1	PROPOSED REGULATIONS FOR
2	STATE COURTS AND AGENCIES IN
3	INDIAN CHILD CUSTODY PROCEEDINGS
4	"ICWA PROPOSED RULE" - 25 CFR 23
5	
6	
7	
8	PUBLIC MEETING
9	* * *
10	April 22, 2015
11	911 NE 11th Avenue
12	Auditorium
13	Portland, Oregon
14	
15	
16	
17	SINEAD R. WILDER, RPR, CSR, CCR
18	Court Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	Panel Members:	
3	Larry Roberts Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary	
4	Indian Affairs	
5	Rodina Cave Senior Adviser to Assistant Secretary	
6	Indian Affairs	
7	Vanessa Ray-Hodge Office of the Solicitor	
8	Gina Jackson	
9	Senior Fellow IPA Indian Child Welfare	
10	Debra Burton	
11	Office of Indian Services, BIA	
12	TAIDHA	
13	INDEX	
14	EXAMINATION BY PAGE NO.	
15	Introductions 3	
16	Overview of ICWA Proposed Rule 6	
17	Comments from Members of the Public 18	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		- 1

1	PORTLAND, OREGON; WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2015
2	9:03 a.m.
3	* * *
4	PUBLIC MEETING
5	LARRY ROBERTS: Good morning, everyone.
6	We're going to go ahead and get started here this
7	morning.
8	Before we get my name is Larry Roberts.
9	I'm the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for
10	Indian Affairs at the Department of Interior.
11	I want to thank all of you for attending
12	this public meeting this morning.
13	Before we get started, we it's
14	traditional for Indian Affairs to start our tribal
15	consultations and public meetings with with a
16	blessing and get us started off in a good way.
17	And so Mr. Vigil is going to Governor
18	Vigil is going to give us an opening blessing.
19	(Blessing by Governor Vigil.)
20	LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.
21	So so this morning we have a number of
22	folks here from the Department of Interior that I
23	want to quickly introduce.
24	To my left here is Vanessa Ray-Hodge.
25	She's with our Solicitor's Office.

I have Rodina Cave who is the Senior 1 2 Adviser to the Assistant Secretary. 3 I have Gina Jackson, who's a Senior Fellow with the Department. 4 5 And I have -- Angie Campbell is with us. She may be helping folks get registered this morning. 6 And Debra Burton from the Office of Indian 7 Services. 8 9 And Bodie Shaw is here from the Regional 10 Director's Office. 11 And so this light is really bright. Ι 12 cannot see any of you out there. So I apologize for 13 that. 14 So to get things started, we have a Power 15 Point that we're going to run through. It should 16 hopefully take no more than 20 minutes to go through. 17 Because the main point of this session is 18 to receive public comment from all of you, and to 19 receive public comment on the proposed rule that we 20 have. 21 And so I want to say a couple of things. 22 One is, we have a lot of people here that have 23 traveled from a very far distance. I want to make 24 sure that everybody has a chance to speak. And so I 25 would ask that you limit your initial comments to

| five minutes.

It looks like we have a small enough group here that everyone's going to be able to have the time to say -- provide any comments that they want on the rule.

But I want to limit folks, initially, to five minutes, just so everyone clearly has a chance.

The other thing that I would say is there have been a couple of folks that have approached us here this morning and saying that they have flights to catch, and that they need to -- they need to leave this public meeting somewhat early.

So I would ask that those folks that have flights to catch, if you can come up to the mikes first and get your comments on the record, that would be great.

For those of you that do not have a flight to catch, please let those folks speak first.

The other thing that I want to say is I know that what we're talking about today is a very important issue. And the comments that we're receiving are a very important issue on this.

I want to make sure that everyone feels comfortable in making their comments, because we need to receive all the comments from everyone.

So you may feel strongly one way or another 1 2. about a particular comment, but please, let's treat everyone with respect in this forum, and so that 3 everyone has an opportunity to share their comments 4 5 on the -- on the proposed rule. So with that, we're going to run -- run 6 through this Power Point. 7 It should -- everyone should have copies of 8 9 We're just going to hit the high points here. 10 Because like I said, the point is to receive comments 11 from you all on the proposed rule. 12 So a little bit of background. 13 Indian -- Indian Child Welfare Act was passed in 14 1978. Congress enacted ICWA to protect the best interest of Indian children, and to promote the 15 16 stability and security of Indian families. It established minimum federal standards 17 for the removal of Indian children from their 18 19 families, and for placement of their children in 20 foster or adoptive homes. 21 And Act articulates strong federal policy 22 that, where possible, an Indian child should remain 23 in an Indian community. 24 In 1979 the Department issued guidelines

for the implementation of ICWA, and issued

2.

regulations on notice to be provided under Indian Child Welfare Act.

From '79 to 2014 state courts have worked with -- to implement ICWA. And that implementation has not been completely consistent over time.

In 2014 we had a number of listening sessions on our 1979 guidelines, and we -- we heard at those listening sessions that we should look at revising our guidelines, and that we should look at promulgating regulations.

The other important piece of all of this is that the Attorney General's Advisory Committee on Violence -- on Native Youth Exposed to Violence also recommended that we look at it more closely in terms of regulations and guidelines.

To this year -- earlier this year, in February, we issued updated guidelines. And in March we issued the proposed regulations.

So this next slide -- sorry about this.

This next slide talks about the various parts of this part that we're proposing to adopt to the ICWA regulations; general provision, pretrial requirements, all of these issues we'll be talking about as part of this Power Point presentation.

So we've added definitions to the proposed

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

rule; active efforts, continued custody, voluntary placement, other definitions.

It's important when we receive your comments -- whether they're here orally today, or whether they're in writing, it's important to -- if you have comments in terms of how the proposed rule should be changed, that we get your ideas, your thoughts on how -- specifically, how they should be changed.

We may receive comments, and we typically receive comments on rule-making, where someone will say, We think you should change the definition of X. But they don't tell us how it should be changed.

So it's helpful for us, as we're going through the comments, to hear from all of you in terms of how you feel the definition or various sections of regulation should be changed.

The goal of the proposed rule is consistent ICWA implementation in all states.

And it's also a goal to make very clear that ICWA applies whenever there's an Indian child that's the subject of a child custody proceeding.

We've put in the regulation that there is no so-called existing Indian family exception. And we've listed a number of factors that should not be

1 | considered in determining the applicability of ICWA.

We proposed in the proposed rule that agencies and state courts ask as early as possible whether the child is an Indian child. And if there's reason to believe that the child is an Indian child, that the agencies and courts treat that child as an Indian child, unless and until it is determined that the child not an Indian child.

We also provide examples of -- for an agency -- when an agency has reason to believe that a child is an Indian child.

So I'm going to turn it over to Rodina here to talk a little bit about pretrial requirements.

And I'll turn it over to her.

Thank you.

RODINA CAVE: Good morning. Let me see if I can clip this here and get it to work.

Let me know if you can't hear me.

So for pretrial requirements, the proposed rule requires that agencies and state courts must ask if the child is -- if there's reason to believe that the child is an Indian child.

And the proposed rule also sets out examples of, you know, when an agency or state court would have reason to believe that the child is an

Indian child.

Next.

The proposed rule sets out that if the consenting parent wants anonymity, then the agency or court must keep the relevant documents under seal, but -- but still provide notice. And that there's the requirement to engage in active efforts.

And so when does this requirement start?

When does active efforts start? It starts as soon as case or investigation may result in placement of an Indian child outside of the custody of the parent or the Indian custodian.

Next.

The proposed rule sets out how it -- how a child's tribe is designated. And what's the process for when there's more than one tribe that is potentially the child's tribe.

And you know, it also sets out, you know, after designation of a tribe, you know, how are the -- how is the notice handled.

And -- and also, that the state court must dismiss an action as soon as it determines that it lacks jurisdiction.

Next.

So when is notice required? How is notice

provided?

Next is time limits, and that a proceeding may not begin until ten days after each parent or Indian custodian and Tribe receives notice or -- and 30 days, if the -- the parent and Indian custodian or tribe receive notice, and they -- they've requested additional 20 days.

Next.

And so it also sets out procedures for emergency removal. Must be as short as possible. And it lays out the process for what the agency or state court -- documenting whether removal or placement is proper and continuous to be necessary to prevent imminent physical damage or harm to the child.

And that it must be immediately terminated, placement/removal, when the emergency has ended.

And next, emergency removal continued.

That's -- the agency must treat a child as an Indian child until contrary determination has been made and conduct active efforts.

And next.

That -- emergency removal continued, that the Court must decide if -- at any court hearing or emergency rule placement hearing, the Court must

decide if removal or placement is no longer necessary to prevent imminent physical damage or harm. And that temporary emergency custody should be less than 30 days and less, unless particular requirements are met.

And -- hi, Beth -- so Deb Burton is from Office of Indian Services. She is an Indian child welfare social worker and is here on behalf of the Chief of Human Services, which is part of our Office of Indian Services.

And she'll go through transfers to tribal court.

DEBRA BURTON: Hello. Good morning.

The proposed rule stresses that the -- the right to request a transfer to tribal court is present at any stage of the proceeding. And the proposed rule also states that there are factors that a Court cannot consider when determining if there's good cause not to transfer.

And these factors are whether the case is at an advanced stage, the child's contacts with the tribe, and the tribal court's prospective placement for the child.

The proposed rule stresses that active efforts have to be documented in detail in the court

record. And that the resources of the extended family tribe and other tribal groups have to be utilized to the extent possible.

The Court may order foster care placement only if there is clear and convincing evidence that -- and there must be qualified expert witness testifying to this -- that continued custody with parent Indian custodian could result in serious physical harm -- damage or harm to the child.

And in the termination of parental rights, the evidence is to be beyond a reasonable doubt is the requirement.

Now, the proposed rule talks about qualification for qualified expert witnesses. And these are in descending order of preference.

The first preference is for a member of the child's tribe to be qualified as the expert witness, someone recognized by the tribal community as knowledgeable in the child-rearing of the child.

The second preference is someone recognized by the tribe as an expert witness in those areas.

The third person is a layperson that has experience and knowledge in services to Indians.

And then the fourth is a professional that has the knowledge of a tribe.

GINA JACKSON: Good morning, everyone. My name is Gina Jackson. And I'm a Senior Fellow with the Assistant Secretary's Office of Indian Affairs.

I'm talking briefly on some high points on the Power Point that you have on voluntary proceedings.

In voluntary proceedings the proposed rule states that the agency and the state court must ask if the child's an Indian child, providing the tribe is noticed of the voluntarily proceeding, including the notice of the right to intervene. So State and agency is highlighted.

Next slide.

The agency must follow in dispositions of the placement, even if there is a request for anonymity, providing clear and convincing evidence for diligent search to meet the preferences, and explain if it couldn't be met. Again, notification, documentation of placements.

And when it comes to good cause, the good cause basis must be included in the record. And the party asserting the cause has a burden to prove the cause by clear and convincing evidence.

Next slide.

The good cause to depart from placement

preferences must be based on the parents' request, if 1 2. both attest they reviewed the placement option; the 3 child's request, if they're able to understand the decision; the child's physical -- extraordinary 4 5 physical or emotional needs, as established by a qualified expert witness; and does not include 6 7 bonding/attachment from placement; or the unavailability of placement, and the determination 8 9 that active efforts were made to find placement. 10 Good cause may not be based upon 11 socioeconomic status of any placement relative to 12 another placement. 13 The proposed rule in post-trial rights 14 establishes procedures to vacate an adoption if 15 consent was obtained by fraud or duress, or the 16 proceeding violated ICWA. 17 Establishes who can invalidate an action based on a violation of ICWA. 18 19 And the -- and so who the Indian child, 20 parent or Indian custodian, tribe, regardless of 21 whether that particular party's rights were violated. 2.2 Another highlight is it requires notice of 23 any change in the child's status, such as change in 24 placement. 25 Next slide.

Post-trial rights. Also, the proposed rule 1 2. states that the States must provide the BIA with a 3 copy of the decree or order in any final adoption or information on the child. And establish a single 4 location for all records of voluntary or involuntary 5 foster care, preadoptive placement, adoptive 6 placement that will be available within seven days of 7 8 request by the Indian child's tribe or the Department 9 of Interior. 10 And so that information would be available. 11 Next slide. 12 Today we're -- and during this comment 13 period, we're looking for comments on any provision 14 of the proposed rule. 15 Next slide. 16 We have public meetings and tribal 17 consultations -- well, of course, here. Albuquerque 18 is coming up, Rapid City. We have Prior Lake, 19 Minnesota, a nationwide teleconference, Tulsa. 20 Tribal consultations also are following 21 same suit, specifically for tribal leaders and their 2.2 designees. 23 Next slide. 24 And the important date to remember is that 25 comments on the proposed rule are due by May 19th.

Email is a preferred method to submit comments. 1 And 2 the email is comments@bia.gov. 3 We look forward to hearing from you. 4 LARRY ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you, Gina. 5 So we've had a number of folks join us as we're going through the Power Point. So I'm just 6 7 going to take a moment just to cover some initial ground that we covered in the opening. 8 9 One is my name is Larry Roberts. 10 Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Indian 11 Affairs. I'm from the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin. 12 With me here today is Regional Director 13 Stan Speaks is here in the audience from BIA for 14 this region. 15 As I said, we're going to allow everyone an 16 opportunity to provide comments here today. We'd ask that you limit your initial comments to five minutes, 17 18 so that everyone has a chance to speak. 19 There are a couple of folks in the audience 20 that have said they need to catch flights this 21 morning, and so they're hoping to be able to speak 22 first. 23 So what we're going to do is we're going to 24 have folks come up to these microphones on either end

of the auditorium. I would like you to say your name

2.

and the organization that you're with.

And look right over here at this court reporter, because she needs to get all your information down, so that we have an accurate record in terms of your name and spelling. And so we want to make sure that we have a clear record of your comments today.

So -- and finally, again, this is an important issue. I know it's important, because all of you have come to this public meeting. And I just want to stress that we respect everyone's opportunity here to provide comments.

So with that, I will open it up to folks to provide comments to the Department.

MS. BURTON: I'm Kate Fort. I work at the Indigenous Law and Policy Center at Michigan State University College of Law. I'm the staff attorney for that organization.

I also teach -- I believe I'm one of the few people who doctrinal class on the Indian Child Welfare Act in law school.

What I would like to say is thank you for promulgating the regulations. We appreciate it.

I am someone who can talk at length at the inconsistencies of cases across the country and state

And that, hopefully, regulations such as 1 these will decrease those inconsistencies as the law 2 3 is applied. 4 I -- we will be submitting detailed written 5 comments on any suggestions, changes and authority for the regulations before May 19th. 6 7 Thank you. 8 LARRY ROBERTS: So I'm just -- I'm just 9 going to ask, if there's somebody here from GSA or in 10 the building, if they can work on increasing volume 11 of the microphones out here, that would be greatly 12 appreciated. 13 We're going to go with Governor Vigil here. 14 GIL VIGIL: Thank you. 15 My name is Gil Vigil. I'm a council 16 member, former governor of Pueblo Tesugue. And I'm President of Indian Child Welfare Association. 17 18 And the reason I'm asking to go first is 19 our conference is concluding this morning, and I'd 20 like to get back to the conclusion of our conference. 21 My comments are basically that the Indian 22 Child Welfare Act was passed to protect our Indian 23 children. And the rules were made to guide those --24 that Act.

And I'm glad that we're finally having

```
1
     these rules being changed, because I think it's going
     to give it clarity. Not just clarity, but
 2
 3
     interpretation of the law and how it should be
 4
     implemented. It's been long overdue.
 5
               Because in my role as an ICWA board
     member -- I've been on the board for -- since 1997.
 6
 7
     And there has been some cases where ICWA was not
     followed.
 8
 9
               If you only follow the law in itself, I
10
     think a lot of these issues would be addressed, and
11
     they would not be -- create places were children are
12
     taken away from their home, in my opinion, illegally.
13
               And so I'm glad that these rules are being
14
     changed.
               And we will be providing a written
     statement, specifically, some of those areas of the
15
16
     rule through NICWA, and by May 19th.
17
               Thank you.
18
               LELAND MORRILL: Hi.
                                     My name is Leland
19
     Morrill, and I'm with the Los Angeles County ICWA
20
     Task Force.
               And I was born Leland Kirk. And I'm Navajo
21
22
     Many Ghost Clan, born from the Santa Domingo Pueblo.
23
     I'm a pre-ICWA adoptee, meaning I was adopted before
24
     the Indian Child Welfare Act was enacted in 1978.
25
               I was taken from my Kirk family when I
```

2.

stepped into a fire with my right foot. And my grandparents took me to the Keams Canyon Indian Hospital in Arizona. They were listed as my parents in the 1968 Navajo traditional way.

And at some point the hospital found out that my biological mother had died. And they were defined in the white way as grandparents.

My biological father was living in the Santa Domingo Pueblo, and there was no birth certificate. So there was no trace of who my father was on record.

This provided a way for them to say there was father abandonment; child neglect through my childhood act of playing and happening to step into a fire; the diagnosis of malnutrition; and then, of course, there was poverty issue, reasons to take me from my Navajo biological family.

The Keams Canyon Indian Hospital decided to remove me and send me to the Gallop Indian Hospital without my Navajo family's consent.

At the time my grandmother only spoke
Navajo Diné Bizaad. They did not know where I had
gone to.

The doctor in Gallop suggested foster care and assigned me to a BIA caseworker, who found the

Morrills, who fostered and then adopted me and my 1 biological cousin, Virginia Bitsue, in July of 1971. 2. The Morrills already had two biological 3 daughters. But my new adoptive mother had six 4 5 miscarriages. And it was her dream to have twelve children. 6 7 So they moved to the Navajo reservation. And my adoptive father worked for the Church of Jesus 8 9 Christ of Latter-day Saints' education system --10 church education system. 11 At the time my adoptive mother also worked 12 for him recruiting and finding Native preschool 13 children to come to the Mormon Church, the LDS Church 14 for preschool. 15 My adoptive father wrote educational 16 curriculum, and also wrote for the church's 17 seminaries and institute program throughout his life. 18 After my adoptive -- after my adoption in 19 the Navajo Tribe Children's Court in Chinle, Arizona, 20 we were moved -- we were removed and moved to 21 Burford, Ontario, Canada. 22 Within a year my adoptive mother also 23 wanted to fulfill her twelve-children idea. And they 24 took -- they looked for children to adopt, and found

Ojibwe children who were one family of brothers and

| sisters.

2.

They were adopted, and a few years later removed from Canada, where we moved to Rapid City, South Dakota. My mother eventually worked for LDS Social Services, both also helped with the LDS Church's Indian placement programs, specifically with Navajo children in the four corners area, Ojibwe, Mohawk children, and the Lakota Sioux nation in the Dakotas, Utah, Wyoming and Nebraska.

This was their life calling, to remove and educate Native children. They were doing God's work, but not realizing the detriment that they were doing with what I term state-to-state, country-to-country human trafficking, because we were moved from Ontario, Canada to South Dakota, United States.

I tell you this, because I can. And I was also adopted without a birth certificate.

And as you know, the law has changed. And the REAL ID Act introduced by Jim Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin passed and was enacted and enforced in California in 2010.

In this Act, it also required anyone in the United States to provide reason to live here. And when you renewed your State-issued I.D. or driver's license, your birth certificate is primary document

for this.

I was denied renewal, which meant I could not have employment through the E-Verify system, and also could not use a valid I.D. for employment development.

Where I -- where I'm going from here is that we do not know what the future laws will affect our future generations 10, 20, 30, 40 years from now. We are fighting for the bare minimum for sovereign nations, indigenous or Indian children here.

Children who are the byproduct of generations of trauma, great-grandparents who were removed and herded for -- to -- sent to concentration camps such as the Basque Redondo. Grandparents and parents who were removed from their families and sent to boarding schools, and a generation that were removed during the Relocation Act of the 1950s. And also those removed through foster care and adoption, all to kill-the-native-and-save-the-child mentality.

We are now at the phase where the natives are healing ourselves and educating our youths, setting up universities and colleges on reservations, such as the Diné College, a community college.

We are urban natives, where a large percentage of natives live off reservation, but are

still tribal citizens. We are fighting for the bare minimum to keep our children and to heal our families.

I currently live in Los Angeles County, where there are no Indian reservations. But we have the second-largest population of urban Indians. We also have a wealth of Native resources. We are organized enough to have our own white pages called The Red Pages, a resource guide for the American Indian Alaska Native Community in Los Angeles County, which lists many cultural and resources for healing and connection to other natives.

Last year our ICWA Task Force Group and
Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family
Services and our American Indian units organized a
Native foster parents recruitment on our own. We are
now in the recruitment process. We are healing our
own. We are at the beginning stages.

We are asking for the bare minimum of guidelines to save our children and reaching out through the newly-formed ICWA guidelines.

We need these to preserve our culture from erosion, from human trafficking, and genocidal tactics.

Thank you for allowing me to speak. Thank

you for the ancestors of this land for being present 1 2 and allowing our generation and for our temporary 3 presence here in Portland. 4 Thank you for all those who authored the 5 ICWA quidelines. LARRY ROBERTS: 6 Thank you. 7 So I know we have a lot of people lined up 8 there. Do all of you have a flight to catch? 9 I just wanted to make sure that 10 we're respecting everybody having to catch flights 11 today. 12 Good morning. My name is VICTORIA SWEET: 13 Victoria Sweet. I am an attorney living in Reno, 14 Nevada right now. And I'm here speaking on behalf of 15 myself. 16 But in my -- in my -- my interest in the regulations has to do, first of all, with 17 18 consistency. In the work that I do there is so much 19 confusion among judges, attorneys, advocates, 20 agencies, because state to state there are no set 21 standards. 22 State to state it is difficult to know what 23 to expect -- even court to court, within some 24 states -- to know what you can expect when you are 25 dealing with an ICWA case. It causes confusion. Ιt

2.

causes fear. It causes people to dread having to deal with ICWA cases.

The consistency, I think, is -- is key.

And it is vital, particularly in my professional life in the work that I have done.

There are a few things I feel are extremely helpful in these new regulations.

Number one is the clarification of what is active efforts. One of the biggest things I am asked professionally is, can you help me understand active efforts. I don't really understand how it differs from reasonable efforts. The clarifications are incredibly helpful.

Number two, the changes in information on good cause to deviate from ICWA placement preferences. Again, this has caused a lot of confusion among professionals. And to be able to understand this, to have some more clarification on just what is appropriate, but what is not appropriate is incredibly important.

Number three, good cause to not transfer to tribal court. Again, I think that there has been confusion about this. The new regulations help with the clarification.

And to get more judges to understand how to

2.

2.2

remain within the original intent of the statute I think is incredibly important.

And then finally, Notice. We know that many, many courts are understanding about registered mail, return receipt requested. But to state specifically, This is a minimum standard. There are other things you can do as well.

But reminding us that you must at least do this, this is an incredible best practice. And I think it's very helpful to many of our judges and attorneys and agency workers to have that.

And finally, speaking specifically as a Native woman, my family is from the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota. I am a first-generation not just attorney, but first-generation college student in my family.

My grandfather went to a boarding school by force. It created huge intergenerational traumatic patterns in our family.

And I do not think you can ever minimize the importance of culture and identity when it comes to overcoming intergenerational traumatic patterns.

I credit a great deal of the ability in my own personal life to be a mother, and now a grandmother, successfully, to have a career, and to

be able to be a functioning member of our society and 1 to overcome some of the things that happened in my 2 3 family by -- because of my connection to my culture. 4 This is why I feel so strongly about this 5 both professionally and personally. And thank you so much for the effort being 6 put into making these regulations. 7 I think we have both 8 LARRY ROBERTS: 9 microphones working now, by the way, in case there's 10 folks on this side of the room that also want to 11 provide comment over to me. 12 Thank you. My name is Nadja NADJA JONES: I am the Tribal Affairs Director at DHS for 13 14 the State of Oregon. 15 My comments have been vetted and approved 16 through the governor's office, Governor Kate Brown. 17 And it's a pleasure and honor to be in front of you 18 today. 19 I want to commend the commission and the 20 advisory and the tribes for continuing the work of 21 improving ICWA compliance. And the following 22 comments are offered in that spirit of intention to 23 collaborate. 24 Active efforts. The law and guidelines describe the types of activities that a quarter (sic) 25

2.

state child-placing agency can provide to prevent the removal of an Indian child from the home, and efforts required to reunify the family if removal is done.

However, the length of time for active efforts to be provided is not described in the current guidelines or regulations. Tribes in Oregon have experienced inconsistent application of active efforts and would be appreciative of enhanced regulation and guidance in this area.

The State of Oregon would like to request additional language in the regulations that provide clarity regarding the length of time in an Indian Child Welfare dependency case that active efforts is required, and the standards apply.

The use of qualified expert witness in ICWA cases has been described in the 2015 proposed regulations. Oregon DHS Tribal Affairs last year conducted a hand count to our tribes of all ICWA-eligible children in our custody and care as of April 1st, 2014.

Data across Oregon revealed that 358

ICWA-eligible tribal children are in the State's care. The ratio of out-of-state to in-state tribes was two to one.

In-state Oregon tribes are meeting the

23

24

25

Public Meeting , 04/22/2015 needs for expert testimony. Out-of-state tribes do 1 not have adequate qualified expert witness capacity. 2. 3 The categories in the BIA guidance 4 regarding who can be a qualified expert do not 5 include a preference order or guidance regarding how to provide qualified expert witness for ICWA-eligible 6 children who are from out-of-state tribes. 7 8 The State of Oregon would like to request 9 additional information regarding how the categories 10 are to be utilized in cases involving out-of-state 11 ICWA-eligible children. 12 I now, for the record, am taking off my 13 badge. 14 My name is Nadja Jones, and I am Comanche, Onondaga, Oneida and Otoe. I was raised and I was 15 16 privileged to be enriched in the culture and the 17 longhouse of Iroquois Confederacy. I have been raised to believe that tribal 18 19 sovereighty has been honored between the tribes and 20 the Federal Government to the greatest extent that 21 humans can endure.

I know that in trying to promote ICWA, there is opportunity for advancing collaboration between state courts and private adoption agencies.

Section 23.134, The rights of adult

adoptees, the "should" needs to be "must." Musts. 1 Required. 2. 3 In 19 -- in 1878 -- I did the math. 4 stand here as a seventh generation. The first 5 generation would have been born in 1878. I carry the DNA and the lineage of Ten Bears, who traveled to 6 Washington, D.C. and did consultation very similar to 7 this. 8 9 I carry the DNA of Chief Ray Elm, who 10 traveled to D.C. and carried a message similar to 11 this. 12 We need to maintain the connection to the 13 adult adoptees. We need to maintain the right of 14 adult adoptees to access their birth records. 15 My brother, Darryl Alonzo, was born in 16 1958. In 2011 he found us. He was placed by a 17 private adoption agency. And the only way that he 18 found his way back to the tribe was his ability to 19 secure the original birth certificate. 20 His father -- his adoptive father 21 approached the Comanche Tribe in 1978, and the 22 Tribe's interpretation of the law being passed --23 ICWA being passed allowed him to become enrolled. 24 He was an enrolled Comanche, as I am, for

the entire length, from 1778 until now. It was only

24

25

his ability to access his original birth certificate 1 that allowed him to be re-membered back to our tribe. 2 3 He is now a part of our community. He is a part of our family. And our society as a whole is 4 5 made better. I have great faith that we can collaborate 6 7 in a way that allows our adult adoptees to access their birth records. 8 9 Thank you. 10 CINDY BAILEY: Hello. My name is Cindy 11 Bailey. My husband and I, John, had six beautiful 12 children, three of which are full-blooded Navajo. Mv13 husband and I opened our home to foster care for 14 children who needed a safe place to sleep and grow 15 and just be kids. 16 When our three children were placed with 17 us, it was only after there had been many 18 unsuccessful attempts to have them stay in 19 ICWA-compliant placements. They had been removed 20 from their parents' home by Tribal CPS and Arizona 21 Department of Economic Security, Arizona CPS, off and 22 on for four years.

By the time they came to be placed with us, we were their seventh foster home. All of those prior were Native American foster homes.

My concern is if we go through all that, and we still don't have a placement for them, but non-Native homes cannot be allowed to adopt Native children, where are these kids going to go? What's going to happen to them?

At the time my children didn't know if they were coming or going. They needed stability, normalcy, attention, boundaries, love and acceptance. Most importantly, they needed to know that they had a future.

