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(10:00 a.m.)

MS. WILBERT: Thank you everyone for your patience. You have now been placed into the consultation session. This is the first of four virtual nationwide government to government consultations hosted by the Department of the Interior Office of the Assistant Secretary Indian Affairs. Prior to making proposed revisions to two regulations, 25CFR Part 151, Land Acquisition, and 25CFR Part 293, Class III Tribal State Gaming Compact Process. This is a government to government consultation and is closed to the press.

If you are a member of the press, we ask you to please sign off at this time. This and each subsequent consultation will last three hours. Upcoming consultations are scheduled for this afternoon beginning at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Friday, May 13, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time, and May 23, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

Registration links for these future sessions are
For optimum audio quality, please ensure your microphone remains on mute unless you would like to speak. Please take a moment to add your title and affiliation to your name in Zoom. To do this, please click on the participant list, find your name, click on the blue MORE button next to your name and choose rename.

The session will be recorded. If you do not consent to being recorded you may disconnect at this time. Closed captioning is available in real time at a link in the chat. I will now turn it over to Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Bryan Newland.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Biju (phonetic), Annie, friends. Good morning to everybody. I hope you're all doing well. I want to welcome you to this government to government consultation that the Department of the Interior is hosting on two sets of regs that we are in the process of developing: Updated regs on the Land and the Trust Process as well as updated regs on
the Gaming Compact Process.

Before we begin, we want to make sure that we start these meetings in a good way and an appropriate way. We don't have anybody available today to offer us an opening prayer so we'll just take a very brief moment of silence and allow those of you who wish to pray in your own way or reflect in your own way to take that moment before we begin.

All right. So, just to give you a little bit of an overview of today's agenda, we are doing consultation on two different sets of regulations that are not linked to one another, but for convenience of people across Indian Country, I know that we keep you all busy on Tribal consultations, we are consulting on both of these regulations at the same time.

So, to have some semblance of order, we're going to try to focus the first 90 minutes of this morning's consultation on our draft fee to trust regulations. We will take a very short five-minute break to allow you to refuel your
coffee mugs or your tea cups and then we will come
back and in the second half of this morning's
session, we will discuss the draft Gaming Compact
Regulations.

We want to prioritize Tribal leadership
in the comments as well as Tribal representatives
and want to make sure I emphasize that this is a
government to government consultation and we will
do our best. We've got a lot of folks on the line
here from the Department of the Interior to make
sure that we capture everybody's comments and I
hope you have seen in the draft regulations that
we put together that we do incorporate the views
that are shared during these consultations from
across Indian Country.

So, with that, we're going to go ahead
and get into the substance of our land-into-trust
regulations in the consultation. If we can
go to the next slide. All right, so you all
should have received your Tribal Leader letter
from us that included a link to our draft
regulations as well as some framing questions for
today's discussion. The first question that we have asked is do the revisions that we've drafted make the fee-to-trust application process more efficient? Are there additional ways to make the process more efficient?

We've also asked do the draft revisions reduce the costs of the fee-to-trust application process? Are there additional ways to reduce that cost? The third question is the draft revisions identify needed information for a complete fee-to-trust application after, which the secretary will have 120 days to issue a decision. Are there additional ways to increase certainty in the fee-to-trust application process?

The fourth question that we've put forward is the draft revisions propose criteria for evaluating applications involving land within the boundaries of a reservation, land contiguous to the boundaries of a reservation, land outside the boundaries of a reservation and land for an initial trust acquisition. Do the draft revisions
sufficiently account for the range of fee-to-trust applications? Next slide please.

The next question we put forward is the draft revisions explain how the Secretary will determine whether statutory authority exists to acquire land in trust status including determinations whether a tribe was under federal jurisdiction in 1934. Do these criteria sufficiently explain how the Secretary will evaluate the information? And finally, we have asked do the draft revisions sufficiently consider the concerns of state and local governments? And I think that is it for the framing of the discussion so I want to invite folks who wish to comment during this consultation to raise your hand. I believe you can use the raise your hand function at the bottom of your screen on Zoom. Don't know if we have folks who are joining us by telephone. We do have a few numbers. Jan or Claire, what is the function to raise your hand on Zoom by telephone?

MS. WILBERT: If you are joining us on
the telephone it is star nine to raise your hand
and star six to mute or unmute yourself.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Claire. I
am going to again call on folks in the order
they come up in the queue and try to prioritize
elected Tribal leaders. And our first comment
will come from Kelly Dennis. Kelly, can you
unmute yourself please? Kelly, we may have to
come back to you. We can’t hear you. It looks
like you’re still on mute.

