October 17, 2016

TRIBAL CONSULTATION COMMENT PERSPECTIVE

The DOJ, DOI, and Army sent a joint letter dated September 23, 2016 to Tribal Leaders inviting tribes to participate in consultation sessions scheduled in October and November. The consultation sessions are to solicit feedback on Federal tribal consultation for infrastructure-related projects. I strongly believe that the Great Sioux Nation must work together in order to have a united front to make this process more meaningful. In anticipation of upcoming listening sessions, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe is putting forward the following broad-based comments/initiatives for change regarding the consultation process.

Indian treaties are Federal law, and the United States is bound to consult with Indian nations and tribes on all matters that implicate treaty rights. Executive Order 13175 (2000).

- For thousands of years before the United States, Indian nations and tribes were independent sovereign nations, with original rights to self-determination, self-government and territorial integrity. The Constitution of the United States acknowledges Indian tribes as sovereigns, and authorizes treaty-making with Indian tribes.
- The United States Constitution acknowledges Indian nations and tribes as sovereigns, with a treaty relationship with the United States, which binds the Federal Government to honor its treaties with Indian nations.
- The treaties establish our reservations as permanent homelands of Indian peoples.

The blue represents the thunderclouds above the world where live the thunder birds who control the four winds. The rainbow is for the Cheyenne River Sioux people who are keepers of the Most Sacred Calf Pipe, a gift from the White Buffalo Calf Maiden. The eagle feathers at the edges of the rim of the world represent the spotted eagle who is the protector of all Lakota. The two pipes fused together are for unity. One pipe is for the Lakota, the other for all the other Indian Nations. The yellow hoops represent the Sacred Hoop, which shall not be broken. The Sacred Calf Pipe Bundle in red represents Wakan Tanka – The Great Mystery. All the colors of the Lakota are visible. The red, yellow, black and white represent the four major races. The blue is for heaven and the green for Mother Earth.
As a function of the United States’ sacred obligation, the federal agencies must consult with tribes on federal projects, including especially major infrastructure projects, to consider and avoid negative impacts on Indian treaty rights and trust resources, including Indian lands, natural resources, and waters and Indian reservation environments as permanent homelands of our Indian peoples.

**Background: 1851 Treaty with the Sioux and 1868 Sioux Nation Treaty**

Indian nations were originally sovereign independent nations prior to the formation of the United States. Indian nations were incorporated into the United States through treaties, which recognized our inherent rights to self-government, territorial management, and territorial integrity. The Dakota, Nakota, and Lakota Oyate of the Oceti Sakowin, or Seven Council Fires of the Great Sioux Nation, are the original peoples of Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado.

The 1851 Treaty with the Sioux acknowledges the original territory of the western Sioux Nation as extending from the Heart River in North Dakota down to Nebraska, which includes the area of the Dakota Access Pipeline.

The Sioux Nation fought wars with the United States to protect our people, our land, our waters, our territory and our sovereignty from invasion. At the close of Red Cloud’s War, the United States offered peace, including withdrawal of the United States Army from our territory.

In our 1868 Sioux Nation Treaty, the Great Sioux Nation reserved all of our lands from the low water mark on the east bank of the Missouri River west through the Black Hills to the 104th Meridian, South Dakota’s western border. In the treaty, our Sioux Nation tribes also preserved 44 million acres of unceded Indian lands in North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado. The 1868 Treaty also expressly preserved the Sioux Reservations on the east bank of the Missouri River, including the Crow Creek and Yankton Sioux Reservations. In addition, the United States reserved the lands on the east bank of the Missouri River as a protection zone to prevent encroachment on our Great Sioux Reservation.

Our Sioux Nation tribes own our lands, natural resources, and waters. The United States holds the title to our lands, natural resources, and waters in trust to protect us from alienation of our territory and interference with our treaty rights. Traditionally, our Lakota, Nakota, and Dakota people relied on hunting and fishing for subsistence, and our treaties protect our rights to hunt and fish throughout our Sioux Nation territory. Spearfish, South Dakota, for example, is named in honor of one of our traditional fishing areas in the Black Hills. The Sioux Nation Treaty also acknowledges our rights to pursue agriculture, including farming, ranching, forestry, and other forms of economic development, including metallurgy, sawmills, etc.