We agreed the take the children in knowing that it was a temporary placement, because both the tribe and ACDS were looking for an ICWA-compliant placement for our children.

We did what was in the best interest of our children. We gave them a place to stay while we were trying to find them a permanent place to stay.

Days turned into weeks. Weeks turned into months. Months turned into years, and still no suitable placement was found by the Tribe or DES.

For various reasons, Native families could not or would not take all -- all three children together. To split the children from each other would have been a tragic story that surely would have ended with the loss of the only bond that our

2.

1 | children had left. And that was with each other.

They flourished in our home. And we attended family meetings, visitation, court dates.

And they all came to the same conclusion. They were in a non-Native home.

However, no Native home would take all three children. And it should always be in the best interest to keep the children together.

Before we knew it, they had been in our home longer than they had been in their mother's home. When it came time for their parents' rights, their biological parents requested that they be placed with us for adoption.

We agreed. Everyone agreed. Their aunts, their uncles, their grandparents, all agreed that even though we were a non-Native placement, it was in the best interest of the children to keep them together.

They wanted the children to remain with us so that they could stay together and have each other. All the while the Tribe and DES were still looking for a Native home that could take all three children together, and none could be found.

If the proposed guidelines are made into law, you are taking the rights of Native American

2.

parents, family members and older siblings to choose what is in the best interest of their children.

Without the flexibility of the guidelines and the State's due diligence and compliance with the law, our children would have faced certain separation from their parents, family members and each other at a time that they needed each other the most.

While I agree completely with the ICWA law as it stands now, we cannot allow Indian children to be denied their right, as Americans, a safe place to sleep and grow up in a home that only wants to love and care for them, no matter what. It shouldn't matter if it's a non-Native placement.

By making the ICWA guidelines an unyielding tool, you are also taking the personal out of the family unit. You are then creating a situation where Indian children in, or that need to be in foster care, who are the victims in all scenarios, property owned by a person or a group of people to be placed without regard for how they are loved or understood.

If you take away the State's obligation to be involved and view a child's case from start to finish for all that it is, and not just a bloodline of a child or a group of children, you are taking away a team of advocates that have been in the

1 child's life and on the child's side from day one, by demanding that they turn their back on the child, and 2 3 have the child stripped of all that is familiar to 4 them, normal and loving and comfortable, and what 5 that child has come to be known as theirs, to suit a group of cold and unfeeling set of words that makes 6 7 up a law. We as adults and leaders of our country 8 9 cannot allow this happen. I believe if you leave the 10 guidelines as they are, a flexible tool used to 11 protect all Indian children. 12 Thank you. 13 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. 14 CINDY BAILEY: I'd also like to submit our 15 trial documents and our Arizona State of Appeals 16 documentation with my statement. 17 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. And if anyone else -- I know that some 18 19 folks are reading their comments as well. We're 20 happy to take copies of that and make sure that 21 they're part of this record. 22 JAY MCCARTHY: Good morning, everyone. Мy 23 name's Jay McCarthy. And I traveled here from 24 Flagstaff, Arizona. 25 I wanted to comment about Cynthia Bailey --

Cindy. She flew here from North Carolina. And I had the honor of representing her and her family in the case she described.

I had the honor to have a ten-day trial.

And when I walked into the courtroom, it was full of
Diné people. And they were all there for them.

She's too modest. The tribe said, even though these children went into custody -- oh. Ten times -- it started in 2003. The trial was 2010.

Half of these children's lives were with that family. They had blessings for them. They took them to the reservation. And to this day, the Navajo relatives still see these children.

I want to ask you, Why do we not have open adoptions like in our state of Arizona, and give tribes the right to have open adoptions, where tribal rights are preserved? I begged for this in 2003, which I think was the last time Congress tried to amend the Indian Child Welfare Act.

Now, I'm here today to say some things that many of you will be upset with me. And I beg you to listen. Because I come here, because I have for over 35 years had the privilege of representing foster children. And it is a privilege that I do not take lightly.

I have been called many things. But I will tell you, they do not hurt when I see what happens to those children.

I also have the great honor of being an attorney that represents adult adoptees, as the gentleman from Los Angeles. I have had the privilege of 30 people from all over the United States have contacted me. And I've been able to open their files -- and many were pre-ICWA files -- to get them enrolled and connected to their tribe.

The Diné people have a saying. I need to say it, because I'm too emotional. They say, Be careful when speaking. You create the world around you with your words. And I need to think that, because I'm on the verge of much anger today.

First of all, I hand-delivered a 45-page document, which I would ask that the Solicitor's Office read carefully, very carefully.

My first question is to you. Has Congress amended the Indian Child Welfare Act? I don't believe they have. No, they have not.

Has Congress recently given any direction to you to make these guidelines now federal regulations? Has there been any Congressional action recently to you to instruct you to do this?

1 LARRY ROBERTS: Not that I'm aware of. 2. JAY MCCARTHY: So I think what all of you 3 need to know what we're talking about, they're 4 federal regulations, not guidelines. 5 A federal regulation supersedes state law. With one fell swoop, 36-plus years of state appellate 6 7 court cases regarding children's rights and families will be gone. 8 9 Now, I want to tell you the first question 10 that has to be asked is, Where is the authority? 11 Before I go into that, let me make this 12 clear. I worked for passage of ICWA. Yes, my 13 daughters say, It's really the mileage, not the age 14 that makes you look like you do. But I was there. 15 And what I want you to remember is that the guidelines -- and the guidelines are interpreted. 16 17 Regulations are law. This is a huge distinction. 18 When the guidelines were published in 1979, we all know that the individuals that wrote those 19 20 were the same individuals that helped in the passage 21 of the Indian Child Welfare Act. They were in 22 Congress making sure that one of the greatest pieces 23 of legislation for children was passed. And they 24 wrote the guidelines. 25 Now, why do I want you to know that? I ask

all of you to read the guidelines from 1979. And I will give you four excerpts as to why you should read those, and why this is a cruel joke that we are going through today.

What they say on the very first page -- so if you go to the guidelines, you look at page 67584, they say, Nothing in the legislative history indicates that Congress intended the Department to exercise supervisory control over state or tribal courts; or to legislate for them with respect to Indian child custody matters.

For Congress to assign to an administrative agency such supervisory control over courts would be extraordinary.

1979, they also say, Nothing in the language of the legislative history of 25 U.S.C.

1952 -- which is the authority being cited now to make binding regulations -- now, they say in '79:

Nothing compels the conclusion that Congress intended to vest this Department with extraordinary power.

That's not all. They say, Assignment of supervisory authority over the courts to an administrative agency -- which by the way, is an administrative agency that has nothing to do with child welfare and nothing to do with the

administration of courts -- is a measure at odds with the concepts of both federalism and the separation of powers. That it should not be imputed to Congress in the absence of an expressed declaration of intent.

Now, I want to also address the definition of, Good cause. Good cause is a phrase that many of us lawyers know is found in two very, very important parts of the Indian Child Welfare Act: The transfer from state court to tribal court, and the placement preferences, which apply to foster care and adoption.

And don't -- I would ask all of you to look this up. Because -- excuse me. I don't have a table.

This is from the BIA guidelines. And this is incredibly important for all of you to understand. The primary responsibility for interpretating other language -- talking about the Indian Child Welfare Act -- however, rests with the courts that decided Indian child custody cases.

For example, the legislative history of the Act -- again, we're talking about the Indian Child Welfare Act -- the federal statute states explicitly, The use of the term, Good cause, was designed to provide state courts with flexibility in determining

21

22

23

24

25

the disposition of a placement proceeding involving 1 an Indian child. 2 3 The idea is that these children deserve the They deserve every court to hear every little 4 best. 5 bit of evidence about them. And what you're trying to do cannot happen. 6 7 You are saying that -- the lady that just spoke who had those children half their lives, they wouldn't 8 9 even have got a hearing. Do you understand that? 10 They were there for four years when they were eight years old, and they wanted to take the 11 12 eight-year-old and the seven-year-old away from their 13 fifteen-year-old sister, the Navajo Nation. 14 their position. Not the Navajo people, the Nation. 15 Do you understand that these are going to be federal law? And they will say, You cannot 16 17 consider the length of time that those children were 18 with that family? 19

Do you understand that the judge would not have been able to have a hearing? Do you understand that attachment -- they're saying is voodoo science.

It is not voodoo science. We all know how important attachment is. That's what those guidelines say.

Don't be -- just stand up and say you have

1 | to fight for these children.

Foster children are the most vulnerable children in our society. And we have an obligation to give them the best, not the worst.

Now, Good cause in the legislative history says it cannot be restricted. And what they're doing is restricting it. They're saying that a foster child that has any Native -- if they're a, quote, Indian child -- I don't like that. I hope that is not offensive.

A Native American child cannot be treated the same.

Now, I appear in the Yavapai Apache, White Mountain Apache, Hopi and Navajo Courts. I have for a long time been very blessed by medicine men who, when I was ill, they came to see me.

We all know tragedy. My family were the orphan trains, the Irish, the poor Irish. We were not good. We were cast aside. We came west. But because of my color -- I was primarily white -- I made it.

No one here today is saying that this

Indian Child Welfare Act is not important. No one
here today is saying it should be rescinded. But it
is not meant to make children second-class citizens.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And let me talk about my birth mothers. Ι represent birth mothers who -- the first case in Arizona I tried was a rape victim. She was a member of the Tohono O'odhams Tribe. And they said, We don't care if you want to pick a family that you knew that were Hispanic. We are against this. Now, there's something called the U.S. Constitution. And a birth parent has those rights, rights of privacy. Tribal rights are nothing but statutory. Also, children, they have constitutional rights. And those rights give them an opportunity to have full due process. We are asking you to please take out some of these egregious things. These are not things that would help children. We are not talking about cases in the tribal court. We all agree those are cases that should be there. We are just asking you to please think about the children and not solely tribal rights. And I thank you. Thank you. LARRY ROBERTS: SEAN MIDDLETON: Geez. All right. LARRY ROBERTS: So -- so we're going to --

```
again, no commentary on other people's comments.
 1
     Because nobody would like commentary on their own
 2
 3
                Okay?
     comments.
 4
               So thank you.
 5
               SEAN MIDDLETON: My apologies.
               My name is Sean Middleton. I'm a Shanabi
 6
             I am in the Chief Seattle Club. I am their
 7
     IPAC representative. I have been asked by my
 8
 9
     community, the Seattle community, to come and speak
10
     with you, please.
11
               When I became the IPAC representative, I
12
     asked the community what they wanted and needed from
13
          This was the number one priority was Indian
14
     Child Welfare.
15
               We love and support what the new
16
     quidelines, regulations that you're putting in there.
17
               I'll read this also as well: We strongly
18
     support these regulations in general. We do have a
19
     few recommendations that we advance for
20
     consideration.
21
               We believe that it is important that the
2.2
     rationale for the authority to regulate be carefully
23
     explained, and that the individual provisions should
24
     be justified with references to supportive cases,
25
     State regulations, and policies that reflect best
```

2.

practice and legislative history.

We also believe that the regulation should explicitly address the adoptive couple -- the Baby Girl case -- one, clarifying that it should not be applied outside of the private adoption context; and two, providing guidance how the Supreme Court interpretation of the law should be effectuated in state court and agency practice.

We urge you to carefully consider technical recommendations that would be provided by national organizations and attorneys who have the expertise in the ICWA from the tribal perspective.

Once again, we very much appreciate everything everyone here does. Everyone here has a hard job. And everyone is right. It's hard.

So thank you all for coming here and speaking for our children.

But I was also asked to speak to the fact that while the community likes everything that's happening here, they asked that you actually make sure that these things are enforced. They asked that you make sure to do audits.

I'm in region two of Washington state. My community's too scared to come here today to talk.

My community feels like the ICWA quidelines have been

2.

tossed to the side, and they're living in a state of fear of the Office of Indian Child Welfare.

And these are adoptive Native parents.

These are non-Native parents who are taking in Native foster kids.

So we ask that you come and pass these, but make sure that you have checks and balances to follow up. Because the current laws aren't being followed up. The current policies and recommendations aren't being followed up in the eyes of the Seattle community.

I work at the Chief Seattle Club. We have over a thousand members from 200 different tribes. I have four people who have lost their kids and had them adopted out because they're First Nations.

So they also asked, Please put in some more protection for our First Nations people. In the urban community, we're losing our children, and it's very scary.

But I want to thank you for all that you do. This is not an easy job. And everyone believes in their heart that they're right. But let's all try to put that aside and work forward for our kids.

REGINA WOODS: This is kind of new to me.

I was raised that you swept everything under the

carpet and put it in a closet. So the things I'm 1 going to share today I don't generally share unless 2 3 people -- I know them well, and I'm close to them. My name is Regina Woods. I'm a mother of 4 5 two beautiful boys, 16 and 22. I'm a certified public accountant. I'm a business owner. 6 I'm a 7 first on my paternal side to graduate from college. 8 I was a U.S. Army veteran. I served from 9 1985 to 1993. I was stationed in Frankfurt, Germany 10 during the First Gulf War. I have an honorable 11 discharge. 12 I'm here to represent myself and my 13 relatives and my ancestors of the past, present and 14 future, especially my mama and my auntie, even though 15 she was mean, and my granny, all of who have passed. 16 I am affected by adoption. Ninety-three 17 years ago in Missouri, in 1921, my maternal 18 grandmother was put up for adoption. She was told 19 this was because her mama was white, and her daddy an 20 Indian. 21 She was told her birth mama was either 22 raped, or her daddy was married. And that was also 23 why she was put up for adoption. 24 My granny's adoptive parents changed her

name to Orphie. When she was 16, they put her on a

train to Oregon to marry one of their nephews. And then she could pick a new name and didn't have to be called Orphie anymore.

She had four children. Her husband became an alcoholic after a logging accident. She stayed with him until he was so bad, he shot her.

One bullet put four holes in my granny, two in her arm and two in her leg, because it ricocheted off of her bones.

She left him. And when she did that, she was alone. She had no family, just her and her four children.

Her two daughters, my auntie and my mama, were molested by a church deacon. When they told on the deacon, the church took them -- they were four and five years old. And they took them to the church, and they placed them on the altar to cast the demons out of them.

My mother and my aunt became schizophrenic.

My mother was the worst. She was hospitalized 22

times over a period of about 25 years.

When I was little, I would ride the bus with my grandma to Dammasch State Hospital to visit my mama. We did that a lot. Sometimes my mama would sneak me from my granny, and she'd put me in the car

and make me curl up on the passenger seat on the floorboard while she drove around giving people letters. And she had me hide there so that the demons she saw couldn't hurt me.

My aunt was mean. And she had her reasons. When she moved back home, she made me and my mama live by ourselves without my granny.

She would tell me to stop being weird. I was too sensitive. I cried too easily. I needed to stop talking about my dreams. If I didn't, I would become crazy, like my mama.

My aunt told me not to braid my hair or to wear moccasins, because that was weird. And I didn't have enough blood from my granny to be an Indian. She also said that my daddy had lied about having Native blood.

By the time I was 12, I was taking care of me and my mama in our little trailer. By the time I was 17 I enlisted in the army. A few months after I enlisted, before I shipped out, my mama got sick again.

This time I called mental health. And I asked for a commitment hearing. I went to court, and I had my own mother committed. A social worker walked up to me and said, You're not 18. I'm going

to place you in a foster care home.

Well, I wasn't a dumb girl. I knew when I signed those enlisted papers -- enlistment papers, I was legally an adult.

So I left. I got married. I had my sons.

I tried corporate America, different churches, and spirituality. But nothing got rid of that part inside of me that felt dead.

My granny died. Ten years ago my mama died. And about that same time I was diagnosed with cancer twice. I didn't have cancer, but I had two surgeries. And I was sick for quite a while.

But my dreams came back. They told me what foods to eat, which a lot of them were Native. They told me what vitamins to take. And then about four years ago I started to feel better.

And I took a Qigong class. And the concept in martial arts is the energy. As soon as I started doing that, my dreams came back with such a vengeance that even though I was way too old as far as what western doctors will tell you to be crazy like my mama, I thought I was going crazy.

But it taught me a lot about myself.

Then an old man came in my dreams who felt like my maternal great-grandfather. He gave me a

2.

2.2

name, and he told me to go home.

I remembered years back -- it had been probably over 20 years ago -- that my grandmother had gotten her adoption papers, and she had gotten her birth certificate. She was happy that her adoption papers had said her real name. And her birth name was Jessie.

But her birth certificate was funny-looking. It was handwritten. It didn't list her daddy. And she couldn't find anything else really out. It was before we had Internets.

So I started doing genealogy research. And looked and looked. And I found out a lot about all areas of my family. But I couldn't find anything else about that. So I gave up.

But I went ahead and wrote Missouri. And I asked for more copies of my granny's birth certificate. Because I promised my uncle I would, because we only had one original.

And even though I couldn't find anything more out, I felt my heart. And with or without confirmation, I knew who I was. I was an Indian.

A week after that I got the copies of the birth certificate from the State of Missouri. And they were complete. And they had my

great-grandfather listed on there.

His name -- his name was Jessie. Within minutes from the census reports I found that he had been a widow -- widower, like, two years before. He wasn't married. And a mama does not name her baby girl after a daddy, if it was a rape.

I also found her daddy on the final rolls as an enrolled member of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma.

So for me, my granny's adoption made me feel isolated and stupid. Because I learn different than a lot of other people. And I have dreams.

I feel the people, the tribe would have been the support my family needed. We would have had the ceremonies, songs and language that resonates with our hearts. From the census data, my granny had 11 aunts and uncles. We didn't have to be alone and isolated.

When I went to my first powwow and heard the drums, I knew I was home. As I've become more involved in the Native community, the deadness that I felt has gone away.

It's been 94 years since my granny's adoption, and it took me 46 years. But I'm proof that you can take the Indian out of the tribe and

away from the heartbeat of the drum, but you can't 1 take the heartbeat of the drum out of the Indian. 2 3 I'm a Cherokee. I'm an Indian. And I have come home. Wado. 4 LARRY ROBERTS: 5 Thank you. Good morning. My name is 6 RAJU DAHLSTROM: 7 Raju Ajaya Tharcicus Dahlstrom. And the reason I go with the lengthy name is I probably share a lot of 8 9 very similar stories, like you folks out here. 10 But it's not about me today. 11 invariably come back to me, it's because I have a 12 very big ego. So I'm going to put that aside. 13 I'm here today to speak on behalf of the 14 Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe. I am the director of the 15 Indian Child Welfare Department. 16 What I am here to speak on, very briefly, 17 is the proposed changes to the -- to the ICWA rules. 18 One of the biggest things that have stymied the Tribe 19 that I work for, the Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe, 20 we're located in Darrington, Washington at the 21 foothills of the Cascades. 22 What I find fascinating is that no matter 23 what courtroom I appear throughout the state of 24 Washington, when I am notifying the Court of our

interests in our children, the Courts invariably look

2.

2.2

at me and then point me toward the direction of the door, or to a seat in the back room, or to be silent.

My given Indian name is mischief-maker, so that's when I begin to start making mischief. And I remind the Court that I represent the Sovereign Nation of the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe.

I had one judge who bent over down looking at me and saying, Would you please kindly sit. And I said, Your Honor, the sovereign tribe I represent is requiring me to stand.

And this was a proceeding, oddly enough, at the 11th hour regarding a termination petition to violate the constitutional rights of one of our children, where she was going to be adopted out into a white home.

The legal documents that the State had provided me was voluminous. It was about, maybe, yay high (indicating). And there was numerous redactions in the record.

And those redactions were what would be considered active effort documentation. But oddly enough, it was redacted out of the record.

Additionally, information regarding tribal affiliation, that was also very conveniently redacted from the record.

So how are we to find our children, if the 1 state court can allow this impermissible act to be 2. 3 performed right in front of the courtroom? 4 So I'm in -- speaking to, again, the 5 transparency that needs to occur in all ICWA proceedings. I think there needs to be rules that 6 7 proclamates clearly that there cannot be a redaction of any records that are transferred from the state 8 9 courts to tribal court or any communications 10 involving the ancestry of a child. 11 I think that needs to be in the rules. Ιt 12 needs to be -- it needs to be enforced. 13 I have heard ridiculous comments out of the 14 state courts, sometimes from the Attorney General's 15 Office or from the State social worker saying, Oh. 16 We're sorry. We had to redact that because of the 17 HIPAA law. 18 And I often remind them, I'm hip to the 19 HIPAA law. And it has absolutely no application to 20 ICWA. 21 The second issue that we need to bring up 22 is that we often conflate MEPA and ICWA. 23 Multi-Ethnic Placement Act has no placement in ICWA. 24 And the Heritage Foundation, in a congressional hearing, attempted to conflate the two and to say 25

2.

that MEPA and ICWA are really one and the same.

No, it's not.

ICWA stands for the premise that children of Indian ancestry -- children affiliated with tribes and children eligible for enrollment, fall under the ICWA for placement preferences, and it does not fall under MEPA.

And so I think that needs to be clarified in the rules. Because I think oftentimes State social workers in -- with -- with good intentions, have very bad consequences for our children when it comes to placement priorities.

The next step in -- in the rule-making policy, I think it is absolutely imperative -- absolutely imperative -- and I think there needs to be a bright line listed in here -- all children -- Native children, identified or eligible, when they are in the state court proceedings for placement, it needs to be emphasized that not only is the placement temporary, but that no matter what designation that the State has provided in their licensing, it is not an adoptive home.

And I think that's where we get into trouble so much with our tribal children when they are entering into the foster care system at 2 a.m. in

```
the morning -- you know, I need to be awake at 2 a.m.
 1
     in the morning to make sure that that child, when
 2.
 3
     being removed in an emergency situation, is not
     placed into a home that says, this is an adoptive
 4
 5
     home.
               Because to the child and to the tribe that
 6
 7
     we're interested in, it isn't.
               Also, I would like from the -- from the
 8
 9
     Sauk-Suiattle's own definition in the family code, we
10
     do not recognize termination of parental rights.
11
     I think that needs to be universally clear,
12
     accessible and available to all courts in the United
13
     States jurisdiction, that the Sauk-Suiattle Indian
14
     tribe does not allow for the termination of parental
15
     rights.
16
               Recently, when I was dealing with a state
17
     court in Iowa, they said, Iowa law takes precedence
18
     over your Sauk-Suiattle law.
19
               And I reminded them that the Sauk-Suiattle
20
     tribe is a sovereign nation. We have our own family
21
     code.
22
               And yes, of course, you may tell the judge
23
     that it supersedes his courtroom antics and rules.
24
     Then I was told that I would be -- they would file a
25
     complaint against me for being rude.
```

2.

I don't know how it can be translated as being rude when I'm trying to encourage compliance with ICWA.

The additional item is that we do not adopt out our children.

So there again, I think in -- within the rules, in the federal register, if there are codes that are clear and concise for the Sauk-Suiattle tribe, it needs to be known across the board, whether it's within the state boundaries of the state of Washington or within the contiguous United States.

In addition, while -- before I forget, the Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe will be providing a written -- formal written statement.

It'll probably come out of our office of legal counsel, because I'm a social worker. So I can't speak the legalese.

But I do want to end with one very quick story. I began work for the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe in November of 2010. And at that time the charge that was given to me by the Tribal Council and by the Honorable Norm Joseph was to bring our children home.

And so I looked at my caseload, and I thought, This should be very easy. There's just seven children to account for. But it was a long

journey.

Three years later we were able to account for every child that was enrolled to the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe or eligible for enrollment of the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe. We were able to effectively identify that, no matter what courtroom they were hiding behind, no matter what foster home they were hiding behind, or no matter what arcane rules they were hiding behind to hide our children.

So we want our children back home. The Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe is a very tiny tribe. But I can tell you this at firsthand. We have a big heart. But more important, we want to enforce, and want the enforcement by the Federal Government and the State to all of the ICWA compliance provisions. And more importantly, the changes that are going to be coming about.

And -- and for anyone who is interested in additional stories, you're certainly welcome to come and talk with me.

But before I end, four children -- no, three children I had the pleasure of removing after being in a foster home that was designated as an adoptive home for them; when I came into that home, within the first 30 seconds, I knew that my charge

2.

would be to remove these children out of a home that they had known for four years.

And the reason for that is, the foster mom looked at me, looked at the child and said, You will call me Mommy. You will call me Mommy.

And the little boy said, My mommy is outside of here, is on the reservation. My daddy is waiting for me. And he's outside on the reservation.

And she decided -- the foster mom decided to prove to me that she was a good parent, grabbed the little boy's hand, and dragged him away, and put him in a corner and said, You're on a time-out for being rude.

And I stood up off the couch, and I said, Please be ready to assist in packing the bags of these children. They're going back to their home. They're going back to their reservation. They're going back to their family.

Thank you for listening to me. And have a good afternoon.

LARRY ROBERTS: Okay. I'm just going to -I know that there's folks waiting in line that are
probably getting a little bit tired of standing up.

I just want to say, if we can please try to keep our comments to five minutes, so that everybody

25

has a chance to speak. 1 You'll have another opportunity to speak. 2 3 But please, let's been respectful of everybody that is waiting in line. 4 5 Thank you. My name is Jessica Hannah. 6 JESSICA HANNAH: I am an Athabascan from Seldovia, Alaska. 7 I was raised with foster children. And my 8 9 heart broke for them. Because I've seen child after 10 child has bounced from home to home. And they've 11 never had identity or roots. And that's saddened me. 12 And it angered me greatly. 13 So I vowed when I turned 21, by golly, I 14 was going to be a foster parent. And I'm now in my 15 ninth year. 16 I made some notes. And I'll be submitting 17 my -- I'll be submitting another document. Because 18 as everyone spoke, I am thinking through things, and 19 with nine years of being in the foster care system as 20 a foster parent. 21 I started out -- the reason I really got 22 into it when I was 21, the girl that I was raised 23 with had a baby, and she was using drugs. And so I

My husband and I decided that we needed a

took my -- my first son, Nicholas, and adopted him.

```
break for a while. We needed some rest.
 1
                                                And we
 2
     decided we had one -- we were going to do one more
     case. And I am a Native home, but I've never been
 3
 4
     placed with a Native child.
               And we took on our child. And her nickname
 5
     we gave her was Sunshine. We didn't know her name
 6
 7
     for months. And I just -- she goes by, Sunshine.
               One of the things I'm concerned about with
 8
 9
     this is -- you know, I understand that -- and it
10
     saddens me that this country is built on a lot of sad
11
     stories.
12
               But there are so many positive stories.
13
     And I am here to advocate for some amazing foster
14
     parents that are investing in the culture of our
15
     children.
16
               I've kind of spear-headed it. I -- I
     love -- I absolutely love my culture and where
17
18
     I've -- where I'm from.
19
               Many times my grandfather and I have gone
20
     to Alaska. And as so many, you know, my
21
     great-grandmother was taken, married off to a Russian
22
     in Alaska. And her name was changed. So that has
23
     been something that people deny being -- they've
24
     denied in the past being Native, because it wasn't a
```

good thing. But it is a good thing.

So this -- this last Friday my daughter has 1 2 been ordered by the Yakima Nation Tribe to be removed 3 from my care -- I've had her for three years --4 because they want her on the reservation. I live 5 outside the reservation. And I am a Native home. And was very angered, and I'm fighting for 6 her. 7 I have grown to love her birth mother. I 8 9 was with her through the death of a family member 10 recently -- her only family member. She says that I 11 am like her sister. And we have done many rounds of 12 treatment. Unfortunately, she's been unable to 13 complete them. 14 But she's burdened -- which a lot of our people -- with alcoholism. But she -- that doesn't 15 16 mean she doesn't love her child and her children. 17 She has asked if I would care for her 18 long-term, until she's able to complete her 19 treatment. But her rights are being overlooked 20 because of her lack of not being able to complete 21 treatment. 22 So they are moving. They have worked for 23 all their Native children to be -- the Yakima Nation, 24 to be returned to the reservation. So we have lots of children that have been in foster homes for years 25

2.

and years that are being broken. And we are dealing with children.

And one of the guidelines here that we're trying to put into effect is not looking at the psychological or bonding attachment issues.

I think we can take great heed from adoptions that have happened in different countries, that when the children do have attachment and bonding issues, we see that these children are unable to be successful in some marriages, because -- some of them, now, they can get -- through counseling and stuff they can overcome it. But with bonding and attachment we have RAD -- Random Attention Disorder.

