we have our own paper form called the Delegation of Authority. We'll get back to you in 24 hours or less and talk about how we can schedule whatever you need to be consulted on so we bring the right subject matter experts to the table to knock these things out. So again, two different sides to the organization—the government side here on the right, First Net powered by AT&T on the left. It's a public-private partnership but it is also very much a contractual-subcontractee relationship as well. Margaret Muir. We both live in Southern California. She's right next to Agua Caliente. She was their emergency manager for over a decade. Again, we both live and work in and around Indian Country. There's a lot of different ways to reach out and get hold of us.

Theron Rutyna, the IT Director for the Red Cliff Tribe. I'm here to do is give you a blueprint of how other tribes can do what we've spent the last three years doing with First Net. This is literally a roadmap of what we did to bring First Net and AT&T onto the reservation. Firstly, for myself, I'm a former military police officer in the Michigan National Guard. I have an engineering degree, a little bit of IT and my partner, my wife is a police officer on the tribal sovereign nation. So I have a major stake in what's happening here. Red Cliff is 14,400 acres right up on the tip of Wisconsin where it juts out into Lake Superior. To give you an idea of the coverage, we have less than 20 percent cellular coverage on our reservation. Worse than that, the land mobile radios you see your police officers using, they have the same coverage. My wife can go from the administration to out of contact with dispatch on foot. That gives you an idea of how bad our particular area is. Can't even get there. So when I saw First Net pop up about three years ago as something that was viable becoming a part of the federal government, our tribal council sent me out here to try to... 'Bring this to Red Cliff. Bring this to Indian Country.' We were one of the only tribes in Wisconsin that actually interface directly with First Net and with our state plan. So essentially what did we do?

First thing we did was we identified our public safety needs. Story of our drug investigator as he was chasing somebody through the woods, bouncing off of towers back and forth with his land mobile radio and his cell phone trying to get somebody to help him out. We took those stories and turned them into something real. We quantified all of that into a real world number. What exact parts of the reservation are covered, what parts of the area around us are covered, how we're ringed, how commercial and government services stay around reservations and don't come into them. We took all that and we brought it directly to First Net. What happened at first? Well, First Net was in the bidding process so we could only go through our state. We could only go through our treaty rights with our state. Wormed our way on there and started talking. What did they come up and tell us? 'Well, you have a reservation. What's not covered?' 'Well, all of it.' 'Okay, can we do about that?' 'Bring it forward and set it out there.' We identified what we could do. As a tribal nation what was different between us and the municipalities around us and brought that to the table. And the biggest thing that we brought was constant and relentless communication with the federal, state and local entities. And once they found

that the nation was able to talk to them, willing to talk to them and wanted to talk to them, they were willing to do things for us that they weren't willing or able to do for other people. So how to go about it. Determine your public safety needs. First Net is bringing public safety communications but AT&T's a company, their vendor's a company. They want to make money. They're not going to put this stuff in places where they can't make money.

So what comes along with First Net? Usually commercial wireless. Wireless for your membership, not just your first responders. And that's the biggest thing that Red Cliff looked at—how we could bring public safety communications and communications for the membership and those around it as well as the economic opportunity that comes with that. We identified how much of the reservation had cellular communication. AT&T knows this. They had these maps. You can request them from them. You can request them directly from AT&T through First Net or directly from First Net. Your state already knows this and you can bring this up on an interactive map on the internet and say, 'Do you have communications outside and inside?' Are your cellular communications required for public safety? I keep talking about the land mobile radios that you see on all the police officers lapels. That technology's ancient. We're not going to be there very much longer. We're going to be pushed to talk on our cellular devices and on devices made specifically to run cellular for public safety. That's where we're going. To do that we have to have cellular communications in Indian Country. How much traffic do we add from tourists, travelers, the membership, the economic opportunities, the businesses on the reservation? How much of that can expand if we have more public safety as well as more commercial coverage that comes along with it? On top of that, what carriers are the tribes using now? Do you have a carrier? You might not. There might be nobody who's putting cellular out in your area or like Red Cliff, we have Verizon and some AT&T coverage. We planned that into our actual request. How to go from there. Investigate the First Net state plans. Everyone in this room lives in a state that already has an approved plan to deliver First Net to your state and I would say most of you have probably never seen it. Getting it is easy. Request it from First Net. You'll go through the process, you'll designate authorities as Adam put forth and that sometimes along with an NDA, a nondisclosure agreement, they will tell you exactly where your state's going in what year of that five year build out, when things are going to happen and where that coverage is going to happen.

For example, Wisconsin said they want critical areas covered, then they want all the major state and federal highways covered as fast as possible, then fill in the gaps. The biggest area of white on the map, white is no coverage, was the Chequamegon National Forest which is right next to Red Cliff and the Bad River Band and the LCO Band. At that point, that big white spot was a major deliverable for whatever vendor picked up First Net's contract. So we said, 'Well, put that up there. This is a major public safety issue.' And we kept hammering that. First, get those state numbers and those coverage maps. See what's going to be built out and when. See what the build out plans are for your reservation areas, your membership areas, the area where your particular tribes needs are. The first thing to do is establish a government-to-government relationship with First Net. Adam talked about that. Why? Do you need more coverage than the state plan provides or do you need to get coverage to your area faster than the state plan provides? Are you in Phase 5, are you in five years out, do you have a greater public safety need than that? Bring that to First Net. See what they can do for you. I will note that any action you take with First Net, any action you take with AT&T in getting a direct line talking with AT&T as this vendor, this will bring up...it will bring up the attention of the other cellular communications. And now this might be a little bit against what First Net and their vendor might say is, 'This is great competition.' If Verizon's there and they see AT&T coming, they will expand into your area as well. They will get interested. T-Mobile, Sprint, etc. Use that leverage. Get it out there. Once you have that government-to-government

relationship going, contact the regional AT&T representatives. Work with the regional and national AT&T reps.