The Cheyenne River, Crow Creek, Lower Brule, Oglala, Rosebud, Santee, and Standing Rock Sioux Tribes and Yankton Sioux Tribes are all constituent tribes of the Great Sioux Nation and signatories to the 1868 Sioux Nation Treaty.
Under the 1851 Treaty and the 1868 Treaty, our Sioux Nation tribes reserved our original territory as our “permanent home,” with the United States’ promise that our lands would be a livable home. Naturally, our treaties reserve our waters as an essential part of our territory. Under the Winters doctrine, our Sioux Nation tribes own the water in the Missouri River, with first priority above all other users.

The Sioux Nation Tribes and the Missouri River Dams and Reservoirs

In the 1950s and 1960s, the Sioux Nation Tribes were asked to make substantial sacrifices when the United States determined to dam the Missouri River for flood control. The primary purpose of the Pick-Sloan projects was to protect downstream cities and towns from the Missouri River’s annual floods with secondary purposes of generating electricity and providing for recreation.

The Sioux Nation tribes along the Missouri River made great sacrifices to protect downstream cities and towns, including St. Louis, Missouri. For example, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe gave up 104,000 of its best bottom land acreage on the Reservation with the inundation of the original Cheyenne Agency tribal headquarters, tribal member homes, churches, schools, and sacred sites. The dislocation was devastating.

Under Public Law 83-776, the Sioux Nation treaty was affirmed, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe maintained our hunting and fishing rights, grazing rights, mineral rights and timber rights in the Army Corps taking area. Our reservation boundaries remained unchanged at the center of the Missouri River. We continue to own the water in the River.

In May 2016, the Army Corps determined that it could not authorize a coal distribution center in proximity to the Lummi Tribe’s treaty-protected fisheries, where the Corps authorized activity would have more than de minimis impacts on treaty fishing rights. Without congressional authority, the Army Corps determined that it had no right to interfere with treaty protected rights.

Our Sioux Nation tribes use the Missouri River for our drinking water, we have treaty rights to hunt and fish, reserved rights to graze livestock along its banks, and it is our source of water for irrigating crops. Under our Treaty, we own reserved waters in the Missouri River. Yet, the Army Corps turned its back upon our Sioux Nation tribes and plans to approve the DAPL to run oil under the Missouri River without consulting with our tribal governments. Indeed, the Army Corps has not even consulted with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture who are our partners in our Missouri River tribal drinking water projects. The Army Corps is violating our treaty rights, statutory rights, and your policy on sustainable Indian nations, President Obama.

We have seen the devastation wrought by oil spills in the Gulf of Mexico, where BP had built “fail safe” systems to run its oil platform. BP’s systems failed catastrophically—despite their best planning. We have seen government planners provide lead poisoned water to the
residents of Flint, Michigan. We have seen the EPA pour out poison mine waters into Colorado waters in the name of “clean-up,” only to poison Navajo Nation waters downstream.

As we Lakota say, Mni Wiconi—“water is life.” The Army Corps must not threaten our treaty rights and risk our children’s lives with the dangerous DAPL project without even conducting an Environmental Impact Statement!

Among our Sioux Nation tribes, we sacrificed to protect American cities downstream on the Missouri River from flooding—sacrificed our sacred oak trees, our wildlife, our best river bottom lands, our very homes for flood control. The Army Corps of Engineers must not sacrifice our people again for an oil pipeline in violation of our treaties.

Consultation must be tailored to treaty rights and must consider all treaty signatories

- The treaties of the Sioux people, like those of many other tribes, have been affirmed by later statutes and set forth present-day rights of the tribes.
- The treaties predate the current reservation boundaries and the current location of the many Sioux bands on their present-day reservations. The treaties were signed by the many bands of the Sioux people in common and set forth expansive treaty boundaries that are common to the many bands.
- Consequently, the Sioux people’s treaty territory is broader than the present-day reservation boundaries, and the treaty rights in this territory are shared in common among all of the signatories to the treaties.
- This means that the United States cannot limit its consultation to the present-day tribe whose present-day boundaries are closest to the area or trust property affected. Instead, the United States must understand what treaty governs what territory and what present-day tribes were signatories to that treaty, and then both notify and consult all affected tribes.
- When the United States fails to properly understand the full scope of its treaty obligations, all tribes are not notified of projects when they should be and they are not properly consulted, which violates tribal treaty rights.
- At a minimum, the United States should notify and consult with tribes as to federal projects that affect the following:
  - Areas within the treaty boundaries of tribes;
  - Trust resources, especially water, to which a tribe may have a treaty right or a property interest;
  - State or national historic sites;
  - Areas commonly/historically significant to tribes; and
  - Cultural landmarks with historic significance to the tribes.