And these children are -- that have been adopted, that grew up in orphanages and have had -- they haven't had stability in their life. They're suffering greatly in their lives as adults to be parents and be a wife or a father, to keep a job, because they've had such attachment issues.

So I do not think that -- this should be one of the primary -- primary things that we look at for these children for the success of their future.

After my meeting on Friday, I -- on
Saturday, when I woke up, I -- my heart was still
very troubled. I asked my children to leave me to my

2.

garden, so I can -- that's kind of my meditation area.

And I was seeking answers. And I believe that there are answers in the creation.

And I was surprised to find, in one of my milk jugs, that I had some seeds from the dollar store that were expired. And I didn't think they were going to make it. And I threw them all in this jug.

And to my surprise, they have all sprouted. But each of the roots is intertwined. And I looked at them, and I'm, like, I'm going to save these flowers. And if I decide to plant them together in the soil, they are going to choke each other out. They are going to fight for what water is there.

And if you unravel their roots, and I look at them as an individual flower, they will -- and plant them in the soil they need, they'll reach their full potential, their full beauty. And they can make it.

So I ask that we look at -- I'm asking on behalf of foster children, that we don't look at them as a whole group, even though that is -- I can see where everyone's coming from for their tribe's sake -- but for the individual child, for their sake.

```
And maybe we can reach out across this
 1
     barrier that we have between foster families and our
 2
 3
     Native communities, and we could not see it as losing
     a child, but gaining another family and taking them
 4
 5
     along -- take their hand and bring them -- help them
     raise our children.
 6
               And that is what I am -- I'm really pushing
 7
           I believe that -- that these children will come
     for.
 8
 9
     back. They will.
10
               One of the ladies here said that you can't
11
     take the heart out of the Native children. And you
12
     cannot. And they will come back. And I believe that
13
     they will be our future leaders, and they will take
14
     us into the next generation.
15
               Thank you.
16
               LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.
17
               RENEE: My name is Renee (unintelligible).
18
     My Cheyenne name is Living Woman.
19
               I'm here to tell you about my sister. And
20
     I kindly request that you raise four fingers when I
21
     get to four minutes, because I'm also a storyteller.
22
     You all know what that means.
23
               My little sister is 16 years younger than
24
     me.
         Her name is Jeananne.
25
               My father called her, Trouble, because she
```

```
1
     was so beautiful. He said, When she's a teenager,
 2.
     I'm going to have a lot of trouble keeping the boys
 3
     away.
 4
               My father was murdered in south side LA.
 5
     He was jumped by two white men and beaten to death.
     I was 17. My sister was one. She was taken from her
 6
 7
     mother, because the police found her on a street
 8
     banging my sister's head against a curb. Her mother
 9
     is non-Native.
10
               She was put into the California foster care
11
              She went from home to home to home.
     system.
                                                    She was
12
     physically abused in these foster homes.
                                               She was
13
     sexually abused in these foster homes.
14
               And I'm not saying every foster home is
15
     bad.
           Because we know that's not true. My daughter
16
     and her fiancee are foster parents. They're
17
     wonderful people.
18
               Could you please raise your hands?
     you -- or shake your head, either way.
19
20
               We can take care of our own children.
                                                       Wе
21
     appreciate the kindness of others. But people have
22
     been taking our children since they got here from
23
     Europe. People have been taking our children without
24
     their knowledge, without our consent.
```

There's a wonderful movie that I'm an extra

in called The Lost Child, with Mercedes Ruehl and Jamey Sheridan. It's based on a true story from the Diné people.

A mom went to have her children. She was having twins. And she was told that her children died. And there were no bodies to bury. They'd already taken care of that for them.

Those children were illegally adopted -adopted out. The book's called, The Lost Bird. And
it categorizes it -- it shows you that story about
how that woman came back to her Diné people, and how
she's still looking for her brother. And how her
mother died before she found her family.

She never stopped believing that her children were alive.

My little sister, in order to get out of the foster care system, pretended to be schizophrenic, so that she could be taken out of the abusive foster home she was in and put in a hospital.

And this is the strength of our people, of our children.

She then had to pretend or prove that she was sane, so they would let her out. Because in California they pay per bed. Every bed filled is money. And that's what my sister was to the State of

California.

Why is this story important? Because I never met my little sister until I was -- until she was thirty-three. Thirty-three years old. And the first time we met, it was as if there had been no time.

We met in the Los Angeles airport. I was flying through, and she was in LA. And I had called her. And I said, I'm coming to your city. Please come met me.

And I asked a little Chinese man to videotape her and take pictures. And I know that's stereotypical, but he was quite nice.

And it was if it was an Oprah moment. And it was. And there were tears. And she wanted to know where her family was. Why was I left there so long? Why didn't anyone ever come save me?

That's what these regulations are about.

It's a great start. It's what we need. It's what our children need. It's what our families need. Our communities. And our hearts.

And for anyone who doesn't understand that,

I beg you to listen to my story, because it's not the
only story. We have hundreds. We have thousands.

We don't need any more stories like that. We need

stories of children with their families, with their 1 extended families. With their grandparents. 2 3 In the old way, first child born to my daughter and my son would have been my child. 4 Ι 5 would have raised it as my own. My son ... Do I have two minutes? Okay. Thank you. 6 7 My son had a daughter, and my son and daughter live with me. So we have that 8 9 three-generation family. He won't give me his 10 daughter, though. They're not traditional. Come on. 11 So those stories, my sister's story, little Jeananne, this beautiful, vibrant, wonderful, 12 13 wonderful girl, who didn't get to meet her family 14 until she was 33. Let's stop that. Let's grow our 15 own children. Let's grow them in a healthy way. Let's help our community members to be healthy and 16 17 show them what was taken from us by the boarding 18 schools. How do we become families? How do we be 19 20 That was stripped from our grandparents, parents? our parents. It was beaten out of them. We can 21 22 learn again. 23 I raised my children in a violence, 24 alcohol, and drug-free home. I have a master's 25 degree. I have spoken all over the world. The thing

I'm most proud of, how I've raised my children, and how they're raising their children.

We can all have that story. We can all have healthy stories for our children. We can give them the love and nourishment that they deserve. We can give them their culture, so they don't grow up going, Who am I? Where are my people? Why don't they come for me?

Thank you.

SHELDON SPOTTED ELK: Good morning.

LARRY ROBERTS: Good morning.

SHELDON SPOTTED ELK: My name is Sheldon Spotted Elk. I'm Northern Cheyenne. And I'm just here to speak for myself and for, I guess, the children, too.

I'm a -- I'm legally trained. I worked as a guardian ad litem attorney doing best interests of the child representation. I'm also -- have a social work degree. I work for a tribe. And so I just want to talk to you about my strong support of the regulations.

First of all, I wanted to say the Indian

Child Welfare Act -- and this is me speaking -- you

know, I -- I feel like it highly -- strongly fulfills

the vision of Federal Indian Law -- the highest

2.

aspirations of Federal Indian Law, in the sense that this Federal Indian Law is defining the relationship between the three sovereigns of the United States.

It's there within the Indian Child Welfare Act, with deference the tribal courts, with deference to tribal sovereignty, to be able to make decisions over children.

I -- I want to make a quick comparison, though. And I feel like these regulations -- in the way that they're drafted, I feel like provides the guidance to States. Because of the patchwork interpretation of -- of ICWA, it provides States some guidance as far as helping effectuate the best for Indian children.

And much the same way that ASFA, the

Adoption and Safe Families and Children Act, has

produced better outcomes. And we know those numbers.

We have less children in out-of-home placements that

we -- that's the same with Indian Child Welfare Act.

And I feel like these regulations will help fulfill

that.

But also, what's associated with that, of course, there's some penalties that are associated with ASFA if States are not in compliance.

And I ask that you look at those, you look

2.

at some of those provisions. And I will also be submitting written comments. Because that's what lawyers are supposed to do; right?

But I'll just focus my last two comments on active efforts. And I want to say something about best interests and wrap up from there.

But active efforts is that I -- in my experience -- in my experience as a guardian ad litem attorney doing best interests of the tribe, I feel like active efforts, it represents the best practices within all child welfare cases. It represents the van -- you know, the highest, the vanguard of child welfare practices. That by doing that, it empowers families. It empowers children.

I know in my personal experience as a guardian ad litem, I'd see -- and as you heard testimony today about -- is that oftentimes there were three or four generations, where children -- good, little children have been raised outside of the home of -- of these families, whether it was boarding schools, next generation, maybe churches, the next generation, State agencies coming and taking the children.

So I've seen the detrimental effect. I've seen a mother or a father, say, Hey, you're a bad

```
1
             You're not making the grade. And seeing the
 2.
     look on their face and seeing their heartbreak.
 3
     Because, Hey, I knew this was going to happen to me.
     Because it happened -- a happened to everybody.
 4
 5
     know, its happened to everybody in our community.
               I believe in Indian families.
                                              I believe in
 6
     Indian -- Indian communities. I believe in Indian
 7
 8
     parents, you know.
 9
               And I see that as, the more we can empower
10
     those families, the better outcomes for our children
11
               The more we can empower communities, the
     will be.
12
     better outcome for our children will be. And I feel
13
     like these regulations will achieve that.
14
               Statistically speaking, in the area that I
15
     work in, and the jurisdiction that I work in, you look
16
     at the census records, you see that just the vast
17
     majority of children within that area are actually
18
     growing up in non -- nonbiological parent homes.
19
               And these are children that are not within
20
     the system. These are children that are not -- they
21
     don't have an open court case. Because there's only a
22
     small fraction of those children that have an open
23
     court case that have placed in out-of-home placements.
24
               So I feel like if you look at those census
25
     numbers, and that family's being able to make that
```

```
1
     decision on their own, and maybe having some -- a hard
     time, but maybe grandmas make that decision --
 2.
 3
     represents the highest.
               I know that's not always the case. I was in
 4
 5
     a quardianship with my grandmother, because my parents
     made that decision, you know.
 6
                                    So ...
 7
               But I think that represents the highest,
     being able to empower families to make those decisions
 8
 9
     that are the best for their children.
10
               And I feel like ICWA and these regulations,
11
     that they do.
12
               Lastly, I just want to say something about
13
     best interests of Indian children. As I know
     oftentimes in maybe some of those cases, I think the
14
15
     best interests of Indian children against the tribal
16
     governments, you know, the -- those two things really
17
     conflict.
               But I feel like, much like in states, those
18
19
     decisions are made -- those decisions about families
20
     and children are best made at -- closest to -- to the
21
     ground, closest to the families, closest to those
22
     governments, closest to those communities.
23
               And so I -- I really strongly encourage
24
     that -- that -- well, I like the language.
```

like the language that -- that best interests of the

2.

tribes are considered in -- and included in that calculus. Oftentimes that -- States will overlook that.

I feel like the highest aspirations that we have as advocates and people that care about this -you know, and I just wanted to acknowledge that
from -- from you sitting at the panel here, working
for the BIA and Indian Affairs, being able to come out
here and -- and listen to us talk about regulations,
whether we support them or whether we don't, and -and spending your time doing this.

Because it's really important in fulfilling the trust obligation. And I think that's really important to us as communities and tribal people.

So I say thank you for that. And I hope that we all could come together. This is not about Indian versus non-Indian. I don't feel that way. I feel like it -- maybe in the -- maybe in those words of the martyr Sitting Bull, you know, he said those famous words, We can all come together and hopefully come out for the best of our children.

So I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

LARRY ROBERTS: Okay. We're going to take a five-minute break. And it'll be only for five minutes. So please -- please come back.

```
We'll come back at 10:55.
 1
               (A recess was taken from 10:51 a.m. to
 2
 3
     10:55 a.m.)
 4
               LARRY ROBERTS: So we're running up against
 5
     11:00.
             So I'm going to ask everyone to really try to
     keep their comments to five minutes. And I
 6
 7
     appreciate your -- your compliance with that.
               So with that, we'll go ahead and get
 8
 9
               Please state your name and the organization
     started.
10
     that you're with.
11
               NICOLE HOMER:
                              Okay. Can you hear me?
12
               LARRY ROBERTS:
                               Yes.
13
               NICOLE HOMER:
                              Okay. My name is Nicole
14
             I'm a citizen of the Oneida of the Thames in
15
     Ontario, Canada. But I'm a tribal attorney for the
16
     Ho-Chunk Nation in Wisconsin.
17
               I speak here today as myself concerned with
18
     a specific issue that we are facing in Wisconsin.
19
     have been working diligently to bring our Safe Haven
20
     Relinquishment Act into compliance with the Indian
21
     Child Welfare Act. However not without much pushback
2.2
     from the hospitals.
23
               Our State law allows a parent to drop a
24
     child 72 hours old or less off at a police station,
25
     firehouse or hospital. The law permits absolute
```

2.

anonymity. They are not asked if the child is Indian when they give birth and leave, or come in and drop off.

My concerns is while the regulations speak of the fact that a parent's request for anonymity should not absolve the requirement to ask if the child is Indian and follow the placement preferences and notice in a voluntary case, Wisconsin Safe Haven Law actually falls under the involuntary grounds and proceeding section in the Wisconsin Children's Code, Chapter 48.

Thus, these regulations do not go far enough to require the accepting safe place to provide the information needed for tribes to make a membership determination to the State agency. This, unfortunately, creates a back-door approach to ICWA avoidance.

I believe similar strong language regarding anonymity not trumping ICWA protections be added to the involuntary sections as well -- although it does appear to be counterintuitive -- to address any similarly-situated states that have their safe haven relinquishment language within the involuntary sections of their State children's codes.

Additionally, a reference to relinquishment

could possibly be made in the definition section 1 2 under both the foster care and adoption sections in 3 the Section 23.2, sub (1) and sub (4). 4 Thank you. 5 DANIELLE LAZORE-THOMPSON: I actually set the timer on my phone there. 6 I'm 7 My name is Danielle Lazore-Thompson. from the St. Regis Mohawk tribe in northern 8 9 New York State, born and raised there. And I 10 currently work as a Deputy General Counsel for the 11 St. Regis Mohawk Tribal council. 12 I just have a few comments that I'd like to 13 make on behalf of the tribe. First of all, I want to 14 thank -- thank all of you for your efforts and for 15 the courage to actually put pen to paper and finally 16 get some regulations like this down for all of us to 17 consider. 18 Guidelines are -- are just that. 19 Guidelines are guidelines. And although they've 20 provided, I know, some, you know, great information 21 for people in how to apply ICWA, one of the big 22 problems that we've had in New York State is that 23 it's been inconsistently applied. 24 You know, if you want to think about that, 25 it's been inconsistently applied across the country,

never mind within each state.

I've practiced in the counties that border our reservation, and these are two counties. They're right next to each other. They both deal with Indian issues. And both courts deal with ICWA completely differently.

And these are counties right next to each other. So never mind the inconsistencies that happen across the country.

So it's so important that these regulations go forward, and that they help provide consistency that we all need, just from a practical standpoint.

I have several comments that I'm going to be providing to you in writing. But I wanted to state here and for the record that the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe absolutely supports these regulations. They're long overdue.

The one thing that we need to always remember is that we're trying to overcome something that has happened systemically to our people for decades.

We are one of the only people in this country that has had written policy geared towards exterminating us. That's literal. That's not exaggerating. You know, we're one of the only groups

2.

of people in this country that have faced, you know, forced sterilization of women.

On my territory, which is bordered with Canada, Canada has similar policies that are even more egregious. These things are written down in black and white about our people. And we face these things today.

There's something called intergenerational trauma. And we figure out a way to put a word to that, to put a name to that. But it impacts us every day.

My father was born in 1931. He passed away about ten years ago. But him and all the siblings were removed from our territory and placed in the foster home called the Thomas Indian School, which is located in the Seneca territory.

And from there, my aunts never moved back home. From there, my first cousin committed suicide. From there, my father and all of my aunts were lifelong alcoholics.

The impact that had on me as a child growing up, as an adult child of alcoholic -- this is just my family. We are always going to find those examples and those good stories.

And don't get me wrong. I mean, these are

```
our children that we're talking about. And I
 1
 2
     appreciate the people who love our children, no
 3
     matter what, no matter if they're white or black or
 4
     indifferent. Because in the end it's about the
 5
     children.
               But at the same time, what we're talking
 6
     about here is something that is geared towards trying
 7
 8
     to rectify a wrong.
               If you go back to 1979, and when all of
 9
10
     this first happened, a lot of those things are still
11
     happening today. Not a lot has changed. We still
12
     have people that we're losing or people that have
     fallen through the cracks.
13
14
               I'm going to tell another brief little
     story just on behalf of myself. And this is kind of
15
16
     funny, because it has to do with Facebook.
17
               Two years ago I got this odd message from
18
     this woman. And she sent me a picture of herself.
19
     And she said, Does this person look familiar?
20
               And I'm, like, you know, Who is this?
                                                       This
21
     is some sort of weird joke?
2.2
               Like, you know, I was going to delete it.
23
               And she had said, No, seriously.
24
               You know, I've met Beatrice before. And I
25
     think you might be my sister.
```

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I'm, like -- like, Prove it. You know, 1 2 I'm, like, Don't be harassing me. Like, What is 3 this? I was all getting defensive and very 4 5 protective of my mother. And sure enough, she sends me a picture 6 that she had taken of my mother in, like, 1992. 7 1955 my mother had a child that she was forced to put 8 9 up for adoption. And this woman lived her entire 10 life away from the community. 11 My mother kept this as a secret from us --12 from us children for our entire lives, for 50 years. 13

from us children for our entire lives, for 50 years. I think back as a child, all those times where I saw my mother crying about something. And I thought it was something stupid that I had done or something stupid my brother had done or, you know, some terrible thing that had happened.

And she was crying for that daughter that was lost. Because we were in a situation where there was nobody to protect her. There was nobody to keep my sister in our family.

And this is now. You know, we're not talking about something that happened, you know, several hundred years ago. The trauma that that creates within families, it's still going on. It's

still continuing.

2.

So having these regulations is so important. Because it is another step towards trying to rectify some of those wrongs that have happened.

I will be providing substantive written comments on just some little tweaky things in the law. And if you don't mind, one of my colleagues is also going to be providing some comments about her practice. She's actually our ICWA coordinator who is the one who's working on the ground day-to-day with our cases involving Indian children.

So thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it.

LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.

JAY MCCARTHY: So just out of respect for everyone in line, everyone's been doing a great job of keeping within the five minutes. And let's please try to keep that going.

ART MARTINEZ: Hello. My name's Art

Martinez. I come to you today. I'm a member of the

Chumash Tribe of the Kalawatsa (sic) people -- the

Kalawatsa (sic) Village, Turtle Clan.

I also come to you as a psychologist. A psychologist that's been active in the area of Indian Child Welfare for many years.

2.

I've served as an expert witness to state courts in over 3,500 cases. I served as an expert to tribal courts in almost a thousand cases. I've seen many, many cases that would curdle our blood in many ways of the -- the abhorrent conditions that many of our children, Native children experience in non-Native foster homes.

We can also find abhorrent experiences, of course, as Native children in tribal placements or in tribal homes.

But the issues of sovereignty cause us to pause for a moment and to realize that in the area of child welfare, courts are imperfect. Courts are an imperfect process.

The more we can define that for a court, the more that we can define what a process of action -- a best practice, if you will -- might be, the better we will be able to serve children.

And it's about serving children that brings me to this work. And that I know brings many -- many of you here.

I also stand before you today as an adoptive parent of two children, two children that are now adults. I have eight grandchildren.

I also stand before you as the parent of a

2.

beautiful ten-year-old disabled child.

And I also stand before you today as a Native person from a family of nine, where three of my siblings are still lost today from their placement. They're somewhere in Washington state. That's all we know.

In that experience what I found, in my experience, is that state courts, if -- if there's not clear direction to a state court -- clear direction of process or guidance, as is intended in these guidelines, state courts will find cracks, particularly in -- in states where litigation is the rule of the day. And of course, that's what kind of happens in courts. Litigation happens.

And so it is very important that we begin to, in standing up for children, define this process and articulate the process that is intended by the law.

I think the guidelines that are being proposed do a fairly good job at further articulating the intent and the process of the Indian Child Welfare Act.

I also think that the prior regulations have many loopholes. I think they've discussed intent, but did not articulate the intent of the law, as would be

2.

intended in this regulation and guidance.

I do see some -- some issues, though, that will -- or may come up within state courts that I think we need to be attentive to.

In the state of California, as in many other states, there are issues of presumed parent. There can be a presumed parent simply by the -- the mother or the -- one of the parents suggesting -- and, typically, it's the father -- suggesting that they know who the father is, and that the father is a tribal member of a certain tribe.

That father may not be available to acknowledge that child. And so the -- the issues of acknowledgment that are referred to in the guidelines are somewhat flawed.

In the state of California, and in many states, even if the father does not the acknowledge the child -- and there are many, many reasons why that might happen, by the way -- they can be the presumed parent, given the fact that they were present at the birth.

The hospital can write their name down and put it on the birth certificate. So there are many ways that a parent could be identified without that parent necessarily acknowledging that child.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in cases where we see child support issues going on, where we see a child that's on aid, or a child that may have other issues going on, it's not unusual to see that one parent has not acknowledged a child, but they -- they function in the state court as the presumed parent. And in actual -- actuality, they have rights of representation in many of these courts as the presumed parent. So I think that, in that case, we need to define, or at least guide courts that, when there's a presumed parent who is Native, that that parent should be given the rights, and the case should proceed as an Indian Child Welfare Act, unless that presumption is then proven wrong or -- or erased, basically. So that's one -- one thing that I would offer. I would also offer that in many cases what we find is that it can take years for a Tribe to recognize that a child is eligible for enrollment. And the issue has to do with enrollment and eligibility for enrollment. The Tribe can oftentimes recognize that the child is from a family from their tribe, and that

is -- that there are other tribal -- other family

2.

members that are -- that are tribal members that are family members that are in their tribe.

But oftentimes there's not enough of a clear line. Maybe the grandmother and then the mother are not enrolled.

And so what I would encourage is guidance that would allow tribes, and articulate that tribes should be involved, and that the case should go forward as an Indian Child Welfare case, if the -- if the Tribe itself claims a presumption that this child may be eligible for enrollment at some point.

And eligibility for enrollment, as we know, takes many -- many phases. There are tribes that don't have their rolls open for enrollment. There are tribes that say a child has to be enrolled before a certain age.

There are tribes that will respond that the child's not eligible for enrollment, but that they're changing -- thinking about changing the enrollment standards.

We need to make a place for those children before we find out four years later that they are, in fact, eligible for enrollment.

So using the same thought as a presumed parent, I think that the presumed tribe in the

2.

2.2

situation should be then recognized and allowed to be represented within the proceeding.

As an expert witness in so many cases, I also want to say that -- thank you for defining, finally, with increased clarity the role of expert witness -- the -- I'm sorry, the definition of expert witness.

I would only offer that in the last bullet under, Expert witness, that the expert witness that has substantial experience with the -- with Indian children and community services, that that be -- you may add to that -- or I would like to see added to that, that the tribe recognizes that person.

So the tribe, as a party, recognizes them -- that person as having distinct knowledge within their -- their tribe and their community.

Because it may not be the same.

Also, you will hear in testimony that will come up throughout your hearings indications of bonding and attachment.

As an expert in this field, and as an expert that has testified many times about bonding and attachment, I can tell you that bonding and attachment issues are not a hard and fast issue.

Bonding and attachment -- many times we think of --

courts will hear arguments about bonding and attachment of a child to foster parents as somehow good cause to not follow a law.

Well, the fact is that if we use bonding and attachment to not follow letters of laws, then we would never remove children from their homes, would we? Because it is for a legal reason that those children are being removed.

Many times, no matter now how abusive the home is, the attachment of the bond between the child and parent is still there.

That speaks to the resilience of children, that children are able -- particularly Native children, it seems -- are able to be so resilient. Because once we have a bond -- once we have established an attachment -- and by the way, that usually occurs within the first year-and-a-half to two years of life -- we can then transfer that attachment.

And that attachment in Native families comes very early. Because of all the arms that hold children throughout the -- throughout our experience. And all the ways that aunties, uncles, grandmas -- I have many grandmothers in my community. It wasn't until I got older that I realized which ones I was

directly related to. 1 2 They all seemed to order me around pretty 3 good. 4 LARRY ROBERTS: So, I don't want to stop 5 you short. Because I appreciate one, traveling here, and comments as well. But we have a number of people 6 7 waiting in line. So --ART MARTINEZ: Okay. The -- the thing that 8 9 I would close with is that the issue of extraordinary 10 needs must be demonstrated. 11 I would suggest that there be wording that 12 more clearly defines what that is, that it should be 13 a demonstrated physical developmental or 14 psychological incapacity of the child that serves as 15 disability which must be addressed. 16 So with that, I'll close. And thank you 17 for all your efforts in this area. I know it's an 18 arduous process. 19 Thank you. 20 Good morning. My name's CATHERINE DEXTER: Catherine Dexter. And I'm an attorney practicing out 21 22 of Portland, Oregon. 23 I've done adoption law for 32 years. 24 member of the Oregon State Bar and the Federal Bar. 25 I was a founding member of the American Academy of

2.

Adoption Attorneys and the Oregon State Bar of Family
Law Section Standing Committee on Adoption.

I come here basically speaking on behalf of myself and the practice that I have in the area of adoption.

In reviewing the proposed regulations here,
I do believe there are multiple problems with the
proposed rules that, if adopted, will directly or
indirectly undermine the purpose and functioning of
the Indian Child Welfare Act, and that this can be to
the detriment of Indian children and families and
tribal culture.

I'd like to state now that I do support the written comments that were submitted by the American Academy of Adoption Attorneys. And I'm not going to address all of the issues that I see within the Act.

I'd like to focus on two. One is the breath of the proposed rules. And the second is the definition of imminent physical danger or harm.

I believe that the proposed rules exceed the authority granted to the Department under 25 U.S.C. 1952. Congress gave the Department limited authority to enact rules regarding tribal jurisdiction and grant-making.

I think by exceeding this authority in --

in the way that these rules have been promulgate and what they contain, the Department is inviting both state and federal court challenges.

We currently have over 35 years of court decisions. And I don't know that we need to have more litigation, because we have new rules, and trying to decide which of the old apply, which of the new apply.

But I think that these challenges will rise in the areas of the State's individual right to legislate in area of family law matters. I think also in the area of the Indian parents' right to privacy under the federal constitution. And lastly, a State's right to enforce its criminal law in cases where child abuse is or is likely to become an issue.

In looking at the issue of imminent physical danger or harm, the definition of a Proposed Rule 23.2 states that, quote, Imminent physical damage or harm means present or impending risk of serious bodily injury or death.

This is too low of a standard to be applied to Indian children, because it fails to protect them from other behaviors which they currently are protected from that are injurious and even criminal -- sexual abuse, domestic violence, child

2.

labor exploitation, exposure to drug-making activities, and psychological injuries, none of which would show necessarily an imminent danger of physical harm or damage.

Indian children are entitled to the same level of protection as non-Indian children under existing child protection statutes under state law.

And I don't -- I would hesitate to support anything that lessened their ability to be protected.

This definition has impact on other proposed rules.

For example, Proposed Rule 23.114, which requires that in instances where the Court finds an Indian child was improperly removed from the custody of his parent or Indian custodian, the Court must terminate proceeding and immediately return the child to its parent or custodian without regard or consideration for the best interest of the child or other possible criminal actions against the child by the parent or someone else in their household.

In order to help with maybe restating that definition, so that it more properly protects Indian children, I would add to the definition of imminent physical damage or harm to say -- following injury or death, to put, And any or action which would

2.

constitute a crime against the child under state or federal law.

I think that's a minimum protection that Indian children are entitled to.

In conclusion, I'd like to say that adopting the present rules, I think, in this form would be very harmful to children and Indian families, the very ones that ICWA was enacted to protect.

I believe the Indian Nation, the tribes deserve to have rules and guidelines that support the reasons that ICWA was enacted to begin with, to protect Indian children, and to help preserve the heritage and cultural identity of Indian tribes.

I'm also concerned of all the hearings that are being held and people given the opportunity to speak, none of them are scheduled for east of the Mississippi. And I don't know why that is.

So I think that we're cutting off a large portion of our geographic population, not giving them an opportunity to comment on these rules the same way that we have here west of the Mississippi.

I also think that by restricting the privacy rights of Indian parents for establishing a lower threshold for protection of Indian children,

the new guidelines and proposed rules devalue the tribe's members, and undermine the value of the tribe's heritage and cultural identity.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion. And I appreciate the work that you are doing. And I appreciate the stories that I've heard.