I don’t see any other hands raised or
other speakers in the queue. Again, we’ll have
several other opportunities for folks to
comment, but Kelly, it looks like you’re off mute
We can’t hear you. Again, as I was saying, Kelly,
you may want to disconnect and try to log back
in or check your audio settings. We still can’t
hear you. We will have additional consultation
sessions on these regulations this week and
encourage folks to submit comments in writing
as part of the record and our intention is
to take these comments, fold them in to our
work, get to a draft set of regulations for both
sets along with the preamble that we can propose
formally through another proposed rule making and
make sure that we’re fulfilling the President's
commitment to make the fee-to-trust process easier
for tribes to navigate and work more efficient.

Those of you who wish to submit comments
in writing can submit those comments up until
midnight on Thursday, June 30. All right, so we
will go to Tim Beyer from Quinault Indian Nation.

MR. BEYER: Maybe you just need somebody
to break the ice a little bit. Good morning.

MR. NEWLAND: Good morning.

MR. BEYER: Thank you for this
opportunity to provide input on the proposed
regulations. I worked for the Quinault Nation in
the 80s and 90s specializing in fee-to-trust work
and for the last year I've been a contractor back
working for the Quinault Nation on fee-to-trust
both on reservation and off reservation
acquisitions. At this point, I'll just offer a
couple of perhaps responses to the first question
regarding efficiency or opportunities for efficiencies. As you're likely aware, or certainly those are aware that there is a new policy or a new process that's been put in place as of the 26th of April related to the land description review process for fee-to-trusts. This is a shift from the historic expectation or the more recent expectation that those land description reviews are reformed by certified federal surveyors and/or Bureau of Land Management Indian Land Surveyors and I understand there had been some inconsistency across the US as far as how those were handled so I do appreciate the efficiencies that this has now put in place by having the BIA undertake those land description reviews which are now called realty land description reviews. I think my concern is that even though this provides an efficiency and it reduces a cost to the tribe of no longer having to hire a certified federal surveyor to do the land description review, I'm not sure if there will be additional funding directed to the BIA offices to
support this added work responsibility of them to perform the realty land description review or for the GIS strike teams which I also understand are understaffed to do this work. So, you know, it provides an efficiency but at the same time if that efficiency is not funded to take on that additional work it's not an efficiency at all if you understand what I'm saying.

So that's one of the concerns I have is again, it provides a great efficiency in the process but if it's not funded and there are a number of dates in that process of ten days for this and 30 days for that and certainly an opportunity to pass things back and forth so a concern on funding. One of the other questions I guess when I look at these things I look at clarity consistence, clarity, complexity and feasibility. I've heard from a number of individuals that the new draft regulations require a survey for all fee-to-trusts. I think as I look through the document, and sometimes maybe this is just the new English, but there has been in some
places a purposeful striking of the words or or
and in context and so a little clarity might be
added to Section 151.8 sub A sub 3 where it talks
about the mapping requirement. It states for the
legal description of the land from the applicant
including a statement of the estate to be acquired
or a survey if land cannot be described by
eloquent legal description. A survey must be
completed by a land surveyor registered in the
jurisdiction and concurrence by the Secretary that
the legal description is legally sufficient so I
think there's a little lack of clarity in there as
far as which the ors or the ands apply to it. I
think some people are reading this that unless it
can be described by eloquent terms that a survey
is required. I don't necessarily read it that
way. I may want to read it that if I have a legal
description and that is concurred by the Secretary
that I should be good to go without needing a
survey but a little bit of clarity could be useful
in there. I think at this point I'll stop and see
if anyone else has any questions. I'm not an
elected official but I certainly can offer more
but at this point let's see if anyone else has
some questions.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Mr. Beyer. I
appreciate those comments and the specific
references. Those are always helpful to us. I'm
going to go back over to Vice Chair Randy King
from Shinnecock Tribe, so, Vice Chairman, you're
up. It looks like you're outside on a beautiful
sunny day.

MR. KING: Thank you. It's a beautiful
day here in Shinnecock and can you hear me first?

MR. NEWLAND: Yeah. It's a little windy
but we can hear you.