There is a lack of consistent implementation and strong policies across federal agencies

- Disparity exists among federal agencies on how consultation is actually implemented. Oftentimes, those agencies with little regular contact with tribes have more thorough and
adequate consultation efforts and policies than those agencies who work with tribes regularly.

- There must be strong minimum standards for implementation and development of consultation policies across federal agencies.
- All federal agencies must consistently implement these policies.
- In order for consultation to be meaningful, these policies must include, but should not be limited to, requiring consulting agencies to do the following:
  - Provide tribes with all pertinent information before consultation in a timely manner;
  - Coordinate with tribes before consultation begins, especially with development of an agreement on consultation timelines before consultation even begins;
  - Consult only with tribal representatives who has been authorized to engage in government-to-government consultation by the tribal government;
  - Make every effort to conduct tribal consultation at the seat of tribal government or in tribal territory;
  - Ensure that federal participants in tribal consultation have actual decision-making authority
  - Provide written confirmation that the agency has considered tribal comments and concerns and the agency’s response, whether positive or negative; and
  - Obtain resolution of approval from the tribe that the United States has met its satisfactorily consulted with the tribe and the tribe agrees with the United States’ response to tribal concerns in each instance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in federal agency structure and appointment of tribal consultation head within the administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All federal agencies should have a full-time tribal liaison position. However, when consultation occurs, each agency must ensure that those federal participants have decision-making authority and these consultation sessions are not simply “listening sessions” with no results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There should be at least one position within the administration to oversee all tribal consultation across all federal agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in executive oversight of policy differences among federal agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple federal agencies administer laws, policies, and regulations that affect tribes and Indian Country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The agencies have demonstrated that they frequently disagree as to the substance and application of laws, policies, and regulations that apply to tribes in ways that have a profound effect on tribes’ rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No sound mechanism exists to resolve these differences between agencies, and the lack of such resolution harms tribes and forces tribes and other stakeholders to seek resolution of these differences in an adversarial forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The United States should elevate the White House Council on Native American Affairs to the White House Council on Native Nations to be co-chaired by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Interior, so that the White House Council on Native Nations is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


empowered to resolve policy differences among federal agencies and refer these matters to the President for resolution where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support legislation that codifies and protects tribal consultation rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Although treaty obligations, the general trust responsibility, executive orders, and some agency regulations require government-to-government consultation with tribes, there is no federal legislation that codifies and protects these rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Without legislation, tribes’ right to enforce the consultation requirement is not as strong as it could be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The United States should endorse legislation like H.R. 5379, the RESPECT Act, to codify the United States’ government-to-government consultation policy with Indian nations and tribes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In addition to provisions already in the RESPECT Act, the United States should support substantive enactments including but not limited to the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Require negotiated rulemaking as to consultation with tribes; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Impose penalties on agencies and officials that fail to comply with their consultation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 25, 2016

The Honorable Barack Obama  
President of the United States  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20050

Re: The Dakota Access Pipeline Poses an Existential Threat to the Tribes of the Great Sioux Nation—the United States Has Trust Duty to Protect Us from It

Dear President Obama,

The people the Oceti Sakowin reside today on the arid reservations of South Dakota and North Dakota. Our reservations are not suitable for wells. We rely entirely upon the waters of the Missouri River for our drinking water, our livelihoods, and our religion. A failure of the Dakota Access Pipeline would render our homelands uninhabitable and threaten the very existence of our tribes.

Under our treaties and under federal law, the United States is treaty-bound to protect us. It should have subjected the Dakota Access Pipeline to a full Environmental Impact Statement that considered our treaty rights and the impact of an oil spill on the waters of the Missouri River, which we own, including consideration of alternate routes. Instead, the Army Corps of Engineers issued only an Environmental Assessment that did not consider the impacts on the waters that we own. And, outrageously, while it ignored the impacts on tribal people, the Corps and Dakota Access actually routed the pipeline so close to tribal land to avoid harmful impacts on the municipal waters of the non-Indian community of Bismarck, North Dakota.
The *Oceti Sakowin* of the Lakota, Nakota, Dakota Oyate or Seven Council Fires of the Great Sioux Nation are the original people of North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa and Nebraska.

We are parties to several treaties with the United States, which have not been abrogated and are the supreme law of the land under the U.S. Constitution. The 1851 Treaty with the Sioux acknowledged our original homeland. The 1868 Sioux Nation Treaty established our “permanent home” known as the Great Sioux Reservation, a huge area that spans much of the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Nebraska.