Because having practiced in the area of adoption law for so many years, I have a great deal of respect for Indian tribes and Indian families.

And I think they deserve better than these proposed rules.

Thank you.

LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.

And there's just one point of clarification that I want to make, and just a general matter in terms of our rule-making. A lot of times what we hear is that we should be going to various states.

And we can't go to every state in our rule-making, generally. But that's why we have national teleconferences. And those national teleconferences are created the same way these are. Everyone can participate. They're transcribed and then become part of the record.

LICIA MCCONELL: Hello. My name's Licia McConnell. And I'll be speaking on behalf of my

family.

I'm an enrolled member of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla. My dad was adopted when he was two, and he was adopted by an Irish family and taken away. And he lived in Idaho.

And because he was adopted, he didn't get the -- the things that are passed down to the family.

And because of that, I never got those either.

I was taken away from my family when I was eight. And I was placed in a non-Native home, because my dad was not enrolled, and neither was I.

Because my dad was adopted, his files were sealed, and we couldn't become enrolled members until a year-and-a-half later. That's how long it took to unseal those files.

When I was placed in a non-Native home, it went well at first, because I had my older sister, and I had my little brother, and I had once-a-week visits with my birth family.

As I stayed in the home, the more it progressed, I stopped going to powwows and I started going more to church. And I did a lot of more things that weren't as Native, and gradually I became more assimilated.

And when I was in the fifth grade -- and I

don't know how old I was then. But when I was in the fifth grade, they decided that they wanted to have guardianship of us. And I thought that was a really good idea, because my older sister and my little brother and I could all stay together. And I thought that we would still have visitations with our birth parents.

But as soon as they got the guardianship of us, things became different. And I was no longer allowed to go to powwows. And they started sending me to Christian schools. And I never got that cultural part of me.

And that was really hard. Because even though I was Native American, I never got that -- that gratification.

And as I got older, I got more cut off.

And they started homeschooling me. And the only books that I could read were the Bible and dictionary and my textbooks, which, you know, doesn't leave a whole lot of room.

My older sister went through a similar thing, and we became targets in the home.

And for me, when we were enrolled, my birth parents -- or not my birth parents -- my foster parents at the time decided to take our per cap and

file -- and say that we were getting braces. But they really just used that money to landscape their yard. Which I don't think that would have happened if I was in a Native home.

I made the choice in October last year to leave the foster home. And doing that -- well, my sister had already left when I was in the second grade. But doing that, I left my little brother behind. Which has been really hard, because we were the only constants in our life.

And he still lives in that home. And it's really hard, because his foster parents have made it so I can't see him. And because he's under a guardianship, the Tribe can't do anything, and neither can the State.

I believe that if we were first placed inside a Native home, that none of this would have happened. So that is why I think that these regulations should be enforced.

Thank you.

ARNESTO SAUK: Hello. I'm Arnesto Sauk (sic). I'm -- I'm a foster youth. I am in the ICWA unit on the east branch DHS.

I'm here on behalf of myself. I'm just curious -- I'm just curious why -- like, curious on

just people's life. And you know, I would like to share my life a little bit.

You know, I was adopted at age three. And my biological parents both are deceased, because they were unable to take care of me. Now, I was just -- I didn't get a chance to be in a -- in a home of my Native tribe. I was just given into a white family, because they just thought it was easier to do.

I was born in Alaska. So I guess, you know, we didn't have a lot of, you know, regulations. And it's, like -- I don't know. It's stuff that would make a lot of sense to me. As in Oregon, everything is just -- it seems more clear.

So at age 12 I was put in a foster care system, and I was just in a -- many homes. I've never been in a -- in a Native home.

And you know, all of the homes I've been in now aren't -- they don't -- they don't -- they don't really support my Native traditions. They -- they don't really do anything. All they do is -- I've been in homes that all they care about is money, treating me really bad, not treating me with respect. They don't support any of my cultural history or anything.

In fact, they don't care for what I do.

```
They, you know, say, You just got to -- you stay out
 1
     of trouble. Be here by this time.
 2.
 3
               They don't even acknowledge, you know, who
     I am, you know. They don't understand who I am.
 4
 5
     I've gone through a lot of loss.
               Now, I could grief on -- you know, I've had
 6
 7
     many bad experiences. But why do that, when I can
     say there's a lot of positive stuff in me?
 8
 9
     being in DHS, you know, has been a help for me.
10
     the -- my caseworker, who's here, actually -- prior
11
     caseworker -- who has done so much work on trying to
12
     locate my -- my siblings and stuff in Alaska. Who --
13
     whoever -- I don't know.
14
               Like, I think if I wasn't in the ICWA unit,
15
     if my case wasn't an ICWA case, I wouldn't be able to
16
     meet my family or try and meet my siblings or
     whatnot. And I really appreciate the work that, you
17
18
     know, the ICWA unit has done for me.
19
               And I -- it's -- it's -- I think it would
20
     speed up the process a whole lot. And you know, I'm
21
     just -- I'm just happy that -- you know, I've had a
22
     rough childhood. You know, because I think this --
23
     and that's what makes me strong, you know,
24
     emotionally stronger, mentally stronger,
25
     spiritually -- everything.
```

It's just -- you know, I wouldn't be here 1 standing talking you to guys right now if I didn't 2 3 have this rough childhood. 4 Thank you. 5 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. And so I just want to say, I know that 6 7 it's -- it's hard for everyone in this room to provide testimony for this record. And I really 8 appreciate the courage of -- of the youth to share --9 10 share their information with us. 11 And so thank you. Thank you for attending 12 the session. And thank you to everyone for sharing. 13 REBECCA LARSON: My name is Rebecca Larson. 14 I'm a proud member of the Quinnault Indian Nation in 15 Washington. I am a second generation survivor of 16 prior ICWA adoption. 17 I'm here in full support of the regulation 18 that -- that we're now talking about, finally, and 19 some teeth to some things that are needed to protect 20 our children. 21 My mother was part of the Scoop Era that 22 the BIA at that time funded and -- and cosponsored, 23 in my opinion. She was taken, physically, from my 24 grandmother off of our reservation.

She was adopted quickly, within a matter of

days, to a family here in Oregon, a non-Native family, where ICWA obviously was not in place to protect her.

She was abused and -- sexually and physically and emotionally in this home by these non-Native people who didn't understand her -- her culture or her pain from being stolen from -- from our family in Taholah.

When she became pregnant with me, this wonderful white family, who always wanted her to feel grateful that they had saved her life, sent her away to a Catholic boarding school for unwed mothers -- because we still had them in those days -- which had become a clearinghouse for more of our children.

And she was forced to give me up for adoption. She was not allowed to hold me or to see me.

My mother left that place a really broken young girl. And she lived the rest of her life on the streets of Portland and Seattle.

I reunited with my mother after I was an adult and had a daughter of my own. And my mother passed away two years ago.

When I -- the coroner called and asked me to come and identify her body. On her death

2.

2.2

certificate it stated that she died of an accidental drug overdose.

My mother died of cultural genocide that was forced upon her by the State, by the government, and by an adoption agency which sells our children.

I, too, was adopted very quickly into a non-Native home. There was no ICWA to protect me.

I, too, was physically and emotionally abused in this home by these people who wanted me to be grateful that they saved this poor Indian girl.

I stand before you today also, now, as a woman who is going through, in region two in Washington state, a licensing process to become a foster parent as a single woman, Native woman. I work for the Suquamish (sic) Tribe, and not in child welfare.

But this is obviously an issue that's very close to my heart. And things that I have found going through this process are disturbing.

I -- I cosponsored an ICWA training where they used a video that I have produced about my story.

And it was full of non-Native foster parents who -- who said appalling things to -- to us about, Oh. Well, I came today, because I'm really

```
My caseworker in region two said that
 1
     confused.
 2
     ICWA's just a piece of paper, that I don't have to
     worry about those kinds of things. And I'm really
 3
     confused. And I wanted to come here today to find
 4
 5
     out what the truth is.
               And this was less than two months ago.
 6
 7
               And so enforcement of ICWA and providing
     that for -- for our states and for our -- our region,
 8
 9
     it is so important to be able to have that
10
     standardized enforcement.
11
               Because the things that I am seeing from
12
     going through the process with the State, it is not
13
     being complied with or applied when it comes to our
14
     children.
15
               And just real quick -- another woman
16
     responded, asking a question about an Indian
     placement. And she said, I've -- you know, I just
17
18
     have some questions about that.
19
               And I asked her, Are you -- are you a
20
     tribal placement home?
21
               Complete silence.
22
               And another woman responded and said, No.
23
     But I am. And I've been licensed for six years. And
24
     I have never been given a tribal placement.
25
               And so we need these.
```

And I appreciate you. And thank you for 1 taking the time. 2. 3 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. ESTELLE NAMAHOE: My name Estelle Namahoe. 4 5 I'm an enrolled member of the Navajo Nation. I'm here today because my story is similar 6 7 to many that are here and aren't here. I was taken from the Navajo Reservation 8 when I was two-and-a-half, after my mother died. 9 10 was taken by a group of Christian women. And they 11 went to Orange County, California and were trying to 12 find homes for us. 13 We ended up being placed in Mormon families 14 and separated. I did not know my siblings until I 15 was in my thirties. 16 My family moved to Hawaii. And that's 17 where I was raised, far from my culture and my 18 people, my language. 19 A part of my healing process as an adult 20 has been to work in child welfare and with Native families. 21 22 What I found working for tribes and for 23 states in child welfare is that I believe that the 24 European system of bringing children into foster care 25 is nothing more than the old boarding school and

forced assimilation.

We don't have enough Native families. And we often have barriers to certify Native families, so our children are forced to go into non-Native families and pick up their practices of that foster home.

Safety is also our goal in child welfare. But it's often compromised with the wiping out of family ties, culture, language, and the knowledge that we are the First People.

European immigrants cannot continue the conquering of the First People. We were here first. And we have rights, rights to our land, to our families, to our traditions.

And we will take care of our children. And we will take care of our families, if we don't have other people telling us how to do that and putting limitations on us. We are strong people.

ICWA guidelines are important. They can certainly be expanded. But this is a good start.

We're not a dying people. And we are not submissive. And we will be around for a long time. And we won't have continued trauma, pain or loss.

ALLIE GREENLEAF MALDONADO: My name is

Allie Greenleaf Maldonado. I am the Chief Judge for

the Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians. And I am here today to support the regulations that are being promulgated.

We need these regulations. And I want to tell you about two cases that I had when I was a -- prior to being chief judge for my tribe, I was the assistant general council for nine years.

And during that time period I litigated several ICWA cases. In fact, that was a large part of my practice with my tribe.

And I want to tell you about two of those cases.

And the first case I'm going to tell you about, we -- the Tribe did not receive notice of these -- of this case until the case had been ongoing for two years. And it wasn't until one of the grandmas reached out and contacted our child welfare commission, and the Tribe then contacted the State, did we receive -- did the Tribe receive official notification of this proceeding.

And all three of the girls in this case were tribal citizens.

We intervened in the case. And the Judge that was sitting in on that case was brand new. She was a newly-elected judge. Not only was this her

2.2

first child welfare case, this was her -- or her first Indian child welfare case, it was her first child welfare case.

So she was looking for guidance from the attorneys that were present on how to proceed. And the State attorney and the guardian ad litem in that case were vigorously against application of the placement preferences in ICWA, because the girls had been illegally in this placement for two years.

And they worked very hard to convince the judge that this -- that the time that had passed and the bonding were good cause to deny transfer of the case.

Now, while I was litigating this case, the attorney for the State gave me a call. And he asked me if we could speak off the record. So I won't say his name.

And he said, Do you really believe what you're arguing in this case about the placement preferences? Do you think that this non-Indian, non-relative placement is illegal and in violation of ICWA?

And I said, Yes. I do think that.

He said, Off the record, will you walk me through that.

And I opened the NARF page on my computer, and asked him to do the same on his. And we walked through it together.

Now, that -- that moment in time wasn't going to help me in my case. Because he was a professional, and he was going to do is job and represent the State, as he had to do.

But it was a pivotal moment for him, and it was actually very pivotal to the Tribe. Because he would later come to the table and be part of a group of attorneys that wrote a bench book for judges, that would assist judges in understanding the Indian Child Welfare Act.

But in this moment he continued to do his job very successfully. And that judge -- you know, she was so -- so inherently annoyed at how vigorously I was arguing, that she actually threatened to hold me in contempt of court. And I lost that case.

About two years later I was speaking at the University of Michigan Law School, and -- about the Indian Child Welfare Act. And I was very surprised to see her sitting in, like, the second row. I got very nervous. I wasn't sure if I was about to get held in contempt of court again. I wasn't sure what was going to happen.

2.

And I wasn't sure if she was going to interrupt me during my talk. But she didn't.

And afterwards I came down, and I thought, Whew, this is over. But she walked right up to me. And she said, I don't know if you remember me. And she said her name.

I was like, Of course I remember.

She said, I want to apologize to you. I did not understand how ICWA worked. And I was misguided by the -- by the guardian ad litem and the proponents in the room. And if I had understood what I know now, I would have ruled and done things differently.

She needed these regulations.

A case that happened right after that, the judge in that case -- again, we had a child at the hospital. The grandmother came to the hospital. And the day that baby was born, she gave her her Indian name.

Nonetheless, the social workers would not consider her as a placement. Instead they placed her in a non-Indian, non-relative placement in violation of ICWA. Because one of her siblings was already there and had been there for so long. And so they called that an Indian placement.

so the Tribe tried to intervene. And everyone was so frightened that if we intervened, we might then transfer, that we were denied the right to intervene. And this was immediately after they terminated the dad's parental rights. So this case had been going on now for two years.

So in a case that was landmarked in Michigan, the Court of Appeals overturned termination of parental rights and sent it back -- back down to the lower court.

And from the bench, that judge apologized -- and I have that transcript -- he apologized because he said, prior to that case, he didn't really understand the purpose of ICWA. That everyone was fighting to keep the tribe from intervening and transferring, including him, because they didn't trust that the tribe would do what was in the best interest of those kids.

And that he now understood that that's the whole point of the Indian Child Welfare Act. That Indian tribes love their kids, too. And that we are the ones that should be entrusted with deciding what's in their best interest.

And just to follow up on that case, when that case -- he did transfer that case to tribal

courts. We were able to do something that state courts couldn't have done, because of state laws' inflexibility.

We allowed the non-Indian foster home to adopt that child and grandma. And they were able to have joint custody. And grandma would have the child on weekends and holidays.

And grandma is a fluent language speaker. She knows our traditional medicines. And that child is growing up with her culture and her community. Her sister's a champion hoop dancer, and she's learning the hoop dance. None of that would have happened.

And that judge, he now sits with me on the Tribal State Judicial Forum. And the Tribal State Judicial Forum will be putting forward a letter of support for these regs. On that forum, 12 state judges, 12 tribal court judges.

Thank you for your work.

LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.

SANDY WHITE HAWK: Good morning. My name is Sandy White Hawk. I was born on the Rosebud Reservation in 1955. I was the third child of Nyna Lulu White Hawk York Renselman. And I was adopted out when I was 18 months old.

It was during that time period that you'll hear many stories of that systematic removal of our children. Mine is one of the stories where an uncle recounted that the -- we remember the day the social worker drove into the driveway, scooped you up, put you in a car and took you off. And I didn't return to them until July of 1988.

My story is like many who are placed in white missionary homes, who had no understanding of who we are. I suffered a great deal of emotional, physical, sexual, and spiritual abuse.

Eventually, through my healing, I saw the need to formalize a process to gather us together, to talk and to share, to encourage and to heal.

And I wanted to express today that while we are always talking about the Indian child and the child, it is not just about that. As Indian people, we can't separate the child from the family. We can't separate the family from the community. Even if we are raised far away. Even if we live in the urban areas.

And you hear also, and will continue to hear, that situations have not changed a whole lot between the '50s and '60s and the placements of young children today, as you heard today from these two

individuals.

2.

I wanted to share with you today two thoughts that I had.

One is in the proposed rule for qualified expert witness. You actually didn't word this exactly as I would have worded it. I just -- actually just thought of this, because I thought there was going to be more addition in it.

But for qualified expert witnesses, I really believe that those who have been through this lived experience of what it's like to have the long-term impact of removal, not having your image mirrored back to you in any way in your community, to not know anything about your history -- someone needs to articulate that in the court, to explain what will happen to that child as they develop over time.

One of the most important developmental stages that we talk about in child development is the mirroring back and seeing our -- ourselves within our community.

Well, an Indian child does not have that mirrored reflection of their image. And as we develop, we have to find a way to negotiate that. And unfortunately, most of the time it's a negative formation that we make.

I'd like to share with you that there's a study that the First Nations Repatriation Institute and Organization that I've founded has partnered with the United -- the University of Minnesota. And we've put together a research study called, The Experiences of Adopted and Fostered Individuals: An Anonymous Study to Break the Silence.

And I just want to share with you a few preliminary findings that we have.

Twenty-three -- I'm just going to speak to the ninety-five individuals who responded who said that they have reunited with some member of their people.

Twenty-three of the ninety-five experienced sexual abuse in their adoptive home. Forty-four of ninety-five experienced physical abuse. Forty-seven of the ninety-five experienced emotional abuse. Forty-three contemplated and planned suicide. Twenty attempted suicide. Fifty-one of them say that they have been in therapy or are in current therapy to address the emotional and physical abuse that they experienced in their home.

Now, I know that there are loving homes. And this is not my argument.

But what I really want to express as well

is that we know that not all of these emotional difficulties are connected to abuse. You can experience extreme profound grief and loss in the midst of a loving home.

And sometimes it's even harder for that individual to express that loss in a loving home. Because how can that child tell their most loving parent, I need to know who I am?

So it's at great cost that they've received that love. And that adoptive parent has not been given the education that they need to understand how to expand the family and help that child reconnect and expand.

When really true condition -- unconditional love exists, there's room for everyone. But we're not quaranteed that.

When an adoption decree is signed, no one goes back into that home to see if that child is safe, to see if they're being abused. It's assumed that the problem has been solved, and the child is put in a safe environment, because that home passed a background check. So something needs to be done there.

One last comment. You're going to hear over and over about bonding. But there is

20

21

22

23

24

25

an original bond that exists that's not being talked 1 about or addressed. And that original bond is the 2 3 bond that we have to the mother who carried us those 4 nine months. 5 All the energy around that birth that took place, if it is during a hard time and a stressful 6 7 time, we are compelled to return and reclaim. Wе have these words: Reunification. 8 Reconnect. 9 Well, if we didn't have this original bond, 10 we would not be using those terms. And that needs to 11 be respected and honored. 12 One last comment. I just thought of this 13 as I was sitting here. Because over the years we've 14 talked in our circles about how there is no penalty. 15 There's no legal penalty. There's nothing. 16 I get a parking ticket. But a judge, a 17 quardian ad litem, a social worker, anyone who's been 18 in noncompliance of ICWA receives no fine. How do I

guardian ad litem, a social worker, anyone who's been in noncompliance of ICWA receives no fine. How do I receive a parking ticket, and they not receive any sort of consequence, when a child's well-being is in their charge?

Thank you for your time.

LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.

So we're running up towards noon. We'll have comments from everyone that's still in line.

2.

But I also want to say that if you haven't had a chance to make a comment today, please submit your comments in writing. All of your comments are going to be submitted -- or considered.

And you can also participate on the national teleconference as well.

So thank you.

JACK TROPE: Hi. Thank you. And I'll keep this very brief. Because I know we're running out of time.

I'm Jack Trope, Executive Director of the Association of American Indian Affairs. We will be providing detailed comments. And so I'm just going to touch on a couple of quick things that I think need to be made clear on the record.

For way of background, the Association in American Indian Affairs was the organization that really started the push for the Indian Child Welfare Act in the late 1960s and early 1970s, convened a series of meetings before Congress had any interest in this issue at all, and brought together tribal people, child welfare people.

And the first oversight hearing in 1974 was organized by the Association. Lead witness was the Director of the Association.

2.

So I've been executive director for 13 years, involved with the organization for 27. And so when you work for this organization, you learn all about this history.

And so I just wanted to point out one thing: When the law was passed in 1978, and then the process began that led to the guidelines, our organization, and an organization that -- the National Tribal Chairman's Associates, which no longer exists, did subcontract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to go out and do listening sessions and help develop what ultimately became a revised form, the guidelines.

The idea at that time was that these were going to be regulations. And our organization, and NTCA understood it in that way.

But -- and our organization, by the way, worked closely with House and staffers in working on drafting the bill. Our attorneys were actively engaged in that. And there was an expectation that there would be regulations.

The decision was ultimately made within the Bureau of Indian Affairs to issue guidelines.

And I would mention that both the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Justice opposed

25

preferences.

the Indian Child Welfare Act. Both recommended that 1 President Carter veto the Act. 2. 3 And he ignored that advice and signed the 4 Act. 5 So it's really not fair to say that the drafters of the bill understood that there wouldn't 6 7 be regulations. In fact, I think that the contrary 8 is true. 9 I would also mention that the language in 10 the statute is quite broad in terms of that 11 regulatory authority. That the case law over the 12 last 35 years makes it clear that that kind of 13 delegation is adequate for the issues of regulations. 14 And in fact, the experience of the last 35 years with court decisions that are all over the 15 16 place on various issues also is the basis for you 17 moving forward to provide some consistency across all of the states as to how the Indian Child Welfare Act 18 19 will be applied. 20 So that's the one point I wanted to make. 21 The second thing I want to talk about just 22 briefly is this -- this notion about -- what was said 23 about good cause to deviate from the placement

I don't see anything in this regulation

2.

2.2

that prevents a court from having a good cause hearing. So I'm not sure what that's about.

And I don't see anything in this regulation that prevents a court to considering sibling placements and whether kids are placed with siblings.

I'm not sure why that's been raised as an issue.

But I think the provision about bonding and attachment -- Dr. Martinez and -- and other -- a whole bunch of other folks talked about bonding, and -- and attachments. And White Hawk talked about it.

All the provision says is that ordinary bonding and attachment in a non-preferred placement is not cause to find extraordinary circumstances to deviate.

Now, the type of situation that was talked about, where -- and I think that the person's no longer here, unfortunately. But the type of person -- or the type of situation that she talked about, where there were diligent searches for many years, where there was strong connection with the -- with the Navajo family, where there were siblings placed together, that's not the typical situation we're talking about.

But what we're talking -- what we're more

2.

often talking about is a situation where there's a non-preferred placement. Very little effort is taken to find a preferred placement. Or in some cases, there's even deliberate actions in the litigation to delay a final determination so that the child can stay in a non-preferred placement. And that's the argument that's being made bonding and attachment.

And so I think what we're looking at here is a regulation designed to promote placements in the best interests of Indian children, more often than less.

Why more often? Because if the placement references are followed, and reasons for deviating from them are -- are lessened, then you're going to see many, many more kids placed in their best interests, as everybody here has said.

And the last point I'll mention is we are conducting research on some of those issues. I think what Dr. Martinez said about some of -- about how courts actually apply those concepts in practice is very different from what the theory is. That a lot of the people testifying in this don't really have expertise.

There are a lot of studies about how the whole theory is based on a western model of, you

```
1
     know, a mother and a child's bond, and ignores
     multiple bonds and extended family bonds and other
 2.
 3
     practices that take place in cultures other than
 4
     Euro-American culture.
               So we will submit with our testimony a lot
 5
     of that research as well. I think that's, of course,
 6
 7
     what Dr. Martinez was saying, and what Sandy White
 8
     Hawk was saying.
 9
               So thank you.
10
               LARRY ROBERTS:
                               Thank you.
11
               MATT NEWMAN: Good morning. My name is
12
     Matt Newman. I'm a staff attorney at the Native
13
     American Rights Fund. I'm based in the Anchorage,
14
     Alaska office.
15
               And I'm here this morning, first and
16
     foremost, just to thank you for the regulations.
                                                        Our
17
     office will be submitting more formal written
18
     comments with more substantive analysis.
19
               But I'd just like to take the time this
20
     morning and mention a few things.
21
               The first is that the jurisdiction in which
22
     I practice has taken some unique interpretations of
23
     ICWA since it became law.
24
               And your definitions section, which begins
25
     laying out definitions for important terms, such as
```

2.

active efforts, is going to go a long way in bringing the uniformity and the consistency to ICWA's application that Congress originally intended and that, unfortunately, various states and -- and state court decisions have each gone in their own direction over the years through interpretation.

Secondly, I'd like to mention good cause -good cause, specifically, for deviating from ICWA's
placement preferences, both the foster care and
adoptive placement preferences. And the gentleman
that spoke earlier had mentioned that the idea that
good cause was meant to embody flexibility.

But it's an unfortunate fact of the matter in the decade since ICWA was passed that flexibility and good cause -- that flexibility has evolved into loopholes.

And in my ICWA practice in Alaska, I have had judges -- and we have seen judges start issuing opinions that good cause exists, because a potential placement is too old.

Good cause exists because a potential placement in a village only has wood heat. And these good cause loopholes are being used to ensure that Alaskan Native children are not placed in ICWA-compliant homes.

And with the regulations listing out and -- and saying what following grounds just cannot be considered good cause, that's a step in the right direction. And that's going to have a big impact in Alaska in a big way.

I would just like to close. I -- you had mentioned earlier that you can't go to every state. But I would recommend, with Alaska being home to 229 federally-recognized tribes, 40 percent of the tribes in the United States, Alaska really needs to have a public hearing.

And ICWA -- of all the laws and federal Indian law, ICWA has the most impact in Alaska. Alaskan Native children constitute 20 percent of Alaska's youth population. 63 percent of children in foster care in Alaska are Alaskan Native.

ICWA has a lot of impact. These regulations are going to have a lot of impact. And as much as we're encouraging folks to get on that teleconference, in villages where VHF radio is the only means of communication, a lot of voices are not going to be heard as a result.

But I'll just conclude, because I know others are waiting.

Thank you again for these regulation. I

2.

very much look forward to their finalization and starting to get my state back on track.

LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you.

JOHN CHALLY: My name is John, with an H -- Chally -- C-H-A-L-L-Y. I'm an attorney in Portland, Oregon.

My focus of practice has been adoptions for 35 years. And it is in no way focused on Indian Child Welfare Act issues. But in a general practice, it's something that we come into contact with fairly frequently.

It can be one of the most frustrating parts of our practice because of the circumstances we find ourselves in. Which oftentimes start with, Oh. And there may be some Native American background.

You start with that point. And you sit down, and you start talking to the person who's presenting this case, which is, in most cases a -- a single woman who is very guarded in what they're willing to share about their background. Very guarded in what they're willing to say about the circumstances of conception. Very guarded about the information they're willing to provide me over their -- their background and places where I might go to better understand the circumstances of their

lineage.

2.

It can be amazingly difficult to do when you add in the fact that the woman in my office has a right to confidentiality with respect to my representation of her.

It means that I can't go knocking on doors trying to find out what her -- what tribal affiliation an ancestor may have had. I am prohibited from doing that.

And a woman of -- with Indian heritage is like every other woman, as she's presenting to us. She is careful about who she shares her circumstances concerning the adoption plan. She's careful with us about the circumstances that she's willing to share with her own family and community with regard to that.

One of the most common things that we find ourselves in is that we never get any clear information with respect to the -- the background.

We're told sometimes, I don't know. I've never been on the reservation.

Oftentimes I'm sure that's true. Sometimes they don't know what the reservation -- where their reservation is. They can't identify a tribe or any other background.

2.

2.2

And we're forced into a situation of trying to provide notice concerning this to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I'll bet that I've done that someplace between 50 and 100 times. And there has not been a single circumstance where I have received information back providing me with a basis to go forward and to notify a tribe of that background.

So it's the twin circumstances of -- of limited information to begin with, followed by the natural and understandable need for confidentiality in the relationship that results in a failure to contact the tribe and to provide the notice that some -- and I understand -- where a notice of some of these circumstances of a voluntary placement is -- is questioned by some.

But the fact of the matter is, that even if you really a wanted to provide that notice, it can oftentimes be very difficult to do.

I actually have written comments that I would like to submit at this point. Many of them are critical of the individual sections of the proposed regulations. And there's -- it would be quite inappropriate for me at this point to try to go through all of those.