They will show up on your doorstep with their national radio network engineers. They will show you what can be done to increase cellular communications on the reservation, what it will and won't cost. Articulate your tribe's needs, goals and your financial capabilities. Red Cliff is one of the poorest tribes in our state. We don't have resources. We articulated that right ahead. First thing we said is, 'We will need help making this happen, to make public safety happen.' And AT&T was willing to engage with us to assist us in that. We have to do things as well assisting with permitting, rents, etc., that's part of what we're working on on the legal side now. Identify areas where equipment can be put up on your reservation in your areas. You know where your cultural sites are, you know where things aren't going to work, you know where things will work. Let them know that. Don't let them tell you where the tower goes. Let them know where the tower can go and where it's best to. In Red Cliff we had a 60 foot tall, 30 year old IHS water tower sitting at the highest point on the reservation slated for destruction about a month and a half ago. It came down and that's where we're going to be putting our First Net tower, right in the middle of that already zoned industrial permitted and tipple approved area. If AT&T had come out and done that themselves, they would have put it in a different place but we said, 'Is this good enough? Is this a good place?' and they came and said, 'Well, that'll work perfectly fine.

Maybe we can go here and here later.' Know your needs, know where the equipment can go and be ready to document them. On top of that, use their resources to find a clear method of success for your reservation and area. Work with the vendor to figure out a plan with the tribe's needs. Be ready to work through your legal, social and environmental issues. And be the first to communicate and the first to follow up. One of the things I kept hearing constantly from around the public safety municipalities in the area as I did these First Net meetings was that, 'AT&T will never talk to you. They'll never show up.' With First Net and with this particular government-to-government relationship they show up. If they don't show up, Adam makes sure they show up for me. I brought AT&T representation to the county meetings. Bayfield County surrounds Red Cliff. We're part of them, they're part of us. What happens to them is necessary. AT&T came in and began engineering what Bayfield County needs as well as what Red Cliff needed but Bayfield County couldn't move their way up through the stack as quickly so we did it for them. And that has really done something to foster communication between the county and the tribe. So that's what I have to present to the TIBC today. Is there any questions for me or anything specific on the use case for Red Cliff? Right now we're in the middle of legal. We're trying to get this lease inked, signed and dried. And at that point, when it's done, there's going to be a 300 foot tower sitting up just off the edge of the hillside development in the middle of our HUD housing.

Thank you.

Video of Tiwahe Program

<https://www.facebook.com/407964536069093/videos/802686829930193/UzpfSTE2MDA5NTM2NjM6MTAyMTA4Mjc1MzkxOTY4MDQ/>

Dave Conner: Some of the Tiwahe pilot tribes have individual unique measures and also some individual unique partnerships that they developed and at Red Lake reducing youth suicide is the top goal of the tribe and has been for a number of years. And we've formed some strong partnerships with groups like the Red Lake Health Services Division and the Red Lake Schools to form a push to end youth suicide task force and the task force involves students including training of students to spot behaviors in other students that might be leaning towards suicide. So the task force has been very mobilized.

They're actually meeting right as I speak now in Red Lake and so it's...these non-BIA connections to other programs is helping us. And so this video I want to show, the Red Lake Schools received a performance grant from the President's Council on Arts. It's called a Turnaround Arts Grant and these grants are provided to the lowest performing schools to integrate art into core curriculums to ultimately increase student performance. So this video, it just was released yesterday by the Red Lake Middle School students with this Turnaround Arts Grant and the connection is the connection we've developed with the school and working in the push to end youth suicide and I think when you see this video you'll understand or get a better understanding of Red Lake and the issues that can lead to that problem. And again, I guess I could say thanks to the Tiwahe initiative it's empowered us in many ways, not just financially but to try and make life better at Red Lake..

Old Business

For old business we have just a few items to follow up from last meeting.

- First was the TIBC officially recommending BIE schools be a part of the preferred program survey with all of the other tribal programs and that's had a lot of discussion this meeting. So that's recommended for the '20-'21 process. And as a reminder, the Education Subcommittee had some recommendations on this.
- There was also a letter we sent to the Secretary as a follow up from the March meeting on calling for better participation from federal members of TIBC including the ASIA and BIA Director and opposing the cuts included in the President's budget. That letter is included in the booklet for the record.
- A motion was made adopting the 2020 Tribal Budget Submission and that is posted online in case you want to see the electronic version of that.
- A recommendation was made that in future years the executive summary of the Tribal Budget Submission be presented as a PowerPoint to the full body so that we can understand the specific bullet points.

New Business

- Recommendation that subcommittees only report on issues needing decisions from the full TIBC as opposed to updates of what happened in the subcommittees.
- Reminder about the Federal Reserve Center for Indian Country Economic Development data workshops on land data on Monday before the July TIBC meeting.
- Update on DOJ funding and VOCA tribal set-aside

Meeting Adjourned