Critically, under our treaties, the Sioux Nation owns the waters of the Missouri River. Our water use has priority over all other users because we are the original users of the Missouri River.

In 1889, the Great Sioux Reservation was divided into five smaller reservations, Cheyenne River, Standing Rock, Lower Brule, Rosebud, and Pine Ridge (Oglala). Crow Creek Sioux Reservation on the east bank of the Missouri River was also affirmed. All of our Reservations have Missouri River water rights guaranteed by the 1868 Sioux Nation Treaty, with an original priority date pre-dating the United States.

The Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation’s northern boundary is the southern boundary of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, so we are vitally concerned with any environmental impacts on the Missouri River. We have 18,000 tribal members and we depend on the Missouri River for drinking water, domestic uses, livestock and agriculture, hunting and fishing, tourism.

For us, the Missouri River is a sacred place. We were asked to give up 104,000 acres to the Oahe Dam, so that St. Louis could have flood control and our original tribal headquarters, where many of our parents and grandparents were born is under water.

An oil spill would be catastrophic. Together with the United States, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars and years of effort on our water pipeline systems. Cheyenne River’s is called the *Mni Waste* system. This means “Good Water.” The Oglala, Rosebud, and Lower Brule water systems is called the *Mni Wiconi* system. This means “Water Is Life.”

These Lakota names means something to us because without these water systems our Reservations would be uninhabitable. Our people would have no water to drink in their homes. Our businesses, governments, and hospitals would have no water to keep them operating. Our Treaty-based rights to use that water for our religion, agriculture, housing and economic development, tourism, hunting, and fishing would be meaningless.

We have several endangered species in the area, including the pallid sturgeon, the golden eagle and the bald eagle, the black footed ferret, the Interior least tern, the whooping crane, and the Dakota skipper butterfly, and we are seeking to restore the buffalo along the Missouri River.

We fought wars to protect our homelands and our people. The United States has a trust responsibility to protect our treaty rights, trust lands, waters, and natural resources. The United
States is wrong to consider allowing an oil pipeline to cross our River without consulting our tribal governments.

At a minimum an EIS is required, with full consideration of the Tribe’s concerns and with consideration of our treaty rights and trust resources. All of our Reservations were originally part of the Great Sioux Reservation and we all own the waters of the Missouri River in common, with priority over all other uses.

Very Truly Yours,

Harold C. Frazier, Chairman
Tab 2
The Great Sioux Nation

October 17, 2016

The Honorable Barack Obama
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Loretta Lynch
Attorney General
U.S. Dept. of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530

The Honorable Sally Jewell
Secretary of the Interior
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20240

The Honorable Eric Fanning
Secretary of the Army
U.S. Army
101 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1000

Re: United States Consultation with the Sioux Nation Tribes Concerning Dakota Access Pipeline, Sioux Nation Treaty Rights and Missouri River Water

Dear President Obama, Attorney General Lynch, Secretaries Jewell and Fanning:

On behalf of our undersigned Sioux Nation tribes, we request that the Attorney General, Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army come to the Sioux Nation (Lakota, Nakota, Dakota Oyate) to meet with each of our tribes at our tribal government headquarters concerning the Dakota Access Pipeline and come to our tribal water intake system, review impacts on human health, drinking water, general water quality, the environment, wildlife, endangered species, hunting and fishing, livestock, agriculture, economic development, and the protection of sacred sites. After your meetings with the Sioux Nation in our territory, we would like to come to meet with you at a central place, whether in Washington, D.C., Minnesota, or Rapid City to convene on a nation-to-nation basis to protect our Indian lands, natural resources, and waters, and treaty rights, and to honor the trust responsibility.

We write on behalf of our undersigned Sioux Nation tribes to thank you for your important interagency decision on September 9, 2016 to halt construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline near the Missouri River in order to give the U.S. Army the chance to reconsider our Sioux Nation concerns about the sanctity of treaty rights, traditional lands and Missouri River waters. We appreciate your updated notice of October 9, 2016 warning Dakota Access LLP not to proceed with construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline (“DAPL”) along Lake Oahe.