So I would like to just provide the written 1 2 comments. 3 LARRY ROBERTS: Sure. Thank you. 4 HALEY CREE: My name is Haley Cree. I work 5 for the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe. I'm the Indian Child Welfare Act coordinator for the only program -- ICWA 6 7 program in New York State. I am grateful for these regulations for my 8 9 program, especially the active efforts from the 10 beginning of the case or investigation that may 11 result in the placement of an Indian child. 12 For my program, this means just working 13 with us from the beginning of dealing with Social 14 Services in a case that's involving our community 15 member. 16 And with this, I believe that we could have 17 less cases go to court. 18 And thank you. 19 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. 20 JILL KEHAU LANI ESCH: Aloha. My name is 21 Jill Kehau Lani Esch. J-I-L-L -- K-E-H-A-U --22 I-A-N-I -- E-S-C-H. I am the Omnibus President for 23 the American Indian Families in the state of 24 Minnesota. Based on the 2013 Minnesota child welfare 25

2.

2.2

report, American Indian children living in Minnesota have the highest rate of contact with the child protection system in the Nation.

This report stated that the American Indian children were 15.5 times more likely than a white child to be placed in out-of-home placement.

I would like to limit my comments to two areas that has not been touched on very much today.

The first, under Section 23.1038, when does ICWA apply? I would like to ask that it -- you specifically state, Third-party custody proceedings.

I know that it is there somewhere. But I have a case right now in Minnesota that the judge has said that third-party custody proceedings do not apply in ICWA cases.

The second thing that I would like to focus on is a notice requirement, the notice to be sent to parents, Indian custodians and tribes -- and this is in the 1978 ICWA laws -- that it's to be sent registered mail, return receipt requested.

I was over the moon when I reviewed the revised guidelines of February of 2015, which specifically stated, reclarified, and again, the notice is to be sent registered mail, return receipt requested.

The problem that we're getting is people do not know the difference between registered mail and certified mail. They think that if they -- you use the green card, the green card can be used for registered mail, certified mail and insured.

The difference is registered mail requires the sender to put it in an envelope, seal it with brown tape, take it to the post office. The post office will then log it in.

And it's kind of like a chain of custody.

Therefore, if it leaves St. Paul, Minnesota airport,

and it travels to White Earth Nation, that post

office will then log it in that it is there.

The receipt is when the person signs for it.

The problem is the counties and agencies are telling me that certified mail is just as good as registered mail. And it is not.

With certified mail, they could -- and they have done this -- lied that they put something in the mail. Because all they need to do is make sure that it has enough postage on it, drop it in the mailbox outside their office. And they would just say, Well, Your Honor, we sent it. It just never came back.

But with registered mail, there is evidence

25

that they went to the post office, that they 1 deposited it there. If the receipt never comes back, 2 3 they can at least show the Court that they did 4 attempt to provide notice to the tribe. 5 The problem that I'm having in Minnesota -we have 87 counties. 90 percent of the Counties, by 6 not getting the notices out to the tribes as 7 required, despite the fact that I brought it to their 8 9 attention. And they have told me, Jill, the tribes 10 are really lucky that we give them notice at all. 11 And that is extremely frustrating to me. 12 What I would like is do not cave to the 13 Counties when they say that certified mail or 14 electronic mail is just as good as registered mail. 15 This is something that has been in the 16 regulations from the law from 1978. And let's just hold their feet to the fire and make sure that the 17 18 notices are sent to the tribes, so that the tribes 19 can do what they need to do for the best interests of 20 our children. 21 Thank you. 22 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. 23 LISA RIEGER: Hello. I'm Lisa Rieger.

council at Cook Inlet Tribal Council in Anchorage,

am Vice President of Public Policy and General

1 | Alaska.

I'd like to add my words to what Matt Newman had to say.

Number one, to request a hearing in Alaska, so that Alaska tribes and tribal organizations can make themselves heard by you.

I wanted to add also that, yes, there are 229 or maybe 231, depending on how you count federally-recognized tribes in Alaska.

The State has spent the last 25 years litigating every fine point of ICWA. And really, first of all, questioning whether there were even tribes at all. And so it is quite an extreme situation.

When I first moved to Alaska 26 years ago and got involved in -- in ICWA in Alaska, the numbers were there. There were fewer than 20 percent of the Native children in Alaska -- fewer than 20 percent of the children in Alaska were Native. 40 percent of the children in out-of-home care were Native.

So in fact, the numbers are not getting better. It's getting worse. As Matt said, it's now at 60 or -- at 60-plus percent.

In Anchorage, where the Alaskan Native youth population is closer to 10 or 15 percent, it's

2.

still over 60 percent of children in foster care who are Alaskan Native. And so it is a very significant issue in the state of Alaska.

And really -- and in addition, the state courts, as Matt described, have really taken a very narrow interpretation, in particular, of active efforts.

One time I was in a court listening. And the judge, in fact, asked the social worker what she had done differently for this Native family than she would have done for another family. And she wasn't really able to answer that question.

And I -- I don't know that that's even that frequent of a question in Court. But the understanding of active efforts is extremely limited. And as is -- and, you know, as is shown by the Jenuna (sic) case, for which we're also very grateful.

So we'll be submitting -- I'm grateful for the intervention of the Department of Justice and the Bureau in that case.

We will be submitting formal comments. We greatly support the regulations. We really think that they are imperative to bring states along where they're unwilling.

We hope that we will continue this process, 1 2 and that this is a real opportunity to make change. 3 Thank you. 4 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. ANDREA SMITH: 5 I'll keep it brief. My name is Andrea Smith. I'm an attorney with the Children 6 7 and Family Services Department at the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe in Kingston, Washington. 8 9 The tribe is in full support of the changes 10 to the regulations that you're proposing. We will be 11 supplementing other written comments. 12 I would just like to tell you that the 13 regulations will help make practices much more 14 consistent across states. I've done a lot of transfers of 15 16 jurisdiction, and they're very different in each 17 State jurisdiction that you speak with. 18 One particular jurisdiction -- and I tell 19 you this story with full support of the tribe -- we 20 had a grandma who lived in a different state. 21 Because at that point in time, economics are hard. 2.2 People move away. 23 The State stepped in on the case. 24 daughter had a drug problem, took away one baby. 25 Figured out -- or decided that the tribe had nothing

to do with the case and decimated the rest of the 1 family within two months. 2 3 And the entire tribe -- so our chairman got 4 involved. Our legal department was involved. Wе 5 contacted attorneys all over that particular state. And there wasn't really anything that we could do. 6 Grandma still thanks us for our 7 involvement. But I consider that a loss, because we 8 9 lost a child, and then we lost five more. And the 10 entire tribe feels a loss. 11 So please, anything you can do, 12 regulations, especially. Thank you for all of your 13 help. 14 LARRY ROBERTS: Thank you. 15 So these will be the last two comments. 16 Because we already went earlier saying that those 17 were the last comments. JOHN DOSSETT: 18 Oh. I'm sorry. 19 My name is John Dossett. I'm a General 20 Counsel for the National Congress of the American 21 Indian. It's an organization of tribal governments. 22 I mostly wanted to express that NCAI very 23 much supports the regulation and appreciates all your 24 work in getting them to this point. 25 NCAI has been advocating for regulations

25

enough.

1 rather than just guidance. So having binding regulations that will result in early placements in 2. 3 the correct locations seems like a very good step in 4 the right direction. And I'll leave it at that and turn it over 5 to the National Indian Child Welfare Association. 6 7 DAVID SIMMONS: Okay. So this is David I'm the Government Affairs Director for the 8 Simmons. 9 National Indian Child Welfare Association. 10 And I just want to start by commending the 11 Bureau of Indian Affairs for their work to take 35 12 years of case law and practice and experience and 13 bring it into a much more defined and clarified 14 We need this. process. 15 So in our office, we take somewhere over a 16 thousand calls every -- every year from parents, 17 professionals, tribes, other interested advocates who 18 are trying to understand how to implement the Indian Child Welfare Act. 19 20 The sad truth is that in many of these 21 cases we have little to offer to people who call, 22 because the law itself isn't clear in some areas. 23 The guidelines have provided some help, but not

So we see kind -- we actually hear

2.

firsthand some -- and know what the consequence are when we don't have clarity in the law.

The other thing I want to mention is there's a lot of discussion today about, you know, tensions between going back and forth between what kind of families our -- our Native children and youth can be placed in.

One of the things that's really missing in the conversation is that there is federal law that requires every State to have a diverse pool of foster and adoptive families that reflect the children who are in their care.

There is not one State in this country -not even -- not even one that's close to having
enough Native children in families who can be placed
in native-licensed homes.

The tribes, unfortunately, have beared the burden of trying to find many of these placements.

They gladly do that.

But the States are not doing enough to provide these homes. And some of the private interests are not doing enough to find these homes.

We personally know of many, many cases where we have licensed Native families who are available for adoption in foster care, and who are

```
looked over time again -- after time, after time.
 1
     And they're chosen sometimes in cases for non-Native
 2
 3
     children. We don't understand that.
 4
               So these are the kinds of things that we
 5
     need to correct.
               And we appreciate you being here.
 6
                                                  Thank
 7
     you very much.
 8
               LARRY ROBERTS:
                               Thank you.
 9
               And I just want to say thank you to
10
     everyone for attending this session today. I really
11
     appreciate everyone's comments.
12
               There were a number of comments here today
13
     that were specific, saying, you know, Please change,
14
     for example, the qualified expert witness in a
15
     certain way, shape or form. Those comments are
16
     extraordinarily helpful to us as we're going through
17
     the proposed rules and evaluate how can we move
     forward with the final rules.
18
               So I thank you all. And I remind everyone
19
20
     that the deadline to submit written comments is
21
     May 19th.
22
               So thank you.
23
               (The Public Meeting concluded at
24
     12:22 p.m.)
25
```

```
1
                     CERTIFICATE
 2
     STATE OF OREGON
                              SS.
 3
     COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH
 4
 5
             I, Sinead R. Wilder, a Notary Public for
     Oregon, do hereby certify that, pursuant to
 6
 7
     stipulation of counsel for the respective parties
 8
     hereinbefore set forth, that the proceedings occurred
 9
     before me at the time and place set forth in the
10
     caption hereof; that at said time and place I
11
     reported in Stenotype all testimony adduced and other
12
     oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that
13
     thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting under
     my direction; and that the foregoing transcript,
14
15
     pages 1 to 143, both inclusive, constitutes a full,
     true and accurate record of all such testimony
16
     adduced and oral proceedings had, and of the whole
17
18
     thereof.
19
             Witness my hand and notarial seal at
2.0
     Portland, Oregon, this 29th of April, 2014.
21
22
                           Sinead Wilder
23
                           SINEAD R. WILDER
2.4
                           Certified Shorthand Reporter
                           Certificate No. 13-0426
25
```

_	122:6 124:10 126:16	30 11:5 12:4 24:9 20:7	index: (1)ac
(123:6 134:19 136:16 1979 6:24 7:7 40:18	30 11:5 12:4 24:8 39:7 61:25	Α
	41:1,15 84:9	32 94:23	
(1) 81:3	1985 49:9	33 72:14	a.m. 3:2 58:25 59:1 79:2,3
(4) 81:3	1988 117:7	35 38:23 96:4 124:12,14	abandonment 21:13
1	1992 85:7	130:8 141:11	abhorrent 87:5,8
	1993 49:9	358 30:21	ability 28:23 32:18 33:1
10 24:8 137:25	1997 20:6	36-plus 40:6	97:9
100 132:5	19th 16:25 19:6 20:16	4	absence 42:4
10:51 79:2	143:21		absolute 79:25
10:55 79:1,3	1st 30:20	40 24:8 129:9 137:19	absolutely 57:19
11 54:17		45-page 39:16	58:14,15 64:17 82:16
11:00 79:5	2	46 54:24	absolve 80:6
11th 56:12	2 58:25 59:1	48 80:11	abuse 96:15,25 117:11 119:15,16,17,21 120:2
12 51:17 103:14 116:17, 18	20 4:16 11:7 24:8 53:3 129:14 137:17,18	5	abused 69:12,13 106:4 107:8 120:19
12:22 143:24	200 48:13	50 85:12 132:5	abusive 70:19 93:9
13 123:2	2003 38:9,17	50s 117:24	Academy 94:25 95:15
15 137:25	2010 23:21 38:9 60:20	303 117.24	acceptance 34:8
15.5 134:5	2011 32:16	6	accepting 80:13
16 49:5,25 68:23	2013 133:25	20 407 00 400 4	access 32:14 33:1,7
17 51:19 69:6	2014 7:3,6 30:20	60 137:23 138:1	accessible 59:12
1778 32:25	2015 3:1 30:16 134:22	60-plus 137:23	accident 50:5
18 116:25	21 63:13,22	60s 117:24	accidental 107:1
1878 32:3,5	22 3:1 49:5 50:20	63 129:15	account 60:25 61:2
19 32:3	229 137:8	67584 41:6	accountant 49:6
1921 49:17	23.1038 134:9	7	accurate 18:4
1931 83:12	23.114 97:12		ACDS 34:13
1950s 24:17	23.134 31:25	72 79:24	achieve 76:13
1952 41:17 95:22	23.2 81:3 96:18	79 7:3 41:18	acknowledge 78:6
1955 85:8 116:23	231 137:8	8	89:13,17 104:3
1958 32:16	25 41:16 50:21 95:22		acknowledged 90:5
1960s 122:19	137:10	87 136:6	acknowledging 89:25
1968 21:4	26 137:15		acknowledgment
1970s 122:19	27 123:2	9	89:14
1971 22:2	3	90 136:6	act 6:13,21 7:2 18:21 19:22, 20:24 21:14
1974 122:23		94 54:23	23:19,22 24:17 38:19
1978 6:14 20:24 32:21	3,500 87:2	9:03 3:2	39:20 40:21 42:9,19,22, 44:23 57:2, 73:23 74:4,

Index: (1)..act

16,19 79:20,21 88:22 101:14 122:12.17 **adoptees** 32:1,13,14 **agencies** 9:3,6, 26:20 33:7 39:5 31:24 75:22 135:16 127:13 130:15 133:23 90:14 95:10.16 113:13. 21 115:20 122:19 134:1,4 140:20 adopting 98:6 agency 9:10,24 10:4 124:1,2,4,18 130:9 11:11,19 14:8,12,14 Americans 36:10 133:6 141:19 adoption 15:14 16:3 28:11 30:1 32:17 41:13, analysis 127:18 24:18 31:24 32:17 **action** 10:22 15:17 23,24 47:8 80:15 107:5 35:13 42:11 47:5 49:16, 39:24 87:16 97:25 ancestor 131:8 18,23 53:4,5 54:10,24 agree 36:8 45:18 actions 97:19 126:4 74:16 81:2 85:9 94:23 ancestors 26:1 49:13 agreed 34:11 35:14,15 95:1,2,5,15 99:8 106:16 **active** 8:1 10:7,9 11:21 ancestry 57:10 58:4 107:5 120:17 131:13 ahead 3:6 53:16 79:8 12:24 27:9,10 29:24 142:25 Anchorage 127:13 30:4,7,13 56:21 75:5,7, **aid** 90:2 136:25 137:24 adoptions 38:15,16 10 86:24 128:1 133:9 airport 71:7 135:11 138:6,15 130:7 Andrea 139:5,6 Ajaya 55:7 actively 123:19 adoptive 6:20 16:6 **Angeles** 20:19 25:4,10, 22:4,8,11,15,18,22 **Alaska** 25:10 63:7 14 39:6 71:7 activities 29:25 97:2 32:20 48:3 49:24 58:22 64:20,22 103:9 104:12 anger 39:15 actual 90:7 59:4 61:24 87:22 127:14 128:17 129:5,8, 119:15 128:10 142:11 10,13,16 137:1,4,5,9, angered 63:12 65:6 actuality 90:7 15,16,18,19 138:3 adult 31:25 32:13,14 Angie 4:5 **ad** 73:17 75:8,16 112:6 33:7 39:5 52:4 106:22 **Alaska's** 129:15 114:10 121:17 **annoyed** 113:16 109:19 Alaskan 128:24 add 92:12 97:23 131:3 anonymity 10:4 14:16 adults 37:8 66:17 87:24 129:14,16 137:24 138:2 137:2,7 80:1,5,19 advance 46:19 Albuquerque 16:17 added 7:25 80:19 92:12 Anonymous 119:6 advanced 12:21 alcohol 72:24 addition 60:12 118:8 answers 67:3.4 advancing 31:23 138:4 alcoholic 50:5 83:22 antics 59:23 **advice** 124:3 alcoholics 83:20 additional 11:7 30:11 anymore 50:3 31:9 60:4 61:19 Adviser 4:2 alcoholism 65:15 **Apache** 44:13,14 Additionally 56:23 advisory 7:12 29:20 **alive** 70:15 80:25 apologies 46:5 advocate 64:13 **Allie** 110:24.25 address 42:6 47:3 apologize 4:12 114:8 80:21 95:16 119:21 advocates 26:19 36:25 allowed 32:23 33:2 apologized 115:12,13 78:5 141:17 34:3 92:1 101:10 addressed 20:10 106:16 116:4 appalling 107:24 94:15 121:2 advocating 140:25 allowing 25:25 26:2 **Appeals** 37:15 115:8 adequate 31:2 124:13 **Affairs** 3:10,14 14:3 17:11 29:13 30:17 78:8 **Aloha** 133:20 appellate 40:6 administration 42:1 122:12,17 123:11,23,25 **Alonzo** 32:15 applicability 9:1 administrative 41:12. 132:3 141:8,11 23,24 **altar** 50:17 application 30:7 57:19 affect 24:7 112:7 128:3 adopt 7:21 22:24 34:3 amazing 64:13 affected 49:16 60:4 116:5 **applied** 19:3 47:5 amazingly 131:2 affiliated 58:4 81:23,25 96:21 108:13 adopted 20:23 22:1 **amend** 38:19 124:19 affiliation 56:24 131:8 23:2,17 48:15 56:14 63:24 66:15 70:8,9 95:8 amended 39:20 applies 8:21 afternoon 62:20 100:3,4,6,12 103:3 America 52:6 apply 30:14 42:11 105:25 107:6 116:24 age 40:13 91:16 103:3, 81:21 96:7,8 126:20 119:6 14 **American** 25:9,15 134:10,15 35:25 44:11 94:25 adoptee 20:23

Index: action..apply

Index: appreciated..birth

appreciated 19:12	assimilation 110:1	authority 19:5 40:10	Bay 111:1
appreciates 140:23	assist 62:15 113:12	41:17, 46:22 95:21,23, 25 124:11	beared 142:17
appreciative 30:8	assistant 3:9 4:2 14:3	avoidance 80:17	Bears 32:6
approach 80:16	17:10 111:7	awake 59:1	beaten 69:5 72:21
approached 5:9 32:21	Associates 123:9	aware 40:1	Beatrice 84:24
approved 29:15	Association 19:17 122:12,16,24,25 141:6,		beautiful 33:11 49:5
April 3:1 30:20	9	В	69:1 72:12 88:1
arcane 61:8	assumed 120:19	baby 47:3 54:5 63:23	beauty 67:19
arduous 94:18	Athabascan 63:7	114:18 139:24	bed 70:24
area 23:7 30:9 67:2	attachment 43:21,23	back 19:20 32:18 37:2	beg 38:21 71:23
76:14,17 86:24 87:12 94:17 95:4 96:11,12	66:5,8,13,19 92:20,23, 24,25 93:2,5,10,16,19,	51:6 52:13,19 53:2 55:11 56:2 61:10 62:16,	began 60:19 123:7
99:7	20 125:8,13 126:7	17,18 68:9,12 70:11	begged 38:17
areas 13:21 20:15	attachments 125:10	78:25 79:1 83:17 84:9 85:13 115:9 118:13,19	begin 11:3 56:4 88:15 98:12 132:10
53:14 96:10 117:21 134:8 141:22	attempt 136:4	120:18 130:2 132:7	beginning 25:18
arguing 112:19 113:17	attempted 57:25	135:24 136:2 142:5	133:10,13
argument 119:24	119:19	back-door 80:16	begins 127:24
126:7	attempts 33:18	background 6:12 120:22 122:16 130:15,	behalf 12:8 26:14 55:13
arguments 93:1	attended 35:3	20,24 131:19,25 132:8	67:22 81:13 84:15 95:3 99:25 102:24
Arizona 21:3 22:19 33:20,21 37:15,24	attending 105:11 143:10	bad 50:6 58:11 69:15 75:25 103:22 104:7	behaviors 96:23
38:15 45:3	attention 34:8 66:13	badge 31:13	believes 48:21
arm 50:8	136:9	bags 62:15	believing 70:14
arms 93:21	attentive 89:4	Bailey 33:10,11 37:14,	bench 115:11
army 49:8 51:19	attest 15:2	25	bent 56:7
Arnesto 102:21	attorney 7:12 18:17 26:13 28:15 39:5 57:14	balances 48:7	bet 132:4
Art 86:19 94:8	73:17 75:9 79:15 94:21	Bands 111:1	Beth 12:6
articulate 88:17,25	112:6,15 127:12 130:5 139:6	banging 69:8	BIA 16:2 17:13 21:25
91:7 118:15	attorneys 26:19 47:11	Bar 94:24 95:1	31:3 42:15 78:8 105:22
articulates 6:21	95:1,15 112:5 113:11	bare 24:9 25:1,19	Bible 101:18
articulating 88:20	123:19 140:5	barrier 68:2	big 61:12 81:21 129:4,5
arts 52:18	audience 17:13,19	barriers 110:3	biggest 27:9 55:18
ASFA 74:15,24	auditorium 17:25	based 15:1,10,18 70:2	bill 123:19 124:6
aspirations 74:1 78:4	audits 47:22	126:25 127:13 133:25	binding 41:18 141:1
asserting 14:22	aunt 50:19 51:5,12	basically 19:21 90:15	biological 21:6,8,17 22:2,3 35:12 103:4
assign 41:12	auntie 49:14 50:13	95:3	·
assigned 21:25	aunties 93:23	basis 14:21 124:16 132:7	Bird 70:9
_	05:44.00:47.40		birth 21:9 23:17,25
Assignment 41:21	aunts 35:14 83:17,19 authored 26:4	Basque 24:14	32:14,19 33:1,8 45:1,2,

business 49:6 65:8 80:2 89:21.23 **boy** 62:6 carried 32:10 121:3 100:19 101:6.23.24 boy's 62:11 byproduct 24:11 carry 32:5,9 121:5 **boys** 49:5 69:2 **Carter** 124:2 **bit** 6:12 9:13 43:5 62:23 C 103.2 **braces** 102:1 Cascades 55:21 Bitsue 22:2 **braid** 51:12 case 10:10 12:20 26:25 C-h-a-l-l-y 130:5 29:9 30:13 36:22 38:3 **Bizaad** 21:22 **branch** 102:23 calculus 78:2 45:2 47:4 64:3 76:21,23 black 83:6 84:3 **brand** 111:24 77:4 80:8 90:10.13 California 23:21 69:10 70:24 71:1 89:5,16 91:8,9 104:15 111:13, blessed 44:15 break 64:1 78:24 119:7 15,21,23,24 112:1,2,3, 109:11 7,13,14,19 113:5,18 blessing 3:16,18,19 **breath** 95:18 call 62:5 112:15 141:21 114:15,16 115:5,7,13, blessings 38:11 briefly 14:4 55:16 24,25 124:11 130:18 **called** 25:8 39:1 45:7 124:22 133:10,14 134:13 blood 51:14,16 87:4 50:3 51:22 68:25 70:1,9 138:17,21 139:23 140:1 bright 4:11 58:16 83:8,15 106:24 114:25 bloodline 36:23 141:12 119:5 **bring** 57:21 60:22 68:5 board 20:5,6 60:9 caseload 60:23 79:19 138:24 141:13 calling 23:10 boarding 24:16 72:17 cases 18:25 20:7 27:2 bringing 109:24 128:1 calls 141:16 75:20 106:12 109:25 30:16 31:10 40:7 42:20 **brings** 87:19,20 Campbell 4:5 Bodie 4:9 45:17,18 46:24 75:11 77:14 86:11 87:2,3,4 **broad** 124:10 camps 24:14 bodies 70:6 90:1,18 92:3 96:14 **broke** 63:9 Canada 22:21 23:3, 111:5,9,12 126:3 **bodily** 96:20 79:15 83:4 130:18 133:17 134:15 broken 66:1 106:18 **body** 106:25 141:21 142:23 143:2 **cancer** 52:11 **brother** 32:15 70:12 **bond** 34:25 93:10.15 caseworker 21:25 85:16 100:18 101:5 **Canyon** 21:2,18 121:1,2,3,9 127:1 104:10,11 108:1 102:8 cap 101:25 **bonding** 66:5,8,12 cast 44:19 50:17 brothers 22:25 92:20,22,23,25 93:1,4 capacity 31:2 catch 5:11,14,18 17:20 112:12 120:25 125:7,9, brought 122:21 136:8 car 50:25 117:6 26:8,10 13 126:7 brown 29:16 135:8 card 135:4 categories 31:3,9 bonding/attachment building 19:10 15:7 care 13:4 16:6 21:24 categorizes 70:10 **built** 64:10 24:18 30:19,23 33:13 **bonds** 127:2 Catherine 94:20,21 36:12,18 42:11 45:5 **Bull** 78:19 **bones** 50:9 51:17 52:1 58:25 63:19 Catholic 106:12 **bullet** 50:7 92:8 65:3,17 69:10,20 70:7, **book** 113:11 **caused** 27:16 17 78:5 81:2 103:5,14, **bunch** 125:9 book's 70:9 21,25 109:24 110:15,16 **cave** 4:1 9:16 136:12 burden 14:22 142:18 128:9 129:16 137:20 **books** 101:18 **census** 54:3, 76:16,24 138:1 142:12,25 burdened 65:14 border 82:2 **Center** 18:16 **career** 28:25 Bureau 123:10.23.24 bordered 83:3 ceremonies 54:15 132:2 138:21 141:11 careful 39:13 131:12, **born** 20:21,22 32:5,15 13 certificate 21:10 23:17, Burford 22:21 72:3 81:9 83:12 103:9 25 32:19 33:1 53:5,8, carefully 39:18 46:22 114:18 116:22 **Burton** 4:7 12:6,13 18,24 89:23 107:1 47:9 18:15 bounced 63:10 **certified** 49:5 135:3,5, Carolina 38:1 **bury** 70:6 17,19 136:13 **boundaries** 34:8 60:10 carpet 49:1 **bus** 50:22 certify 110:3

Index: bit..certify

chain 135:10

chairman 140:3

Chairman's 123:9

challenges 96:3,9

champion 116:11

63:1 103:6 122:2

change 8:12 15:23

changed 8:7,9,13,17

20:1,14 23:18 49:24 64:22 84:11 117:23

139:2 143:13

changing 91:19

charge 60:20 61:25

Cherokee 54:8 55:3

Cheyenne 68:18 73:13

chief 32:9 46:7 48:12

child 6:13,22 7:2 8:21,

22 9:4,5,6,7,8,11,21,22,

25 10:1,11 11:15,19,20

15:19 16:4 18:20 19:17,

22 20:24 21:13 30:2,13

12:7,23 13:9,19 14:9

36:24 37:2,3,5 38:19

39:20 40:21 41:11,25

44:8,9,11,23 46:14 48:2

42:9,18,20,22 43:2

Chapter 80:11

check 120:22

checks 48:7

110:25 111:6

121:21

chance 4:24 5:7 17:18

Chally 130:4,5

Index: chair	ncomments@bia.gov.
Chinese 71:11	clearinghouse 106:14
Chinle 22:19	clip 9:17
choice 102:5	close 49:3 94:9,16
choke 67:14	107:18 129:6 142:14
choose 36:1	closely 7:14 123:18
chosen 143:2	closer 137:25
Christ 22:9	closest 77:20,21,22
Christian 101:11	closet 49:1
109:10	Club 46:7 48:12
Chumash 86:21	code 59:9,21 80:10
church 22:8,10,13 50:14,15,17 100:22	codes 60:7 80:24
church's 22:16 23:6	cold 37:6
churches 52:6 75:21	collaborate 29:23 33:6
Cindy 33:10 37:14 38:1	collaboration 31:23
circles 121:14	colleagues 86:7
circumstance 132:6	college 18:17 24:23 28:15 49:7
circumstances	colleges 24:22
125:14 130:13,22,25 131:12,14 132:9,15	color 44:20
cited 41:17	Comanche 31:14 32:21,24
citizen 79:14	comfortable 5:24 37:4
citizens 25:1 44:25 111:22	commend 29:19
city 16:18 23:3 71:9	commending 141:10
claims 91:10	comment 4:18,19 6:2 16:12 29:11 37:25
Clan 86:22	98:21 120:24 121:12
clarification 27:8,18,	122:2
24 99:14	commentary 46:1,2
clarifications 27:12	comments 4:25 5:4, 15,21,24,25 6:4,10 8:4,
clarified 58:8 141:13	6,10,11,15 16:13,25
clarifying 47:4	17:1,16,17 18:7,12,14 19:5,21 29:15,22 37:19
clarity 20:2 30:12 92:5 142:2	46:1,3 57:13 62:25 75:2,4 79:6 81:12 82:13
class 18:20 52:17	86:6,8 94:6 95:14
clear 8:20 13:5 14:16, 23 18:6 40:12 59:11 60:8 88:9 91:3 103:13 122:15 124:12 131:18	121:25 122:3,13 127:18 132:20 133:2 134:7 138:22 139:11 140:15, 17 143:11,12,15,20
141:22	comments@bia.gov.