MR. KING: Great. So just kind of want
to illustrate for the Department the land of
Shinnecock that we have memorials that we hold as
our Tribal land. This is their side and this is
our side. These are the stories of this land.
We're seeking to protect our land. We're seeking
to create some sort of economic development for
our people so we can truly realize the
self-determination that other tribes have across this country. You, obviously, understand that our work product is before you. Obviously, this is fee-to-trust regulations and a lot of that work product is different than what you're asking and I just wanted you to acknowledge our presence today and the restricted fee status of the Shinnecock land that we've maintained through these years as perceived so, thank you, Assistant Secretary Newland, for hearing us and if you have any questions just let me know.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Vice Chairman.

I appreciate that and the recognition of restricted fee lands as a legitimate land tenure as well and the importance to your people and your tribe and thanks for taking time with us this morning.

MR. KING: Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: All right. We don't have any speakers in the queue at this time on the fee-to-trust regulations. It looks like Mr. Beyer has his hand raised again. I want to invite those
of you here on behalf of your tribe or your inter-Tribal organization to raise your hand and offer comments and, of course, provide us written comments as well. We do read those I assure you and oftentimes our work product is fundamentally changed and helped by the comments we receive in these sessions and the written comments. Mr. Beyer, I will come back to you.

MR. BEYER: Thank you, Assistant Secretary. Again, it may be a couple of direct points of clarity or reference. So I had mentioned previously about some of this kind of purposeful omission or striking of ors in a series of statements and as a specific example I would go back to 151.6 where previously 151.6 had identified A through E as being a series of ors. Again, I'm not an English expert but now the only or that exists is between sub D and sub E and the rest are just statements, which might lead someone to believe in a clarity of are those now ands or are those still all ors. So, again, there's just, you know, maybe to go back and see if that could
be cleared up for the full range of people that
will be reading the regulations and putting them
into place.

A couple of examples or other questions
related back to I'm not sure which question
specifically, but in the definitions section, and
maybe this is just a broader conversation for a
different time or a different policy, but references
this issue of restricted land or land held in
restricted status and so there's been, you know,
you own land in fee, you own land in trust,
but sometimes it appears there's this opportunity
for that middle ground of restricted status
land that again, cannot be incumbered without
the approval of the Secretary but at the same time
perhaps provided a little bit more opportunity
for tribes to manage those lands without
needing the full support of the Department.

Again, just to comment there is no
process other than what I've seen through, you
know, congressional action, there is no process
that allows for a tribe or an individual to go
through like fee-to-trust to put land into restricted status.

Second thing is that under again, definitions, sub L talks about Tribal consolidation area and that is also referenced a couple of times in the fee-to-trust regs but no reference to any process or law that would allow an organization to develop a Tribal consolidation area or a Tribal acquisition plan. So, again, it provides efficiency as efficiencies are listed in the proposed consultation draft where it talks about if there's a Tribal consolidation area, but again, no reference about how you would get a secretarially approved Tribal consolidation area. And I'll take a pause again at that point. Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Mr. Beyer. Again, I appreciate your comments. So, we don't have any folks in the queue for speaking or comments. I want to pause here and make sure that we're providing an opportunity for those of you who do want to make comments to get that raise my
hand function. We'll give it another few minutes.
If we don't, we can move on to the second part of our consultation. I'll give it just a few moments here. Tim, is that a new hand?
MR. BEYER: That's the left hand, so I'll leave you with just one more, please. One of the questions was where it talks about on reservation off-reservation, does the draft document provide for, I'm trying to find my list of questions here briefly. Sorry about that. One of the questions was the draft revisions propose criteria for evaluating applications involving land in the boundaries, contiguous and off. Do the draft regulations or revisions sufficiently account for the range of fee-to-trust applications?
And I know it's natural to be referenced in 25 CFR 151, but these regulations do not incorporate mandatory acquisitions. Not sure again if there's a value added of trying to pull those into 151. Those are my comments for today. Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Thanks, Tim, and thanks for raising that last point as an issue. I know that's been discussed before and how the Department effectuates those mandatory acquisitions, and it often involves a legal review of the statutory language, but I appreciate you referencing it. It must be a little too early in the morning for folks to get wound up about land-into-trust regulations. For folks here at the Department who are doing this work I'll tell you it's never too early in the morning to start talking about this stuff and working on it. We'll give you, again, just another few minutes here if you do want to offer a comment. If not, we can move on to the second set of regs. All right, going once. Going twice. Okay, Claire, can you please, oh, all right, never mind. Chief Barnes from the Shawnee tribe.