First and foremost among the Sioux Nation’s treaty rights with regard to the DAIP project is the Sioux Nation tribes’ ownership of the water in the Missouri River. Under the 1868 Sioux Nation Treaty and the 1851 Treaty with the Sioux, our Sioux Nation tribes own the water in the Missouri River as part of our rights to our permanent reservation homelands. The essence of our treaties is the preservation of our “permanent” homes as livable homelands for our people, and clean drinking water is essential to the survival of our Sioux Nation tribal members.
We are grateful that you have repeated your intention to consult with our Sioux Nation tribes before issuing an easement for the DAPL. We oppose issuance of such an easement because DAPL poses an existential threat to our reservations and our clean drinking water in the Missouri River. A significant oil spill from the DAPL would poison our water, ruin our lands, wreck the environment, kill our wildlife, destroy our agriculture and threaten our people's health and very lives. We own our treaty rights and Missouri River waters in common, and the Army Corps has not consulted with any of our Sioux Nation tribes on the preservation of our safe, clean drinking water. The Army Corps failed to consider the potentially ruinous impact on our Indian nations and tribes of a DAPL oil spill.

The Environmental Assessment ("EA") and the Nationwide Permit 12 cannot support the DAPL's request for an easement. DAPL is planned as an 1100 mile oil pipeline transporting 570,000 barrels of oil per day. The EA is an inadequate basis for a project of this magnitude, and Federal agency action based thereon would violate NEPA's mandate to "prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man." 42 U.S.C. § 4321. NEPA requires Federal agencies to prepare Environmental Impact Statements ("EIS") for major federal actions that are expected to result in significant environmental impacts. To suggest that the massive DAPL project will not have significant environmental impacts is false. The stakes for the environment and human health are too high to allow DAPL to go forward without a full EIS.

Federal Indian treaties are Federal law, which protect our original Indian lands, natural resources and waters under a Federal trust responsibility. The Army Corps cannot evade our treaty rights and the trust responsibility by looking only to its own regulations. Protection of Indian treaty rights requires collaboration among the Federal agencies, and in this case, the Army Corps blatantly disregarded the views of the EPA and the Department of Interior, which counseled the Corps to undertake an EIS with full consideration of the impact on our Sioux Nation water rights in our downstream water systems. Our water rights are original and prior to all other uses of the Missouri River, including the transportation of oil. Winters v. United States, 207 U.S. 564 (1908). The Army Corps cannot ignore Federal Indian law, and the Secretary of the Army must consult with our Sioux Nation tribes.

The Department of Transportation identifies high consequence areas ("HCA") for hazardous liquid pipelines based on populated areas, drinking water sources, and unusually sensitive ecological resources. According to the Corps, a land area in which spilled hazardous liquid could affect the water supply is treated as an HCA, and areas with endangered species are also treated as HCA's. The whole region along Lake Oahe is therefore to be considered a high consequence area that must be protected by an EIS.

The Constitution binds the United States to honor its treaties with Indian nations. During consultation on major infrastructure projects, Federal Agencies should consult, consider and avoid negative impacts on Indian treaty rights and trust resources, including Indian lands, natural resources, and waters and Indian reservation environments as permanent homelands of our Indian peoples. Our Sioux Nation tribes request that the President elevate the White House Council on Native American Affairs to the White House Council on Native Nations to be co-chaired by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Interior, with Indian nations and tribes sitting across the
table from Secretaries and Agency heads, so that the White House Council is empowered to resolve policy differences among Federal agencies and refer these matters to the President for resolution where necessary.

Further, our Sioux Nation tribes request that the Administration endorse and call upon Congress to enact H.R. 5379, the RESPECT Act to codify the United States' government-to-government consultation policy with Indian nations and tribes.

Finally, our Sioux Nation tribes call upon the United States to reopen its decision-making process and consider alternatives to permitting the DAPL to cross the Missouri River and threaten our Indian reservation homelands and our drinking water projects. Do not let DAPL oil spills poison our waters, ruin our lands, and threaten our children's lives. Do not violate our treaty rights.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Harold Frazier, Chairman
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

Dave Archambault, II, Chairman
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

William Venter, President
Rosebud Sioux Tribe – Tribal Council

Robert Flying Hawk, Chairman
Yankton Sioux Tribe

Charlie Vig, Chairman
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Tribe

Boyd Ceurenau, Chairman
Lower Brule Sioux Tribe

Anthony Reider, President
Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe

John Yellow Bird Steele, President
Oglala Sioux Tribe

Brandon Sake, Chairman
Crow Creek Sioux Tribe

Myra Peason, Chairperson
Spirit Lake Tribe

Roger Trudell, Chairman
Santee Sioux Tribe