17:2

55:15 57:10 59:2,6 61:3 62:4 63:9,10 64:4,5 65:16 67:25 68:4 70:1 72:3,4 73:18,23 74:4,19 75:11,12 79:21,24 80:1, 7 83:21,22 85:8,13 86:25 87:13 88:1,21 89:13,18,25 90:1,2,3,5, 14,20,24 91:9,10,15 93:2,10 94:14 95:10 96:15,25 97:7,14,16,18, 19 98:1 107:15 109:20, 23 110:7 111:17 112:1, 2,3 113:12,21 114:16

115:20 116:5,6,9,23 117:16,17,18 118:16, 18,21 120:7,12,18,20 122:18,22 124:1,18 126:5 130:9 133:5,11, 25 134:2,6 140:9 141:6, 9,19

child's 10:15,17 12:21 13:17 14:9 15:3,4,23 16:8 36:22 37:1 91:18 121:20 127:1

child-placing 30:1 child-rearing 13:19

childhood 21:14 104:22 105:3

children 6:15,18,19 19:23 20:11 22:6,13,2 25 23:7,8,11 24:10,11 25:2,14,20 30:19,22 31:7,11 33:12,14,16 34:4,6,11,14,16,22,23 35:1,7,8,17,19,22 36: 5,9,17,24 37:11 38:8, 13,24 39:3 40:23 43:3 8,17 44:1,2,3,25 45:1 16,20 47:17 48:18 50 12 55:25 56:14 57:1 58:3,4,5,11,16,17,24 60:5,22,25 61:9,10,21 22 62:1,16 63:8 64:15 65:16,23,25 66:2,8,9, 14,22,25 67:22 68:6,8 11 69:20,22,23 70:4,5 8,15,21 71:20 72:1,15 23 73:1,2,4,15 74:7,1 16,18 75:14,18,19,23 76:10,12,17,19,20,22 77:9,13,15,20 78:21 84:1,2,5 85:12 86:11 87:6,9,18,19,23 88:16 91:21 92:11 93:6,8,12 13,14,22 95:11 96:22 97:5,6,23 98:4,7,13,2 105:20 106:14 107:5 108:14 109:24 110:4, 117:3,25 126:10 128: 129:14,15 134:1,5 136:20 137:18,19,20 138:1 142:6,11,15

children's 22:19 38:10 40:7 80:10,24

143:3

Index: commission..court

116:18 124:15 125:1,4 128:5 133:17 136:3 138:8,14 court's 12:22 courtroom 38:5 55:23

57:3 59:23 61:6

courts 9:3,6,20 19:1 28:4 31:24 41:10,13,22 42:1,19,25 44:14 55:25 57:9,14 59:12 82:5 87:2,3,13 88:8,11,14 89:3 90:8,11 116:1,2 126:20 138:5

cousin 22:2 83:18

cover 17:7

covered 17:8

CPS 33:20,21

cracks 84:13 88:11

crazy 51:11 52:21,22

create 20:11 39:13

created 28:18 99:21

creates 80:16 85:25

creating 36:16

creation 67:4

credit 28:23

Cree 133:4

cried 51:9

crime 98:1

criminal 96:14,25 97:19

critical 132:22

cruel 41:3

crying 85:14,18

cultural 25:11 98:14 99:3 101:12 103:23 107:3

culture 25:22 28:21 29:3 31:16 64:14,17 73:6 95:12 106:7 109:17 110:9 116:10 127:4

cultures 127:3

curb 69:8

curious 102:25

curl 51:1

current 30:6 48:8,9 119:20

curriculum 22:16

custodian 10:12 11:4,5 13:8 15:20 97:15.17

custodians 134:18

custody 8:1,22 10:11 12:3 13:7 30:19 38:8 41:11 42:20 97:14 116:6 134:11,14 135:10

cut 101:16

cutting 98:19

Cynthia 37:25

D

D.C. 32:7,10

dad 100:3,11,12

dad's 115:5

daddy 49:19,22 51:15 53:10 54:6, 62:7

Dahlstrom 55:6,7

Dakota 23:4.15

Dakotas 23:9

damage 11:14 12:2 13:9 96:19 97:4,24

Dammasch 50:23

dance 116:12

dancer 116:11

danger 95:19 96:17 97:3

07.0

Danielle 81:5,7

Darrington 55:20

Darryl 32:15

data 30:21 54:16

date 16:24

dates 35:3

daughter 65:1 69:15 72:4,7,8,10 85:18 106:22 139:24

daughters 22:4 50:13

David 141:7

day 37:1 38:12 83:11 88:13 114:18 117:4

day-to-day 86:10

days 11:3,5,7 12:4 16:7 34:18 106:1,13

deacon 50:14,15

dead 52:8

deadline 143:20

deadness 54:21

deal 27:2 28:23 82:4,5 99:8 117:10

dealing 26:25 59:16 66:1 133:13

death 65:9 69:5 96:20 106:25

Deb 12:6

Debra 4:7 12:13

decade 128:14

decades 82:21

deceased 103:4

decide 11:24 12:1 67:13 96:7

decided 21:18 42:19 62:9 63:25 101:2, 139:25

deciding 115:22

decimated 140:1

decision 15:4 77:1,2,6 123:22

decisions 74:6 77:8,19

96:5 124:15 128:5 **declaration** 42:5

acolaration 42.

decrease 19:2

decree 16:3 120:17

defensive 85:4

deference 74:5

define 87:15, 88:16 90:11

defined 21:7 141:13

defines 94:12

defining 74:2 92:4

definition 8:12,16 42:6 59:9 81:1 92:6 95:19 96:17 97:10,22,23

definitions 7:25 8:2 127:24,25

degree 72:25 73:19

delay 126:5

delegation 124:13

delete 84:22

deliberate 126:4

demanding 37:2

demons 50:18 51:4

demonstrated 94:10,

denied 24:2 36:10 64:24 115:3

deny 64:23 112:12

depart 14:25

department 3:10,22 4:4 6:24 16:8 25:14 33:21 41:8,20 55:15 95:21,22 96:2 123:25 138:20 139:7 140:4

dependency 30:13

depending 137:8

deposited 136:2

Deputy 3:9 81:10

DES 34:20 35:21

descending 13:15

describe 29:25

deserve 43:3,4 73:5 98:11 99:10

designated 10:15 61:23

designation 10:19

index. designedende			
58:20	diligently 79:19	doors 131:6	eat 52:14
designed 42:24 126:9	Diné 21:22 24:23 38:6	Dossett 140:18,19	Economic 33:21
designees 16:22	39:11 70:3,11	doubt 13:11	economics 139:21
detail 12:25	direction 39:22 56:1 88:9 128:5 141:4	drafted 74:10	educate 23:11
detailed 19:4 122:13	directly 94:1 95:8	drafters 124:6	educating 24:21
determination 11:20	director 17:12 29:13	drafting 123:19	education 22:9,10
15:8 80:15 126:5	55:14 122:11,25 123:1	dragged 62:11	120:11
determined 9:7	141:8	dread 27:1	educational 22:15
determines 10:22	Director's 4:10	dream 22:5	effect 66:4 75:24
determining 9:1 12:18 42:25	disability 94:15	dreams 51:10 52:13,	effectively 61:5
detriment 23:12 95:11	disabled 88:1	19,24 54:12	effectuate 74:13
detrimental 75:24	discharge 49:11	driver's 23:24	effectuated 47:7
devalue 99:1	discussed 88:24	driveway 117:5	effort 29:6 56:21 126:2
develop 118:16,23	discussion 142:4	drop 79:23 80:2 135:22	efforts 8:1 10:7,9 11:21 12:25 27:9,11,12 29:24
123:12	dismiss 10:22	drove 51:2 117:5	30:2,5,8,13 75:5,7,10
development 24:5	Disorder 66:13	drug 107:2 139:24	81:14 94:17 128:1 133:9 138:7,15
118:18	disposition 43:1	drug-free 72:24	ego 55:12
developmental 94:13	dispositions 14:14	drug-making 97:1	egregious 45:15 83:5
deviate 27:15 124:23	distance 4:23	drugs 63:23	eight-year-old 43:12
125:15	distinct 92:15	drum 55:1,2	electronic 136:14
deviating 126:13 128:8	distinction 40:17	drums 54:20	eligibility 90:22 91:12
Dexter 94:20,21	disturbing 107:19	due 16:25 36:4 45:13	eligible 58:5,17 61:4
DHS 29:13 30:17	diverse 142:10	dumb 52:2	90:20 91:11,18,23
102:23 104:9	DNA 32:6,9	duress 15:15	Elk 73:10,12,13
diagnosed 52:10	doctor 21:24	dying 110:21	Elm 32:9
diagnosis 21:15	doctors 52:21	E	email 17:1,2
dictionary 101:18	doctrinal 18:20	-	embody 128:12
died 21:6 52:9,10 70:6, 13 107:1,3 109:9	document 23:25 63:17	E-s-c-h 133:22	emergency 11:10,17,
difference 135:2,6	documentation 14:19 37:16 56:21	E-verify 24:3	18,23,25 59:3
differently 82:6 114:13	documented 12:25	earlier 7:16 128:11 129:7 140:16	emotional 15:5 39:12 117:10 119:17,21 120:1
138:10	documenting 11:12	early 5:12 9:3 93:21	emotionally 104:24
differs 27:11	documents 10:5 37:15	122:19 141:2	106:5 107:8
difficult 26:22 131:2	56:16	Earth 28:13 135:12	emphasized 58:19
132:19	dollar 67:6	easier 103:8	employment 24:3,4
difficulties 120:2	domestic 96:25	easily 51:9	empower 76:9,11 77:8
diligence 36:4	Domingo 20:22 21:9	east 98:17 102:23	empowers 75:13,14
diligent 14:17 125:20	door 56:2	easy 48:21 60:24	enact 95:23

Index: designed..enact

enacted 6:14 20:24 fails 96:22 establish 16:4 experiences 87:8 23:20 98:8.12 104:7 119:5 established 6:17 15:5 failure 132:12 **encourage** 60:2 77:23 93:16 **expert** 13:6,14,17,21 **fair** 124:5 91:6 117:14 15:6 30:15 31:1,2,4,6 establishes 15:14,17 87:1,2 92:3,5,6,9,21,22 fairly 88:20 130:10 encouraging 129:19 establishing 98:24 118:5,9 143:14 faith 33:6 end 17:24 60:18 61:21 expertise 47:11 126:23 Estelle 109:4 84:4 fall 58:5,6 Euro-american 127:4 expired 67:7 **ended** 11:17 34:25 **fallen** 84:13 109:13 explain 14:18 118:15 **Europe** 69:23 falls 80:9 **endure** 31:21 European 109:24 explained 46:23 familiar 37:3 84:19 110:11 energy 52:18 121:5 **explicitly** 42:23 47:3 families 6:16,19 24:15 evaluate 143:17 **enforce** 61:13 96:14 exploitation 97:1 25:3 34:21 40:7 68:2 **eventually** 23:4 117:12 71:20 72:1,2,19 74:16 enforced 23:20 47:21 Exposed 7:13 75:14,20 76:6,10 77:8, 57:12 102:19 **everyone's** 5:3 18:11 exposure 97:1 19,21 85:25 93:20 67:24 86:16 143:11 enforcement 61:14 95:11 98:8 99:9 109:13, **express** 99:4 117:15 108:7,10 **evidence** 13:5.11 21 110:2,3,5,14,16 119:25 120:6 140:22 133:23 142:6,11,15,24 14:16,23 43:5 135:25 engage 10:7 expressed 42:4 **evolved** 128:15 family 8:24 13:2 20:25 engaged 123:20 **extended** 13:1 127:2 21:17 22:25 25:14 exaggerating 82:25 enhanced 30:8 28:13,16,19 30:3 33:4 extent 13:3 31:20 35:3 36:1,6,16 38:2,11 examples 9:9, 83:24 enlisted 51:19,20 52:3 exterminating 82:24 43:18 44:17 45:5 50:11 **exceed** 95:20 enlistment 52:3 54:14 59:9,20 62:18 extra 69:25 65:9,10 68:4 70:13 exceeding 95:25 enriched 31:16 extraordinarily 143:16 71:16 72:9,13 83:23 exception 8:24 85:21 88:3 90:24,25 enrolled 32:23,24 extraordinary 15:4 91:2 95:1 96:11 100:1, 39:10 54:8 61:3 91:5,15 excerpts 41:2 41:14,20 94:9 125:14 100:2,11,13 101:23 4,7,9,19 103:7 104:16 **excuse** 42:13 106:1,2,8,10 109:16 109:5 **extreme** 120:3 137:13 110:9 117:18,19 120:12 executive 122:11 **enrollment** 58:5 61:4 **extremely** 27:6 136:11 125:22 127:2 131:15 123:1 90:20,21,22 91:11,12, 138:15 138:10,11 139:7 140:2 14,18,19,23 exercise 41:9 eyes 48:10 family's 21:20 76:25 **ensure** 128:23 **existing** 8:24 97:7 famous 78:20 entering 58:25 F **exists** 120:15 121:1 fascinating 55:22 123:10 128:19,21 entire 32:25 85:9,12 face 76:2 83:6 fast 92:24 140:3,10 **expand** 120:12,13 Facebook 84:16 father 21:8,10,13 22:8, entitled 97:5 98:4 expanded 110:20 15 32:20 66:18 68:25 faced 36:5 83:1 entrusted 115:22 expect 26:23,24 69:4 75:25 83:12,19 **facing** 79:18 89:9,10,12,17 envelope 135:7 expectation 123:20 **fact** 47:18 80:5 89:20 fear 27:1 48:2 environment 120:21 **experience** 13:23 75:8, 91:23 93:4 103:25 15 87:6 88:7,8 92:10 **February** 7:17 134:22 **Era** 105:21 111:9 124:7,14 128:13 93:22 118:11 120:3 131:3 132:17 136:8 **federal** 6:17,21 31:20 **erased** 90:15 124:14 141:12 137:21 138:9 39:23 40:4,5 42:23 erosion 25:23 experienced 30:7 43:16 60:7 61:14 73:25 factors 8:25 12:17,20 119:14,16,17,22 74:1,2 94:24 96:3,13 Esch 133:20,21 98:2 129:12 142:9

Index: enacted..federal

federalism 42:2	fine 121:18 137:11	foremost 127:16	frequently 130:11
federally-recognized	fingers 68:20	forget 60:12	Friday 65:1 66:23
	finish 36:23	form 98:6 123:13	frightened 115:2
feel 6:1 8:16 27:6 29:4 52:16 54:11,13 73:24	fire 21:1,15 136:17	143:15	front 29:17 57:3
74:9,10,20 75:9 76:12, 24 77:10,18 78:4,17,18	firehouse 79:25	formal 60:14 127:17 138:22	frustrating 130:12 136:11
106:10	first-generation 28:14,15	formalize 117:13	fulfill 22:23 74:20
feels 5:23 47:25 140:10	firsthand 61:12 142:1	formation 118:25	fulfilling 78:12
feet 136:17	five-minute 78:24	Fort 18:15	fulfills 73:24
fell 40:6	Flagstaff 37:24	Forty-four 119:15	full 38:5 45:13 67:19
Fellow 4:3 14:2	flawed 89:15	Forty-seven 119:16	105:17 107:23 139:9,19
felt 52:8,24 53:21 54:22	flew 38:1	Forty-three 119:18	full-blooded 33:12
fewer 137:17,18	flexibility 36:3 42:25	forum 6:3 116:15,16,17	function 90:5
fiancee 69:16	128:12,14,15	forward 17:3 48:23	functioning 29:1 95:9
field 92:21	flexible 37:10	82:11 91:9 116:16 124:17 130:1 132:7	Fund 127:13
fifteen-year-old 43:13	flight 5:17 26:8	143:18	funded 105:22
Fifty-one 119:19	flights 5:10,14 17:20	foster 6:20 13:4 16:6	funny 84:16
fight 44:1 67:15	26:10	21:24 24:18 25:16 33:13,24,25 36:17	funny-looking 53:9
fighting 24:9 25:1 65:6	floorboard 51:2	38:23 42:11 44:2,7 48:5	future 24:7,8 34:10
115:15	flourished 35:2	52:1 58:25 61:7,23 62:3,9 63:8,14,19,20	49:14 66:22 68:13
figure 83:9	flower 67:17	64:13 65:25 67:22 68:2	
Figured 139:25	flowers 67:13	69:10,12,13,14,16 70:17,19 81:2 83:15	
file 59:24 102:1	fluent 116:8	87:7 93:2 101:24 102:6,	gaining 68:4
files 39:9 100:12,15	flying 71:8	12,22 107:14,23 109:24 110:5 116:4 128:9	Gallop 21:19,24
filled 70:24	focus 75:4 95:17 130:7	129:16 138:1 142:10,25	Gamble 139:7
final 16:3 54:7 126:5 143:18	134:16	fostered 22:1 119:6	garden 67:1
finalization 130:1	focused 130:8	found 21:5,25 22:24	gather 117:13
finally 18:8 19:25 28:3,	folks 3:22 5:6,9,13,18 17:5,19,24 18:13 29:10	32:16,18 34:20 35:23 42:8 53:13 54:3, 69:7	gave 34:16 52:25 53:15
12 81:15 92:5 105:18	37:19 55:9 62:22 125:9	70:13 88:7 107:18	64:6 95:22 112:15 114:18
find 15:9 34:17 53:10,	129:19 follow 14:14 20:9 80:7	109:22	geared 82:23 84:7
14,20 55:22 57:1 67:5 83:23 87:8 88:11 90:19	93:3,5 115:24	Foundation 57:24	Geez 45:24
91:22 108:4 109:12	foods 52:14	founded 119:3	genealogy 53:12
118:23 125:14 126:3 130:13 131:7,17	foot 21:1	founding 94:25	general 7:22 46:18
142:18,22	foothills 55:21	fourth 13:24	81:10 99:15 111:7
finding 22:12	force 20:20 25:13 28:18	fraction 76:22	130:9 136:24 140:19
findings 119:9	forced 83:2 85:8	Frankfurt 49:9	General's 7:12 57:14
finds 97:13	106:15 107:4 110:1,4	fraud 15:15	generally 49:2 99:19
	132:1	frequent 138:14	generation 24:16 26:2 32:4,5 68:14 75:21,22

Greenleaf 110:24.25 half 38:10 43:8 105:15 governor's 29:16 generations 24:8,12 grabbed 62:10 hand 30:18 62:11 68:5 grew 66:15 75:18 **grade** 76:1 100:25 grief 104:6 120:3 hand-delivered 39:16 genocidal 25:23 101:2 102:8 handled 10:20 ground 17:8 77:21 genocide 107:3 gradually 100:23 86:10 hands 69:18 gentleman 39:6 graduate 49:7 grounds 80:9 129:2 handwritten 53:9 128:10 grandchildren 87:24 **group** 5:2 25:13 36:19, Hannah 63:6 geographic 98:20 24 37:6 67:23 113:10 grandfather 28:17 **happen** 34:5 37:9 43:6 Germany 49:9 64:19 **aroups** 13:2 82:25 76:3 82:8 89:19 113:25 **get all** 18:3 grandma 50:23 116:5, grow 33:14 36:11 118:16 6,8 139:20 140:7 72:14,15 73:6 Ghost 20:22 happened 29:2 66:7 grandmas 77:2 93:23 growing 76:18 83:22 76:4,5 82:20 84:10 Gil 19:14,15 111:17 85:17,23 86:4 102:3,18 116:10 **Gina** 4:3 14:1,2 17:4 114:15 116:13 grandmother 21:21 grown 65:8 **qirl** 47:4 52:2 54:6 28:25 49:18 53:3 77:5 happening 21:14 **GSA** 19:9 63:22 72:13 106:19 91:4 105:24 114:17 47:20 84:11 107:10 guaranteed 120:16 grandmothers 93:24 happy 37:20 53:5 girls 111:21 112:8 guarded 130:19,21,22 104:21 grandparents 21:2,7 24:14 35:15 72:2,20 quardian 73:17 75:8,16 harassing 85:2 **give** 3:18 20:2 38:15 112:6 114:10 121:17 41:2 44:4 45:12 72:9 granny 49:15 50:7,25 hard 47:15 77:1 92:24 73:4,6 80:2 106:15 51:7,14 52:9 54:16 guardianship 77:5 101:13 102:9,12 105:7 136:10 101:3,8 102:14 112:10 121:6 139:21 granny's 49:24 53:17 giving 51:2 98:20 **harder** 120:5 54:10,23 quess 73:14 103:9 **glad** 19:25 20:13 grant-making 95:24 **harm** 11:14 12:2 13:9 guidance 30:9 31:3,5 gladly 142:19 95:19 96:17,19 97:4,24 47:6 74:11,13 88:10 granted 95:21 89:1 91:6 112:4 141:1 harmful 98:7 **goal** 8:18,20 110:7 grateful 106:11 107:9 guide 19:23 25:9 90:11 God's 23:11 133:8 138:18,19 haven 79:19 80:8,22 **guidelines** 6:24 7:7,9, Hawaii 109:16 gratification 101:15 **golly** 63:13 15,17 25:20,21 26:5 great 5:16 28:23 33:6 29:24 30:6 35:24 36:3, Hawk 116:21,22,24 **good** 3:5, 9:16 12:13,19 39:4 66:6 71:19 81:20 125:10 127:8 14 37:10 39:23 40:4,16, 14:1,20,25 15:10 26:12 86:16 99:8 117:10 18,24 41:1,6 42:15 27:15,21 37:22 42:7,24 head 69:8,19 120:9 43:24 46:16 47:25 66:3 44:5,19 55:6 62:10,20 heal 25:2 117:14 64:25 73:10,11 75:18 81:18,19 88:11,19 great-grandfather 89:14 98:11 99:1 83:24 88:20 94:3,20 52:25 54:1 healing 24:21 25:11,17 101:4 110:20 112:12 110:19 123:7,13,23 109:19 117:12 134:22 141:23 great-grandmother 116:21 124:23 125:1 health 51:22 127:11 128:7,8,12,15, 64:21 **Gulf** 49:10 19,21,23 129:3 135:17 great-grandparents **healthy** 72:15,16 73:4 136:14 141:3 guys 105:2 24:12 **hear** 8:15 9:18 43:4 government 31:20 greatest 31:20 40:22 79:11 92:18 93:1 99:17 Н 61:14 107:4 141:8 117:2.22.23 120:24 greatly 19:11 63:12 governments 77:16, 141:25 66:17 138:23 **hair** 51:12 22 140:21 **heard** 7:7 54:19 57:13 green 135:4 Haley 133:4 **governor** 3:17,19 75:16 99:6 117:25 19:13, 29:16 129:22 137:6

136:17

holes 50:7 hundred 85:24 image 118:12,22 **hearing** 11:24,25 17:3 43:9.20 51:23 57:25 hundreds 71:24 holidays 116:7 immediately 97:16 122:23 125:2 129:11 115:4 137:4 home 20:12 30:2 33:13, hurt 39:2 51:4 20,24 35:2,5,6,10,11,22 immigrants 110:11 hearings 92:19 98:15 husband 33:11,13 50:4 36:11 51:6 53:1 54:20 63:25 **imminent** 11:14 12:2 heart 48:22 53:21 61:13 55:4 56:15 58:22 59:4,5 95:19 96:16,18 97:3,23 63:9 66:24 68:11 60:22 61:7,10,23,24 ı 107:18 62:1,16 63:10 64:3 65:5 **impact** 83:21 97:10 69:11,14 70:19 72:24 118:12 129:4,13,17,18 heartbeat 55:1,2 75:19 83:15,18 100:10, **I.D.** 23:24 24:4 **impacts** 83:10 heartbreak 76:2 16,20 101:22 102:4,6, ICWA 6:14,25 7:4,21 11.17 103:6.16 106:5 impending 96:19 hearts 54:16 71:21 8:19,21 9:1 15:16,18 107:7,9 108:20 110:6 imperative 58:14,15 20:5,7,19 25:13,21 heat 128:22 116:4 119:15,22 120:4, 138:24 26:5,25 27:2,15 29:21 6,18,21 129:8 heed 66:6 30:15 31:22 32:23 36:8, **imperfect** 87:13,14 **Homer** 79:11,13,14 14 47:12,25 55:17 57:5, held 98:16 113:24 impermissible 57:2 20,22,23 58:1,3,6 60:3 **homes** 6:20 33:25 34:3 **helped** 23:5 40:20 61:15 74:12 77:10 65:25 69:12,13 76:18 **implement** 7:4 141:18 80:16,19 81:21 82:5 87:7,10 93:6 103:15,17, **helpful** 8:14 27:7,13 implementation 6:25 86:9 98:8,12 102:22 21 109:12 117:9 119:23 28:10 143:16 7:4 8:19 104:14,15,18 105:16 128:25 142:16,21,22 **helping** 4:6 74:13 106:2 107:7,20 108:7 implemented 20:4 homeschooling 110:19 111:9 112:8,22 **herded** 24:13 101:17 importance 28:21 114:9,23 115:14 121:18 heritage 57:24 98:14 127:23 128:14,17 honor 29:17 38:2, 39:4 **important** 5:21,22 7:11 99:3 131:10 129:12,13,17 133:6 56:9 135:24 8:3,5 16:24 18:9 27:20 134:10,15,19 137:11,16 hesitate 97:8 28:2 42:8,16 44:23 honorable 49:10 60:22 ICWA'S 128:2,8 46:21 61:13 71:2 78:12, **Hey** 75:25 76:3 honored 31:19 121:11 14 82:10 86:3 88:15 ICWA-COMPLIANT **hide** 51:3 61:9 108:9 110:19 118:17 **hoop** 116:11,12 33:19 34:13 128:25 127:25 hiding 61:7,8,9 **hope** 44:9 78:15 139:1 **ICWA-ELIGIBLE importantly** 34:9 61:16 **high** 6:9 14:4 56:18 30:19,22 31:6,11 Hopi 44:14 improperly 97:14 **ID** 23:19 **highest** 73:25 75:12 hoping 17:21 77:3,7 78:4 134:2 improving 29:21 **Idaho** 100:5 hospital 21:3,5,18,19 imputed 42:3 highlight 15:22 50:23 70:19 79:25 idea 22:23 43:3 101:4 89:22 114:17 highlighted 14:12 in-state 30:23.25 123:14 128:11 hospitalized 50:20 inappropriate 132:24 **highly** 73:24 ideas 8:7 hospitals 79:22 hip 57:18 identified 58:17 89:24 incapacity 94:14 **hour** 56:12 include 15:6 31:5 HIPAA 57:17,19 identify 61:6 106:25 131:24 hours 79:24 included 14:21 78:1 Hispanic 45:6 identity 28:21 63:11 House 123:18 **history** 41:7,16 42:21 including 14:10 115:16 98:14 99:3 44:5 47:1 103:23 household 97:20 inconsistencies 118:14 123:4 ignores 127:1 18:25 19:2 82:8 huge 28:18 40:17 hit 6:9 ill 44:16 inconsistent 30:7 **human** 12:9 23:14 **Ho-chunk** 79:16 illegal 112:21 inconsistently 81:23, 25:23 hold 93:21 106:16 illegally 20:12 70:8 25 humans 31:21

Index: hearing..inconsistently

112:9

increased 92:5

incredible 28:9

28:2 42:16

increasing 19:10

incredibly 27:13,20

15,16,18,22,23 7:1

Indian 3:10,14 4:7 6:13,

8:21,24 9:4,5,7,8,11,22

10:1,11,12 11:4,5,20

12:7,10 13:8 14:3,9 15:19,20 16:8 17:10

18:20 19:17,21,22

20:24 21:2,18,19 23:6

24:10 25:5,10,15 30:2,

12 36:9,17 37:11 38:19

39:20 40:21 41:11 42:9,

18,20,22 43:2 44:9,23

46:13 48:2 49:20 51:14

53:22 54:25 55:2,3,14,

15,19 56:3 58:4 60:13

61:11 73:22,25 74:1,2,

78:8,17 79:20 80:1,7

82:4 83:15 86:11,24

4,14,19 76:6,7 77:13,15

88:21 90:14 91:9 95:10,

11 96:12,22 97:5,14,15,

22 98:4,7,10,13,14,24, 25 99:9 105:14 107:10

108:16 112:2 113:12,21

114:18,25 115:20,21

122:12,17,18 123:11,

129:13 130:8 131:10

132:3 133:5,11,23

134:1,4,18 140:21

141:6,9,11,18

23,25 124:1,18 126:10

117:16,17 118:21

Index: increased..Justice interpreted 40:16 J interrupt 114:2 intertwined 67:11 **J-i-l-l** 133:21 intervene 14:11 115:1, Jack 122:8,11 Jackson 4:3 14:1.2 intervened 111:23 **Jamey** 70:2 115:2 **Jay** 37:22,23 40:2 86:15 intervening 115:16 **Jeananne** 68:24 72:12 intervention 138:20 **Jenuna** 138:17 introduce 3:23 Jessica 63:6 introduced 23:19 **Jessie** 53:7 54:2 invalidate 15:17 **Jesus** 22:8 invariably 55:11,25 **Jill** 133:20,21 136:9 investigation 133:10 **Jim** 23:19 investing 64:14 **job** 47:15 48:21 66:18 inviting 96:2 86:16 88:20 113:6,15 involuntary 16:5 80:9, John 33:11 130:4 20,23 140:18,19 involved 36:22 54:21 join 17:5 91:8 123:2 137:16 140:4 joint 116:6 involvement 140:8 joke 41:3 84:21 involving 31:10 43:1 **Jones** 29:12,13 31:14 57:10 86:11 133:14 Joseph 60:22 lowa 59:17 journey 61:1 **IPAC** 46:8,11 judge 43:19 56:7 59:22 Irish 44:18 100:4 110:25 111:6,23,25 112:11 113:15 114:16 Iroquois 31:17 115:11 116:14 121:16 134:13 138:9

Indians 13:23 25:6 111:1

indicating 56:18

indications 92:19

indifferent 84:4

indigenous 18:16 24:10

indirectly 95:9

individual 46:23 67:17, 25 96:10 120:6 132:22

individuals 40:19,20 118:1 119:6,11

inflexibility 116:3

information 16:4,10 18:4 27:14 31:9 56:23 80:14 81:20 105:10 130:23 131:19 132:6,10

inherently 113:16

initial 4:25 17:7,17

initially 5:6

injuries 97:2

injurious 96:24

injury 96:20 97:24

Inlet 136:25

inside 52:8 102:17

instances 97:13

institute 22:17 119:2

instruct 39:25

insured 135:5

intended 41:8,19 88:10,17 89:1 128:3

intent 28:1 42:5 88:21, 24,25

intention 29:22

intentions 58:10

interest 6:15 26:16 34:15 35:8,17 36:2 115:18,23 122:20

interested 59:7 61:18 141:17

interests 55:25 73:17 75:6,9 77:13,15,25 126:10,16 136:19 142:22

intergenerational 28:18,22 83:8

Interior 3:10,22 16:9

Internets 53:11

interpretating 42:17

interpretation 20:3 32:22 47:7 74:12 138:6

interpretations 127:22

isolated 54:11,18

issue 5:21,22 18:9 21:16 57:21 79:18 90:21 92:24 94:9 96:15, 16 107:17 122:21 123:23 125:6 138:3

issued 6:24,25 7:17,18

issues 7:23 20:10 66:5, 9,19 82:5 87:11 89:2,6, 13 90:2,3 92:24 95:16 124:13,16 126:18 130:9

issuing 128:18

item 60:4

28:10 113:11,12 128:18

judges 26:19 27:25

Judicial 116:15,16

jug 67:9

jugs 67:6

July 22:2 117:7

jumped 69:5

jurisdiction 10:23 59:13 76:15 95:24 127:21 139:16,17,18

Justice 123:25 138:20

justified 46:24	Lake 16:18	LDS 22:13 23:4,5	lifelong 83:20
	Lakota 23:8	Lead 122:24	light 4:11
	land 26:1 110:13	leaders 16:21 37:8	lightly 38:25
K-e-h-a-u 133:21	landmarked 115:7	68:13	likes 47:19
Kalawatsa 86:21,22	landscape 102:2	learn 54:11 72:22 123:3	limit 4:25 5:6 17:17
Kate 18:15 29:16	language 30:11 41:16	learning 116:12	134:7
Keams 21:2,18	42:18 54:15 77:24,25 80:18,23 109:18 110:9	leave 5:11 37:9 66:25 78:22 80:2 101:19	limitations 110:18
keeping 69:2 86:17	116:8 124:9	102:6 141:5	limited 95:22 132:10 138:15
Kehau 133:20,21	Lani 133:20,21	leaves 135:11	limits 11:2
key 27:3	large 24:24 98:19 111:9	led 123:7	lineage 32:6 131:1
kids 33:15 34:4 48:5, 14,23 115:18,21 125:5	Larry 3:5,8,20 17:4,9 19:8 26:6 29:8 37:13,17	left 3:24 35:1 50:10 52:5 71:16 102:7,8	lined 26:7
126:15	40:1 45:23,25 55:5 62:21 68:16 73:11	106:18	Lisa 136:23
kill-the-native-and-	78:23 79:4,12 86:14	leg 50:8	list 53:9
save-the-child 24:19 kind 48:24 64:16 67:1	94:4 99:13 105:5 109:3 116:20 121:23 127:10	legal 60:16 93:7 121:15 140:4	listed 8:25 21:3 54:1 58:16
84:15 88:13 124:12 135:10 141:25 142:6	133:3,19 136:22 139:4 140:14 143:8	legalese 60:17	listen 38:22 71:23 78:9
kindly 56:8 68:20	Larson 105:13	legally 52:4 73:16	listening 7:6,8 62:19
kindness 69:21	lastly 77:12 96:13	legislate 41:10 96:11	123:11 138:8
kinds 108:3 143:4	late 122:19	legislation 40:23	listing 129:1
Kingston 139:8	Latter-day 22:9	legislative 41:7,16	lists 25:11
Kirk 20:21,25	law 18:16,17,21 19:2	42:21 44:5 47:1	litem 73:17 75:8,16 112:6 114:10 121:17
knew 35:9 45:5 52:2	20:3,9 23:18 29:24	Leland 20:18,21	literal 82:24
53:22 54:20 61:25 76:3	32:22 35:25 36:5,8 37:7 40:5,17 43:16 47:7	length 18:24 30:4,12 32:25 43:17	litigated 111:8
knocking 131:6	57:17,19 59:17,18	lengthy 55:8	litigating 112:14
knowing 34:11	73:25 74:1,2 79:23,25 80:9 86:7 88:18,25 93:3	lessened 97:9 126:14	137:11
knowledge 13:23,25	94:23 95:2 96:11,14	letter 116:16	litigation 88:12,14 96:6
69:24 92:15 110:9	97:7 98:2 99:8 113:20 123:6 124:11 127:23	letters 51:3 93:5	126:4
knowledgeable 13:19	129:13 136:16 141:12, 22 142:2,9	level 97:6	live 23:23 24:25 25:4 51:7 65:4 72:8 117:20
L	laws 24:7 48:8 93:5	license 23:25	lived 85:9 100:5 106:19
	129:12 134:19	licensed 108:23	118:11 139:20
L-a-n-i 133:22	laws' 116:2	142:24	lives 38:10 43:8 66:17 85:12 102:11
LA 69:4 71:8	lawyers 42:8 75:3	licensing 58:21 107:13	living 21:8 26:13 48:1
labor 97:1	laying 127:25	Licia 99:24	68:18 134:1
lack 65:20	layperson 13:22	lied 51:15 135:20	locate 104:12
lacks 10:23	lays 11:11	life 22:17 23:10 27:4 28:24 37:1 66:16 85:10	located 55:20 83:16
ladies 68:10 lady 43:7	Lazore-thompson 81:5,7	93:18 102:10 103:1,2 106:11,19	location 16:5

Index: justified..location

locations 141:3 maternal 49:17 52:25 mentioned 128:11 М 129:7 log 135:9,13 math 32:3 **MEPA** 57:22 58:1,7 logging 50:5 **Matt** 127:11,12 137:2, **made** 11:21 15:9 19:23 22 138:5 Mercedes 70:1 33:5 35:24 44:21 51:6 long 20:4 44:15 60:25 54:10 63:16 77:6,19,20 82:17 100:14 110:22 matter 36:12,13 55:22 message 32:10 84:17 81:1 102:5,12 122:15 114:24 128:1 58:20 61:6,7,8 84:3 **met** 12:5 14:18 71:3,5, 123:22 126:7 93:9 99:15 105:25 long-term 65:18 7,10 84:24 128:13 132:17 **mail** 28:5 134:20,24 118:12 method 17:1 135:2,3,5,6,17,18,19, **matters** 96:11 longer 12:1 35:10 21,25 136:13,14 Michigan 18:16 113:20 101:9 123:10 125:18 Mccarthy 37:22,23 mailbox 135:22 115:8 40:2 86:15 longhouse 31:17 microphones 17:24 main 4:17 MCCONELL 99:24 looked 22:24 53:13 19:11 29:9 maintain 32:12,13 Mcconnell 99:25 60:23 62:4 67:11 143:1 Middleton 45:24 46:5,6 majority 76:17 loopholes 88:24 meaning 20:23 midst 120:4 128:16,23 make 5:23 8:20 18:6 means 68:22 96:19 mikes 5:14 26:9 37:20 39:23 40:11 **Los** 20:19 25:4,10,14 129:21 131:6 133:12 41:18 44:25 47:20.22 39:6 71:7 mileage 40:13 meant 24:2 44:25 48:7 51:1 59:2 67:8,19 losing 48:18 68:3 84:12 128:12 milk 67:6 74:6,8 76:25 77:2,8 80:14 81:13 91:21 **loss** 34:25 104:5 measure 42:1 mind 82:1,8 86:7 99:15 103:12 118:25 110:23 120:3,6 140:8, medicine 44:15 Mine 117:3 122:2 124:20 135:21 136:17 137:6 139:2,13 medicines 116:9 minimize 28:20 **lost** 48:14 70:1,9 85:19 **makes** 37:6 40:14 88:4 113:18 140:9 meditation 67:1 minimum 6:17 24:9 104:23 124:12 25:2,19 28:6 98:3 lot 4:22 20:10 26:7 meet 14:17 72:13 making 5:24 29:7 27:16 50:24 52:14,23 104:16 Minnesota 16:19 28:14 36:14 40:22 56:4 76:1 53:13 54:12 55:8 64:10 119:4 133:24,25 134:1, meeting 3:4, 5:12 65:14 69:2 84:10.11 Maldonado 110:24.25 13 135:11 136:5 18:10 30:25 143:23 99:16 100:22 101:20 malnutrition 21:15 minutes 4:16 5:1,7 103:10,12 104:5,8,20 meetings 3:15 16:16 17:17 54:3 62:25 68:21 117:23 126:21,24 127:5 35:3 122:20 mama 49:14,19,21 72:6 78:25 79:6 86:17 129:17,18,21 139:15 50:13,24 51:6,11,18,20 member 19:16 20:6 142:4 mirrored 118:13,22 52:9,22 54:5 29:1 45:3 54:8 65:9,10 lots 65:24 86:20 89:11 94:24.25 mirroring 118:19 man 52:24 71:11 100:2 105:14 109:5 **love** 34:8 36:11 46:15 March 7:17 miscarriages 22:5 119:12 133:15 64:17 65:8.16 73:5 84:2 mischief 56:4 marriages 66:10 115:21 120:10,15 members 36:1,6 48:13 72:16 91:1, 99:2 100:13 mischief-maker 56:3 married 49:22 54:5 loved 36:20 64:21 membership 80:15 misguided 114:10 loving 37:4 119:23 **marry** 50:1 120:4,6,7 men 44:15 69:5 missing 142:8 martial 52:18 **low** 96:21 mental 51:22 missionary 117:9 Martinez 86:19.20 lower 98:25 115:10 mentality 24:19 Mississippi 98:18,22 125:8 126:19 127:7 lucky 136:10 mentally 104:24 Missouri 49:17 53:16, **martyr** 78:19 24 Lulu 116:24 mention 123:24 124:9 master's 72:24 126:17 127:20 128:7 moccasins 51:13 142:3

model 126:25 **Musts** 32:1 **necessarily** 89:25 97:3 normalcy 34:8 modest 38:7 needed 33:14 34:7,9 **North** 38:1 Ν 36:7 46:12 51:9 54:14 Mohawk 81:8,11 82:16 northern 73:13 81:8 63:25 64:1 80:14 133:5 105:19 114:14 notes 63:16 Nadja 29:12 31:14 molested 50:14 negative 118:24 **notice** 7:1 10:6,20,25 Namahoe 109:4 mom 62:3,9 70:4 11:4,6 14:11 15:22 28:3 neglect 21:13 name's 37:23 86:19 80:8 111:14 132:2,13, moment 17:7 71:14 94:20 99:24 negotiate 118:23 14,18 134:17,24 136:4, 87:12 113:4,8,14 **NARF** 113:1 10 nephews 50:1 mommy 62:5,6 noticed 14:10 **narrow** 138:6 nervous 113:23 money 70:25 102:2 notices 136:7,18 nation 17:11 23:8 Nevada 26:14 103:21 43:13,14 54:8 56:6 notification 14:18 months 51:19 64:7 newly-elected 111:25 59:20 65:2,23 79:16 111:20 108:6 116:25 121:4 98:10 105:14 109:5 newly-formed 25:21 notify 132:8 140.2 134:3 135:12 **Newman** 127:11,12 moon 134:21 notifying 55:24 national 47:10 99:20 137:3 122:6 123:9 140:20 **Mormon** 109:13 notion 124:22 **nice** 71:13 141:6,9 morning 3:5,7,12,21 nourishment 73:5 Nicholas 63:24 nations 24:10 48:15,17 4:6 5:10 9:16 12:13 November 60:20 119:2 14:1 17:21 19:19 26:12 nickname 64:5 37:22 55:6 59:1.2 NTCA 123:16 nationwide 16:19 **Nicole** 79:11,13 73:10,11 94:20 116:21 number 3:21 7:6 8:25 **Native** 7:13 22:12 127:11,15,20 **NICWA** 20:16 17:5 27:8,14,21 46:13 23:11 25:7,10,16 28:13 Morrill 20:18,19 **ninety-five** 119:11,14, 94:6 137:4 143:12 33:25 34:3,21 35:6,22, 16,17 25 44:8,11 48:3,4 51:16 Morrills 22:1.3 numbers 74:17 76:25 52:14 54:21 58:17 64:3, Ninety-three 49:16 137:16,21 mother 21:6 22:4,11,22 4,24 65:5,23 68:3,11 23:4 28:24 49:4 50:19, ninth 63:15 numerous 56:18 87:6,9 88:3 90:12 20 51:24 65:8 69:7,8 93:13,20 100:23 101:14 non-indian 78:17 97:6 Nyna 116:23 70:13 75:25 85:5,7,8, 102:4,17 103:7,16,19 112:20 114:22 116:4 11,14 89:7 91:4 105:21 107:14 109:20 110:2,3 106:18,21,22 107:3 0 127:12 128:24 129:14, non-native 34:3 35:5, 109:9 121:3 127:1 16 130:15 137:18.19. 16 36:13 48:4 69:9 87:6 20,24 138:2,10 142:6, 100:10,16 106:1,6 **O'odhams** 45:4 mother's 35:10 15,24 107:7,23 110:4 143:2 **obligation** 36:21 44:3 mothers 45:1,2 106:12 native-licensed non-preferred 125:13 78:13 Mountain 44:14 142:16 126:2.6 obtained 15:15 move 139:22 143:17 natives 24:20,24,25 non-relative 112:21 occur 57:5 25:12 114:22 moved 22:7,20 23:3,14 occurs 93:17 51:6 83:17 109:16 **natural** 132:11 nonbiological 76:18 137:15 **October** 102:5 **Navajo** 20:21 21:4,17, noncompliance movie 69:25 121:18 20,22 22:7,19 23:7 Odawa 111:1 38:12 43:13, 44:14 moving 65:22 124:17 Nonetheless 114:20 odd 84:17 109:5,8 125:22 Multi-ethnic 57:23 noon 121:24 **oddly** 56:11,21 **NCAI** 140:22,25 multiple 95:7 127:2 Norm 60:22 odds 42:1 Nebraska 23:9 murdered 69:4 normal 37:4 offensive 44:10

Index: model..offensive

offer 90:17.18 92:8 ordinary 125:12 patchwork 74:11 pages 25:8,9 141:21 Oregon 3:1 29:14 30:6, pain 106:7 110:23 paternal 49:7 offered 29:22 10,17,21,25 31:8 50:1 **panel** 78:7 patterns 28:19,22 94:22,24 95:1 103:12 office 3:25 4:7,10 12:7, 106:1 130:6 Paul 135:11 paper 81:15 108:2 9 14:3 29:16 39:18 48:2 organization 18:1,18 60:15 127:14,17 131:3 papers 52:3 53:4,6 pause 87:12 135:8,9,13,23 136:1 79:9 119:3 122:17 parent 10:4,11 11:3,5 pay 70:24 141:15 123:2,3,8,15,17 140:21 13:8 15:20 45:8 62:10 pen 81:15 official 111:19 organizations 47:11 63:14,20 76:1,18 87:23, 137:5 25 89:6,7,20,24,25 penalties 74:23 oftentimes 58:9 75:17 90:4,6,9,12 91:25 93:11 organized 25:8,15 77:14 78:2 90:23 91:3 penalty 121:14,15 97:15,17,20 107:14 130:14 131:22 132:19 122:24 120:8,10 people 4:22 18:20 26:7 **Ojibwe** 22:25 23:7 original 28:1 32:19 27:1 36:19 38:6 39:7,11 parent's 80:5 33:1 53:19 121:1,2,9 48:14,17 49:3 51:2 Oklahoma 54:9 54:12,13 64:23 65:15 parental 59:10,14 originally 128:3 older 36:1 93:25 100:17 115:5,9 69:17,21,23 70:3,11,20 101:4,16,21 **orphan** 44:18 73:7 78:5,14 81:21 parents 21:3 24:15 82:20,22 83:1,6 84:2,12 **Omnibus** 133:22 orphanages 66:15 25:16 35:12 36:1,6 86:21 94:6 98:16 106:6 48:3,4 49:24 64:14 once-a-week 100:18 **Orphie** 49:25 50:3 107:9 109:18 110:10, 66:18 69:16 72:20,21 12,17,18,21 117:17 Oneida 17:11 31:15 **Otoe** 31:15 76:8 77:5 89:8 93:2 119:13 126:22 135:1 79:14 98:24 101:7,24,25 out-of-home 74:18 139:22 141:21 102:12 103:4 107:24 76:23 134:6 137:20 **ongoing** 111:15 134:18 141:16 **people's** 103:1 Onondaga 31:15 out-of-state 30:23 parents' 15:1 33:20 percent 129:9,14,15 31:1,7,10 35:11 96:12 **Ontario** 22:21 79:15 136:6 137:17,18,19,23, outcome 76:12 25 138:1 **parking** 121:16,19 open 18:13 38:14,16 percentage 24:25 outcomes 74:17 76:10 39:8 76:21,22 91:14 part 7:21,24 12:9 33:3,4 opened 33:13 113:1 overcome 29:2 66:12 37:21 52:7 99:23 performed 57:3 82:19 101:12 105:21 109:19 **period** 16:13 50:21 opening 3:18 17:8 111:9 113:10 overcoming 28:22 111:8 117:1 opinion 20:12 99:5 participate 99:22 permanent 34:17 105:23 overdose 107:2 122:5 **opinions** 128:19 overdue 20:4 82:17 permits 79:25 partnered 119:3 **opportunity** 6:4 17:16 overlook 78:2 person 13:22 84:19 parts 7:20 42:9 130:12 18:11 31:23 45:12 63:2 88:3 92:13,15 125:19 overlooked 65:19 party 14:22 92:14 130:17 135:14 98:16,21 99:4 139:2 oversight 122:23 opposed 123:25 party's 15:21 person's 125:17 overturned 115:8 **Oprah** 71:14 pass 48:6 personal 28:24 75:15 owned 36:19 passage 40:12,20 personally 29:5 option 15:2 142:23 owner 49:6 passed 6:13 19:22 orally 8:4 23:20 32:22, 40:23 perspective 47:12 **Orange** 109:11 49:15 83:12 100:7 Ρ petition 56:12 106:23 112:11 120:21 order 13:4,15 16:3 31:5 123:6 128:14 phase 24:20 70:16 94:2 97:21 p.m. 143:24 passenger 51:1 **phases** 91:13 ordered 65:2 packing 62:15 past 49:13 64:24

Index: offer..phases

phone 81:6 115:20 123:5 124:20 practicing 94:21 **prior** 16:18 33:25 88:23 104:10 105:16 111:6 126:17 130:16 132:21, phrase 42:7 pre-icwa 20:23 39:9 24 137:11 139:21 115:13 physical 11:14 12:2 140:24 preadoptive 16:6 priorities 58:12 13:9 15:4,5 94:13 95:19 points 6:9 14:4 precedence 59:17 priority 46:13 96:17,18 97:3,24 police 69:7 79:24 117:11 119:16,21 preference 13:15,16, privacy 45:9 96:13 20 31:5 policies 46:25 48:9 physically 69:12 98:24 105:23 106:5 107:8 83:4 preferences 14:17 **private** 31:24 32:17 15:1 27:16 42:11 58:6 pick 45:5 50:2 110:5 policy 6:21 18:16 58:14 47:5 142:21 80:7 112:8,20 124:24 82:23 136:24 picture 84:18 85:6 128:9,10 privilege 38:23,24 39:6 **pool** 142:10 pictures 71:12 preferred 17:1 126:3 privileged 31:16 **poor** 44:18 107:10 piece 7:11 108:2 problem 120:20 135:1, pregnant 106:9 population 25:6 98:20 16 136:5 139:24 **pieces** 40:22 preliminary 119:9 129:15 137:25 problems 81:22 95:7 **pivotal** 113:8,9 premise 58:3 Port 139:7 **procedures** 11:9 15:14 preschool 22:12,14 **place** 33:14 34:16,17 portion 98:20 **proceed** 90:13 112:5 36:10 52:1 80:13 91:21 presence 26:3 **Portland** 3:1 26:3 106:2,18 121:6 124:16 **proceeding** 8:22 11:2 127:3 94:22 106:20 130:5 present 12:16 26:1 12:16 14:10 15:16 43:1 49:13 89:20 96:19 98:6 position 43:14 **placement** 6:19 8:2 56:11 80:10 92:2 97:16 112:5 10:10 11:13,25 12:1,22 111:20 positive 64:12 104:8 13:4 14:15,25 15:2,7,8, presentation 7:24 proceedings 14:6,7 9,11,12,24 16:6,7 23:6 possibly 81:1 presenting 130:18 57:6 58:18 134:11,14 27:15 34:2,12,14,20 **post** 135:8,12 136:1 131:11 35:16 36:13 42:10 43:1 process 10:15 11:11 57:23 58:6,12,18,19 post-trial 15:13 16:1 preserve 25:22 98:13 25:17 45:13 87:14.16 80:7 88:4 108:17,20,24 88:10,16,17,21 94:18 **postage** 135:22 preserved 38:17 112:8,9,19, 114:21,22, 104:20 107:13,19 25 124:23 125:13 potential 128:19,21 **President** 19:17 124:2 108:12 109:19 117:13 126:2,3,6,12 128:9,10, 123:7 139:1 141:14 133:22 136:24 potentially 10:17 20,22 132:15 133:11 proclamates 57:7 presumed 89:6,7,19 134:6 poverty 21:16 90:6,9,12 91:24,25 produced 74:17 placement/removal power 4:14 6:7 7:24 107:21 presumption 90:14 11:17 14:5 17:6 41:20 91:10 professional 13:24 placements 33:19 powers 42:3 27:4 113:6 pretend 70:22 74:18 76:23 87:9 **powwow** 54:19 117:24 125:5 126:9 professionally 27:10 pretended 70:17 141:2 142:18 **powwows** 100:21 29:5 pretrial 7:22 9:13,19 101:10 places 20:11 130:24 professionals 141:17 pretty 94:2 practical 82:12 **plan** 131:13 profound 120:3 prevent 11:14 12:2 practice 28:9 47:1.8 **planned** 119:18 program 22:17 133:6, 30:1 86:9 87:17 95:4 111:10 7,9,12 plant 67:13,18 126:20 127:22 128:17 **prevents** 125:1,4 programs 23:6 130:7,9,13 141:12 playing 21:14 primarily 44:20 progressed 100:21 practiced 82:2 99:7 pleasure 29:17 61:22 primary 23:25 42:17 prohibited 131:9 **practices** 75:10,13 66:21 point 4:15,17 6:7,10 110:5 127:3 139:13 7:24 14:5 17:6 21:5 promised 53:18 **Principal** 3:9 17:10 56:1 91:11 99:14

Index: phone..promised

promote 6:15 31:22 126:9 promulgate 96:1 promulgated 111:3 promulgating 7:10 18:23 proof 54:24 **proper** 11:13 properly 97:22 property 36:18 proponents 114:11 proposed 4:19 6:5,11 7:18,25 8:6,18 9:2,19, 23 10:3, 12:14,17,24 13:13 14:7 15:13 16:1, 14,25 30:16 35:24 55:17 88:20 95:6,8,18, 20 96:17 97:11,12 99:1, 10 118:4 132:22 143:17 proposing 7:21 139:10 prospective 12:22 protect 6:14 19:22 37:11 85:20 96:22 98:9, 13 105:19 106:3 107:7 protected 96:24 97:9 protection 48:17 97:6, 7 98:3,25 134:3 protections 80:19 protective 85:5 protects 97:22 **proud** 73:1 105:14 prove 14:22 62:10 70:22 85:1 proven 90:15 **provide** 5:4 9:9 10:6 16:2 17:16 18:12,14 23:23 29:11 30:1,11 31:6 42:25 80:13 82:11 105:8 124:17 130:23 132:2,13,18 133:1 136:4 142:21

provided 11:1 21:12

81:20 141:23

30:5 47:10 56:17 58:21

, 04/22/2015 **providing** 14:9,16 20:14 47:6 60:13 82:14 86:5,8 108:7 122:13 132:7 provision 7:22 16:13 125:7,12 provisions 46:23 61:15 75:1 psychological 66:5 94:14 97:2 psychologist 86:23,24 **public** 3:4,12,15 4:18, 19 5:12 16:16 18:10 49:6 129:11 136:24 143:23 published 40:18 **Pueblo** 19:16 20:22 21:9 purpose 95:9 115:14 push 122:18 pushback 79:21 pushing 68:7 put 8:23 29:7 48:16,23 49:1,18,23,25 50:7,25 55:12 62:11 66:4 69:10 70:19 81:15 83:9,10 85:8 89:23 97:25 103:14 119:5 120:21 135:7,20

putting 46:16 110:17 116:16

Q

Qigong 52:17 qualification 13:14 qualified 13:6,14,17 15:6 30:15 31:2,4,6 118:4,9 143:14 quarter 29:25 question 39:19 40:9 108:16 138:12,14 questioned 132:16 questioning 137:12 questions 108:18 quick 60:18 74:8 108:15 122:14 quickly 3:23 105:25 107:6 Quinnault 105:14 quote 44:8 96:18 R **RAD** 66:13 radio 129:20 raise 68:6,20 69:18 raised 31:15,18 48:25 63:8,22 72:5,23 73:1 75:19 81:9 109:17 117:20 125:6 raising 73:2 **Raju** 55:6,7 **Random** 66:13 rape 45:3 54:6 raped 49:22 Rapid 16:18 23:3 rate 134:2 ratio 30:23 rationale 46:22 Ray 32:9 Ray-hodge 3:24 re-membered 33:2 reach 67:18 68:1 reached 111:17 reaching 25:20 read 39:18 41:1.2 46:17 101:18 reading 37:19

real 23:19 53:6 108:15

realizing 23:12 reason 9:5,10,21,25 19:18 23:23 55:7 62:3 63:21 93:7 reasonable 13:11 27:12 reasons 21:16 34:21 51:5 89:18 98:12 126:13 Rebecca 105:13 receipt 28:5 134:20,24 135:14 136:2 receive 4:18,19 5:25 6:10 8:3,10,11 11:6 111:14, 121:19 received 120:9 132:6 receives 11:4 121:18 receiving 5:22 recently 39:22,25 59:16 65:10 recess 79:2 reclaim 121:7 reclarified 134:23 recognize 59:10 90:20, recognized 13:18,20 92:1 recognizes 92:13,14 recommend 129:8 recommendations 46:19 47:10 48:9 recommended 7:14 124.1 reconnect 120:12 121:8 record 5:15 13:1 14:21

18:4,6 21:11 31:12 37:21 56:19,22,25 82:15 99:23 105:8 112:16,24 122:15 records 16:5 32:14 57:8 76:16

recounted 117:4

ready 62:15

realize 87:12

realized 93:25

139:2

recruiting 22:12 41:10 86:15 99:9 123:15,21 124:7,13 reports 54:3 103:22 131:4.19 127:16 129:1,18 132:23 recruitment 25:16.17 represent 45:2 49:12 133:8 136:16 138:23 56:5,9 113:7 respected 121:11 rectify 84:8 86:4 139:10,13 140:12,25 141:2 representation 73:18 respectful 63:3 **Red** 25:9 90:8 131:5 regulatory 124:11 respecting 26:10 redact 57:16 representative 46:8, related 94:1 respond 91:17 redacted 56:22,24 11 relationship 74:2 responded 108:16,22 redaction 57:7 represented 92:2 132:12 119:11 representing 38:2,23 redactions 56:18,20 relative 15:11 responsibility 42:17 Redondo 24:14 represents 39:5 75:10, relatives 49:13 rest 64:1 106:19 140:1 11 77:3,7 reference 80:25 relevant 10:5 restating 97:21 request 14:15 15:1,3 references 46:24 relinquishment 79:20 16:8 30:10 31:8 68:20 restricted 44:6 126:13 80:23,25 80:5 137:4 restricting 44:7 98:23 referred 89:14 Relocation 24:17 requested 11:6 28:5 rests 42:19 35:12 134:20,25 reflect 46:25 142:11 remain 6:22 28:1 35:19 result 10:10 13:8 require 80:13 reflection 118:22 remember 16:24 40:15 129:22 133:11 141:2 82:19 114:5,7 117:4 required 10:25 23:22 regard 36:20 97:17 results 132:12 30:3,14 32:2 136:8 131:15 remembered 53:2 return 28:5 97:16 117:6 requirement 10:7,8 **Regina** 48:24 49:4 remind 56:5 57:18 121:7 134:20,24 13:12 80:6 134:17 region 17:14 47:23 143:19 returned 65:24 requirements 7:23 107:12 108:1,8 reminded 59:19 9:13,19 12:4 Reunification 121:8 **Regional** 4:9 17:12 reminding 28:8 requires 9:20 15:22 reunify 30:3 **Regis** 81:8,11 82:15 97:13 135:6 142:10 removal 6:18 11:10,12, 133:5 reunited 106:21 119:12 18,23 12:1 30:2,3 117:2 requiring 56:10 118:12 revealed 30:21 register 60:7 rescinded 44:24 remove 21:19 23:10 registered 4:6 28:4 reviewed 15:2 134:21 research 53:12 119:5 62:1 93:6 134:20,24 135:2,5,6,18, reviewing 95:6 25 136:14 126:18 127:6 removed 22:20 23:3 revised 123:12 134:22 reservation 22:7 24:25 24:13,15,17,18 33:19 regs 116:17 59:3 65:2 83:14 93:8 28:14 38:12 62:7,8,17 revising 7:9 regulate 46:22 97:14 65:4,5,24 82:3 105:24 ricocheted 50:8 109:8 116:23 131:21, regulation 8:17,23 removing 61:22 23,24 30:9 40:5 47:2 89:1 rid 52:7 105:17 124:25 125:3 **Renee** 68:17 reservations 24:22 ride 50:22 126:9 129:25 140:23 renewal 24:2 25:5 ridiculous 57:13 regulations 7:1,10,15, renewed 23:24 resilience 93:12 18,22 18:23 19:1,6 Rieger 136:23 resilient 93:14 Reno 26:13 26:17 27:7,23 29:7 rights 13:10 15:13,21 30:6,11,17 39:24 40:4, Renselman 116:24 resonates 54:15 16:1 31:25 35:11.25 17 41:18 46:16,18,25 38:17 40:7 45:8,9,12,21 Repatriation 119:2 resource 25:9 71:18 73:21 74:9.20 56:13 59:10,15 65:19 76:13 77:10 78:9 80:4, report 134:1,4 resources 13:1 25:7, 90:7,13 98:24 110:13 12 81:16 82:10,16 86:2 11 115:5,9 127:13 88:23 95:6 102:19 reporter 18:3 103:10 111:2,4 114:14 respect 6:3 18:11 rise 96:9

Index: recruiting..rise

risk 96:19	s	Sean 45:24 46:5,6	serve 87:18
Roberts 3:5,8,20 17:4, 9 19:8 26:6 29:8 37:13, 17 40:1 45:23,25 55:5		search 14:17	served 49:8 87:1,2
	S'klallam 139:8	searches 125:20	serves 94:14
62:21 68:16 73:11	sad 64:10 141:20	seat 51:1 56:2	services 4:8 12:7,9,10
78:23 79:4,12 86:14 94:4 99:13 105:5 109:3	saddened 63:11	Seattle 46:7,9 48:10,12	13:23 23:5 25:15 92:11 133:14 139:7
116:20 121:23 127:10	saddens 64:10	106:20	serving 87:19
133:3,19 136:22 139:4 140:14 143:8	safe 33:14 36:10 74:16	second-class 44:25	session 4:17 105:12
Rodina 4:1 9:12,16	79:19 80:8,13,22 120:19,21	second-largest 25:6	143:10
role 92:5	Safety 110:7	seconds 61:25	sessions 7:7,8 123:11
rolls 54:7 91:14	Saints' 22:9	secret 85:11	set 26:20 37:6 81:5
room 29:10 56:2	sake 67:25	Secretary 3:9 4:2 17:10	sets 9:23 10:3,14,18
101:20 105:7 114:11	Sandy 116:21,22 127:7	Secretary's 14:3	11:9
120:15	sane 70:23	section 31:25 80:10	setting 24:22
roots 67:11,16	Santa 20:22 21:9	81:1,3 95:2 127:24	seven-year-old 43:12
Rosebud 116:22		134:9	seventh 32:4 33:24
rough 104:22 105:3	Saturday 66:24	sections 8:17 80:20,24 81:2 132:22	sexual 96:25 117:11 119:15
rounds 65:11	Sauk 102:21	secure 32:19	sexually 69:13 106:4
row 113:22	Sauk-suiattle 55:14,19 56:6 59:13,18,19 60:8,	security 6:16 33:21	shake 69:19
rude 59:25 60:2 62:13	13,19 61:4,5,11	seeds 67:6	Shanabi 46:6
Ruehl 70:1	Sauk-suiattle's 59:9	seeking 67:3	shape 143:15
rule 4:19 6:5,11 8:1,6, 18 9:2,20,23 10:3,14	save 25:20 67:12 71:17	Seldovia 63:7	share 6:4 49:2 55:8
11:25 12:14,17,24	saved 106:11 107:10	sells 107:5	103:2 105:9,10 117:14
13:13 14:7 15:13 16:1, 14,25 20:16 88:13	scared 47:24	seminaries 22:17	118:2 119:1,8 130:20 131:14
96:18 97:12 118:4	scary 48:19	send 21:19	shares 131:12
rule-making 8:11	scenarios 36:18	send 21.19 sender 135:7	sharing 105:12
58:13 99:16,19	scheduled 98:17		Shaw 4:9
ruled 114:12	schizophrenic 50:19	sending 101:10	
rules 19:23 20:1,13 55:17 57:6,11 58:9	70:18	sends 85:6	she'd 50:25 she'll 12:11
59:23 60:7 95:8,18,20,	school 18:21 28:17 83:15 106:12 109:25 113:20	Seneca 83:16	Sheldon 73:10,12
23 96:1,6 97:11 98:6, 11,21 99:1,11 143:17,		Senior 4:1,3 14:2	•
18	schools 24:16 72:18	sense 74:1 103:12	Sheridan 70:2
run 4:15 6:6	75:21 101:11	Sensenbrenner 23:19	shipped 51:20
running 79:4 121:24	science 43:21,22	sensitive 51:9	short 11:10 94:5
122:9	Scoop 105:21	separate 117:18,19	shot 50:6
Russian 64:21	scooped 117:5	separated 109:14	show 72:17 136:3
	seal 10:5 135:7	separation 36:5 42:3	shown 138:16
	sealed 100:13	series 122:20	shows 70:10

Index: risk..shows

sibling 125:4	small 5:2 76:22	speed 104:20	starting 130:2
siblings 36:1 83:13	Smith 139:5,6	spelling 18:5	starts 10:9
88:4 104:12,16 109:14 114:23 125:5,22	sneak 50:25	spending 78:11	state 9:3,20,24 10:21
sic 29:25 46:7 86:21,	so-called 8:24	spent 137:10	11:12 14:8,11 18:16,25 26:20,22 28:5 29:14
102:22 107:15 138:17	social 12:8 23:5 51:24	spirit 29:22	30:1,10 31:8,24 38:15
sick 51:20 52:12	57:15 58:10 60:16 73:18 114:20 117:4	spiritual 117:11	40:5,6 41:9 42:10, 46:25 47:8,23 48:1
side 29:10 48:1 49:7	121:17 133:13 138:9	spirituality 52:7	50:23 53:24 55:23
69:4	society 29:1 33:4 44:3	spiritually 104:25	56:16 57:2,8,14,15 58:9,18,21 59:16 60:10
signed 52:3 120:17 124:3	socioeconomic 15:11	split 34:23	61:15 70:25 75:22 79:9,
significant 138:2	soil 67:14,18	spoke 21:21 43:7 63:18	23 80:15,24 81:9,22 82:1,15 87:1 88:5,8,9,
signs 135:14	solely 45:20	128:11	11 89:3,5,16 90:6 94:24
silence 108:21 119:7	Solicitor's 3:25 39:17	spoken 72:25	95:1,13 96:3 97:7 98:1 99:18 102:15 107:4,13
silent 56:2	solved 120:20	Spotted 73:10,12,13	108:12 111:18 112:6,15 113:7 116:1,2,15,17
similar 32:7,10 55:9	someplace 132:4	sprouted 67:10	128:4 129:7 130:2
80:18 83:4 101:21	son 63:24 72:4,5,7	St 81:8,11 82:15 133:5 135:11	133:7,23 134:11 137:10 138:3,4 139:17,20,23
109:6	songs 54:15	stability 6:16 34:7	140:5 142:10,13
similarly-situated 80:22	sons 52:5	66:16	State's 30:22 36:4,21
Simmons 141:7,8	sort 84:21 121:20	staff 18:17 127:12	96:10,14
simply 89:7	south 23:4,15 69:4	staffers 123:18	State-issued 23:24
single 16:4 107:14	sovereign 24:9 56:5,9	stage 12:16,21	state-to-state 23:13
130:19 132:6	59:20	stages 118:18	stated 107:1 134:4,23
Sioux 23:8	sovereigns 74:3	Stan 17:13	statement 20:15 37:16 60:14
sister 43:13 65:11	sovereignty 31:19 74:6 87:11	stand 32:4 43:25 56:10	states 8:19 12:17 14:8
68:19,23 69:6 70:16,25 71:3 84:25 85:21	speak 4:24 17:18,21	87:22,25 88:2 107:11	16:2 23:15,23 26:24
100:17 101:4,21 102:7	25:25 46:9 47:18 55:13,	standard 28:6 96:21	39:7 42:23 59:13 60:11 74:3,11,12,24 77:18
sister's 69:8 116:11	16 60:17 63:1,2 73:14 79:17 80:4 98:17	standardized 108:10	78:2 80:22 88:12 89:6,
sisters 23:1	112:16 119:10 139:17	standards 6:17 26:21 30:14 91:20	17 96:18 99:17 108:8 109:23 124:18 128:4
sit 56:8 130:16	speaker 116:8	standing 62:23 88:16	129:10 138:24 139:14
sits 116:14	speaking 26:14 28:12 39:13 47:17 57:4 73:23	105:2	142:20
sitting 78:7,19 111:24 113:22 121:13	76:14 95:3 99:25	standpoint 82:12	station 79:24
situation 36:16 59:3	113:19	stands 36:9 58:3	stationed 49:9 Statistically 76:14
85:19 92:1 125:16,19,	speaks 17:13 93:12	start 3:14 10:8,9 36:22 56:4 71:19 110:20	•
23 132:1 137:14	spear-headed 64:16	128:18 130:14,16,17	status 15:11,23
situations 117:23	specific 79:18 143:13	141:10	statute 28:1 42:23 124:10
sleep 33:14 36:11	specifically 8:8 16:21 20:15 28:6,12 128:8	started 3:6,13,16 4:14 38:9 52:16,18 53:12	statutes 97:7
slide 7:19,20 14:13,24 15:25 16:11,15,23	134:11,23	63:21 79:9 100:21	statutory 45:10
		101:10,17 122:18	

Index: sibling..statutory

stay 33:18 34:16,17 stymied 55:18 supposed 75:3 taught 52:23 35:20 101:5 104:1 subcontract 123:10 Supreme 47:6 teach 18:19 126:6 subject 8:22 Suguamish 107:15 team 36:25 **stayed** 50:5 100:20 submissive 110:22 **surely** 34:24 tears 71:15 **step** 21:14 58:13 141:3 technical 47:9 **submit** 17:1 37:14 surgeries 52:12 **stepped** 21:1 139:23 122:2 127:5 132:21 surprise 67:10 teenager 69:1 stereotypical 71:13 143:20 surprised 67:5 113:21 **teeth** 105:19 sterilization 83:2 submitted 95:14 122:4 survivor 105:15 teleconference 16:19 **stolen** 106:7 **submitting** 19:4 63:16, 122:6 129:20 17 75:2 127:17 138:19, **Sweet** 26:12,13 stood 62:14 22 teleconferences swept 48:25 stop 51:8,10 72:14 94:4 99:20,21 substantial 92:10 **swoop** 40:6 telling 135:17 stopped 70:14 100:21 substantive 86:5 **system** 22:9,10 24:3 **store** 67:7 127:18 temporary 12:3 26:2 58:25 63:19 69:11 34:12 58:20 **success** 66:22 stories 55:9 61:19 70:17 76:20 103:15 64:11,12 71:25 72:1,11 109:24 134:3 ten 11:3 32:6 38:8 52:9 successful 66:10 73:4 83:24 99:6 117:2,3 83:13 systematic 117:2 successfully 28:25 story 34:24 60:19 70:2, ten-day 38:4 113:15 systemically 82:20 10 71:2,23,24 72:11 ten-year-old 88:1 73:3 84:15 107:22 suffered 117:10 109:6 117:8 139:19 Т tensions 142:5 suffering 66:17 storyteller 68:21 term 23:13 42:24 suggest 94:11 table 42:14 113:10 street 69:7 terminate 97:16 suggested 21:24 **tactics** 25:24 **streets** 106:20 terminated 11:16 suggesting 89:8,9 Taholah 106:8 115:5 strength 70:20 suggestions 19:5 takes 59:17 91:13 termination 13:10 **stress** 18:11 **suicide** 119:18,19 56:12 59:10,14 115:8 taking 31:12 35:25 stresses 12:14,24 36:15,24 48:4 51:17 suit 16:21 37:5 terms 7:14 8:6,16 18:5 68:4 69:22,23 75:22 stressful 121:6 99:16 124:10 127:25 suitable 34:20 109:2 **stripped** 37:3 72:20 terrible 85:17 **Sunshine** 64:6.7 talk 9:13 18:24 45:1 strong 6:21 73:20 47:24 73:20 78:9 114:2 territory 83:3,14,16 supersedes 40:5 80:18 104:23 110:18 117:14 118:18 124:21 testified 92:22 59:23 125:21 talked 121:1,14 125:9, supervisory 41:9,13, testifying 13:7 126:22 stronger 104:24 10,16,19 22 testimony 31:1 75:17 strongly 6:1 29:4 46:17 talking 5:20 7:23 14:4 supplementing 92:18 105:8 127:5 73:24 77:23 40:3 42:18,22 45:17 139:11 **Tesuque** 19:16 51:10 84:1,6 85:23 student 28:16 **support** 46:15,18 54:14 105:2,18 117:16 textbooks 101:19 **studies** 126:24 73:20 78:10 90:1 95:13 125:24,25 126:1 130:17 **Thames** 79:14 97:8 98:11 103:19,23 **study** 119:2,5,7 talks 7:20 13:13 105:17 111:2 116:17 Tharcicus 55:7 stuff 66:12 103:11 138:23 139:9,19 tape 135:8 104:8,12 theory 126:21,25 supportive 46:24 targets 101:22 **stupid** 54:11 85:15,16 therapy 119:20 supports 82:16 140:23 Task 20:20 25:13

Index: stay..therapy

transferred 57:8 thing 5:8,19 72:25 times 38:9 50:21 64:19 136:4 139:8,9,19,25 82:18 85:17 90:16 94:8 85:13 92:22.25 93:9 140:3.10 transferring 115:16 101:22 123:6 124:21 99:16 134:5 tribe's 32:22 67:24 134:16 142:3 **transfers** 12:11 139:15 tiny 61:11 99:2,3 things 4:14,21 27:6,9 translated 60:1 tired 62:23 tribes 29:20 30:6,18,23, 28:7 29:2 38:20 39:1 transparency 57:5 25 31:1,7,19 38:16 45:15 47:21 49:1 63:18 today 5:20 8:4 17:12,16 48:13 58:4 78:1 80:14 64:8 66:21 77:16 83:5,7 18:7 26:11 29:18 38:20 trauma 24:12 83:9 91:7,13,15,17 98:10,14 84:10 86:6 100:7,22 39:15 41:4 44:22, 47:24 85:24 110:23 99:9 100:3 109:22 101:9 105:19 107:18,24 49:2 55:10,13 79:17 115:21 129:9 134:18 **traumatic** 28:18,22 108:3,11 114:12 122:14 83:7 84:11 86:20 87:22 136:7,9,18 137:5,9,13 127:20 131:17 142:8 88:2,4 107:11,25 108:4 traveled 4:23 32:6,10 142:17 143:4 109:6 111:2 117:15,25 37:23 122:2 134:8 142:4 **Trope** 122:8,11 thinking 63:18 91:19 traveling 94:5 143:10,12 trouble 58:24 68:25 third-party 134:11,14 **travels** 135:12 Tohono 45:4 104:2 **thirties** 109:15 Traverse 111:1 troubled 66:25 **told** 49:18,21 50:14 thirty-three 71:4 51:12 52:13,15 53:1 treat 6:2 9:6 11:19 true 69:15 70:2 120:14 59:24 70:5 131:20 **Thomas** 83:15 124:8 131:22 treated 44:11 136:9 thought 52:22 60:24 trumping 80:19 treating 103:22 tool 36:15 37:10 85:14 91:24 101:3.5 trust 78:13 115:17 treatment 65:12,19,21 103:8 114:3 118:7 tossed 48:1 121:12 truth 108:5 141:20 trial 37:15 38:4,9 touch 122:14 thoughts 8:8 118:3 **Tulsa** 16:19 **tribal** 3:14 12:11,15,22 touched 134:8 13:2,18 16:16,20,21 thousand 48:13 87:3 turn 9:12,14 37:2 141:5 trace 21:10 25:1 27:22 29:13 30:17, 141:16 **turned** 34:18,19 63:13 22 31:18 33:20 38:16 track 130:2 thousands 71:24 41:9 42:10 45:9,18,20 **Turtle** 86:22 traditional 3:14 21:4 47:12 56:23 57:9 58:24 threatened 113:17 72:10 116:9 60:21 74:5 77:15 78:14 tweaky 86:6 three-generation 72:9 79:15 81:11 87:3,9,10 traditions 103:19 twelve 22:5 89:11 90:25 91:1 95:12, threshold 98:25 110:14 twelve-children 22:23 23 108:20,24 111:22 threw 67:8 trafficking 23:14 25:23 115:25 116:15,18 **Twenty** 119:18 122:21 123:9 131:7 ticket 121:16,19 tragedy 44:17 136:25 137:5 140:21 Twenty-three 119:10, ties 110:9 tragic 34:24 14 **tribe** 10:15,16,17,19 trailer 51:18 time 5:4 7:5 11:2 21:21 11:4,6 12:22 13:2,17, twin 132:9 22:11 30:4,12 33:23 21,25 14:9 15:20 16:8 **train** 50:1 twins 70:5 34:6 35:11 36:7 38:18 22:19 32:18,21 33:2 trained 73:16 34:13,20 35:21 38:7 43:17 44:15 51:17,18, two-and-a-half 109:9 22 52:10 60:20 71:5,6 39:10 45:4 54:13,25 training 107:20 type 125:16,18,19 77:2 78:11 84:6 86:12 55:14,18,19 56:6,9 101:25 104:2 105:22 **trains** 44:18 59:6,14,20 60:9,13,19 types 29:25 61:4,5,11 65:2 73:19 109:2 110:22 111:8 transcribed 99:22 typical 125:23 112:11 113:4 117:1 75:9 81:8,13 82:16 118:16,24 121:6,7,22 86:21 89:11 90:19,23, transcript 115:12 **typically** 8:10 89:9 122:10 123:14 127:19 24 91:2,10,25 92:13,14, transfer 12:15,19 27:21 138:8 139:21 143:1 16 102:14 103:7 107:15 U 42:9 93:18 112:12 111:6,10,14,18,19 time-out 62:12 115:3,25 113:9 115:1,15,17 **U.S.** 45:7 49:8 timer 81:6 131:24 132:8,13 133:5

Index: thing..U.S.

U.S.C. 41:16 95:22 unsuccessful 33:18 14.15 107:9 108:4 117:15 118:2 123:5 124:20 **ultimately** 123:12,22 unusual 90:4 vigorously 112:7 132:18 137:7 140:22 113:16 Umatilla 100:3 **unwed** 106:12 War 49:10 village 128:22 unable 65:12 66:9 unwilling 138:25 Washington 32:7 103:5 villages 129:20 unyielding 36:14 47:23 55:20,24 60:11 88:5 105:15 107:13 violate 56:13 unavailability 15:8 updated 7:17 139:8 uncle 53:18 117:3 violated 15:16,21 **upset** 38:21 **water** 67:15 uncles 35:15 54:17 violation 15:18 112:21 urban 24:24 25:6 48:18 114:22 ways 87:5 89:24 93:23 93:23 117:21 unconditional 120:14 wealth 25:7 violence 7:13 72:23 urge 47:9 96:25 undermine 95:9 99:2 wear 51:13 **Utah** 23:9 Virginia 22:2 WEDNESDAY 3:1 understand 15:3 utilized 13:3 31:10 vision 73:25 27:10,11,18,25 42:16 week 53:23 43:9,15,19,20 64:9 visit 50:23 ٧ 71:22 104:4 106:6 weekends 116:7 114:9 115:14 120:11 visitation 35:3 weeks 34:18 130:25 132:14 141:18 **vacate** 15:14 visitations 101:6 143:3 weird 51:8.13 84:21 valid 24:4 visits 100:19 understandable welfare 6:13 7:2 12:8 van 75:12 132:11 vital 27:4 18:21 19:17,22 20:24 30:13 38:19 39:20 understanding 28:4 Vanessa 3:24 vitamins 52:15 40:21 41:25 42:9,18, 113:12 117:9 138:15 vanguard 75:12 voices 129:21 44:23 46:14 48:2 55:15 understood 36:20 73:23 74:4,19 75:11,13 vast 76:16 **volume** 19:10 114:11 115:19 123:16 79:21 86:25 87:13 vengeance 52:19 124:6 88:21 90:14 91:9 95:10 voluminous 56:17 107:16 109:20,23 110:7 verge 39:15 unfeeling 37:6 voluntarily 14:10 111:17 112:1,2,3 versus 78:17 unfortunate 128:13 113:13,21 115:20 voluntary 8:1 14:5,7 122:18,22 124:1,18 16:5 80:8 132:15 vest 41:20 uniformity 128:2 130:9 133:6,25 141:6,9, voodoo 43:21,22 veteran 49:8 19 unintelligible 68:17 vowed 63:13 veto 124:2 well-being 121:20 unique 127:22 vulnerable 44:2 **vetted** 29:15 west 44:19 98:22 unit 36:16 102:23 104:14.18 VHF 129:20 western 52:21 126:25 W **United** 23:15,23 39:7 vibrant 72:12 **whatnot** 104:17 59:12 60:11 74:3 119:4 Wado 55:4 129:10 Vice 136:24 Whew 114:4 victim 45:3 waiting 62:8,22 63:4 units 25:15 white 21:7 25:8 44:13, 94:7 129:24 20 49:19 56:15 69:5 victims 36:18 universally 59:11 83:6 84:3 103:7 106:10 walk 112:24 Victoria 26:12,13 universities 24:22 116:21,22,24 117:9 walked 38:5 51:25 125:10 127:7 134:5 video 107:21 University 18:17 113:2 114:4 135:12 113:20 119:4 videotape 71:12 wanted 22:23 26:9 widow 54:4 unravel 67:16 35:19 37:25 43:11 view 36:22 widower 54:4 46:12 71:15 73:22 78:6 unseal 100:15 **Vigil** 3:17,18,19 19:13, 82:14 101:2 106:10 wife 66:18

Index: U.S.C...wife

Index: wiping..youths

Public Meeting , 04/22/2015 **wiping** 110:8 writing 8:5 82:14 122:3 Wisconsin 17:11 written 19:4 60:14 75:2 23:20 79:16,18 80:8,10 82:23 86:5 95:14 127:17 132:20 133:1 witnesses 13:14 118:9 139:11 143:20 woke 66:24 wrong 83:25 84:8 90:15 woman 28:13 68:18 70:11 84:18 85:9 **wrongs** 86:4 107:12,14 108:15,22 wrote 22:15,16 40:19, 130:19 131:3,10,11 24 53:16 113:11 women 83:2 109:10 Wyoming 23:9 wonderful 69:17,25 72:12.13 106:10 Υ wood 128:22 Woods 48:24 49:4 Yakima 65:2.23 word 83:9 118:5 yard 102:3 worded 118:6 Yavapai 44:13 wording 94:11 yay 56:17 words 37:6 39:14 year 7:16 22:22 25:13 78:18,20 121:8 137:2 30:17 63:15 102:5 141:16 work 9:17 18:15 19:10 23:11 26:18 27:5 29:20 year-and-a-half 93:17 48:12,23 73:19 76:15 100:14 81:10 87:20 99:5 years 23:2 24:8 33:22 104:11.17 107:15 34:19 38:23 40:6 43:10, 109:20 116:19 123:3 11 49:17 50:16,21 52:9, 133:4 140:24 141:11 16 53:2,3 54:4,23,24 worked 7:3 22:8,11 62:2 63:19 65:3,25 66:1 23:4 40:12 65:22 73:16 68:23 71:4 83:13 84:17 112:10 114:9 123:18 85:12,24 86:25 90:19 91:22 93:18 94:23 96:4 worker 12:8 51:24 99:8 108:23 111:7,16 57:15 60:16 117:5 112:9 113:19 115:6 121:17 138:9 121:13 123:2 124:12,15 workers 28:11 58:10 125:21 128:6 130:8 114:20 137:10,15 141:12 working 29:9 78:7 York 81:9,22 116:24 79:19 86:10 109:22 133:7 123:18 133:12 young 106:19 117:24 world 39:13 72:25

younger 68:23 youth 7:13 102:22 105:9 129:15 137:25 142:6 youths 24:21

write 89:22

wrap 75:6

worry 108:3

worse 137:22

worst 44:4 50:20