MR. BARNES: Good morning, Deputy Secretary. I just want to offer a comment and more of a point of order for this consultation and the next one. For those of us that work inside
section, I've dealt extensively in Section 106 and
NAGPA world and I promise this is germane to this
conversation. I feel that we have a hard time
having discussion today frankly and honestly with
yourself and making sure that our concerns are conveyed
or things that we speak today are going to be conveyed
to Secretary Haaland in confidence when we have a
third party hosting on your behalf today as a
public/private partnership where we contracted out
this consultation with Bernstein and Associates.
They've often sat across the table from us
adversely and as hired by entities at state
government levels, museums and universities. And so
having our private conversations consultations
between us and Interior having that potential for
that conversation to not be privileged causes me a
little bit of concern so I bring this up as a
point of order. I'm very excited for this
administration, the appointment of yourself and
Secretary Haaland but I think it's a misstep to
have a third party act as a interceptor, a liaison
or to attend these privileged conversations
between ourselves and our federal partners. And I say these things very respectfully, sir.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Chief Barnes. I appreciate that and note your concerns and we'll make sure that we're discussing internally. What I do want to say in response to that is we often use a third party contractor to facilitate these consultations to do the technical assistance piece with the Zooms and pulling it all together and so we'll make sure that we're being mindful of that and I will also say that as far as the folks are concerned here at the Department of the Interior, we view this as a part of our government to government relationship and consultation and we approach these conversations and your comments with that in mind and we just for awareness with these all of our consultations we typically have a court reporter and under our policy we generate a report of the consultation as well as the written comments that we receive and those reports are generally available on our website for Indian Country to make sure that we're accurately
reflecting and capturing what folks say but, Chief Barnes, your comments and concerns are well taken and I appreciate you raising your hand.

Okay. I see Bethany Sullivan.

MS. SULLIVAN: Hello, Assistant Secretary Newland. My name is Bethany Sullivan. I'm an attorney with Maier Pfeffer Kim Geary & Cohen. We represent a number of Tribal governments in California, but I am here today on behalf of the Federated Indians of Green Rancheria and I just have a few comments and really I think a couple of them are more so questions for clarification so maybe not necessarily things that you can respond to today, but things for you and your staff to think about as you're developing these regulations.

So, I'll start with 151.12 which is also reiterated in the definition section and this idea of Initial Indian Acquisition, it seems like the intent of this provision is for it to really apply to tribes as opposed to individuals and again, so I would just make the minor drafting suggestion
that that be changed to refer to Initial Tribal Acquisition.

My next comment concerns subsection B that reiterates in the four different types of fee-to-trust acquisitions so, within reservation boundaries, contiguous, off-reservation and initial and again, this is sort of just putting a question out there to gain some clarification as to what is the intent behind this subsection B. It's reiterating a lot of the secretarial policy from earlier in the regulations but then a few factors are missing such as housing. So, it's not clear if the purpose of this subsection is to sort of reinforce the secretarial policy or if it's to create perhaps like a priority track for certain types of applications, which is an idea that I think has come up in a couple different contexts in terms of thinking about conservation and coastal resource protection, etcetera, or is it just creating perhaps a greater likelihood of approval for certain types of applications. So, I think just better understanding the purpose of
subsection B would be very helpful.

My next comment concerns notice and comment. So, as we all know, there has been for some time a notice and comment requirement for local jurisdictions and we would recommend that there be a similar notice and comment requirement for local tribes. So, local jurisdictions beyond cities, counties and the state. That seems imminently logical and appropriate in terms of incorporating the local Tribal sovereigns.

And then my last comment concerns the presumption of community benefits that is woven into a few different provisions. You know, this, of course, seems like a positive thing but I think we're just trying to figure out what exactly does it mean for there to be a presumption of community benefits, if that benefits to the non-Tribal community in the area, benefits to both the Tribal and non-Tribal community. What about neighboring Tribal communities, so just a little bit of clarification as to what it means to have a presumption of community benefits. And that is it
for me.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you. I'm just trying to keep up with your comments --

MS. SULLIVAN: I have written comments as well.

MR. NEWLAND: -- in my note taking. With respect to the comment you made regarding including tribes as governments entitled to notice and comment to the extent that you submit written comments it would be helpful for us to understand the scope of that. You know, there are tribes that share reservation boundaries and there are tribes that share aboriginal homelands and there are tribes that are just very close neighbors and, you know, it would be helpful to understand the scope of your concern in your comments. So, and not something you have to address this morning but.

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, absolutely, and that's something that we're definitely thinking about and I'm sure, you know, that same type of question has already been tossed around with
Interior in terms of how to notify local jurisdictions that are not tribes so there might be some precedent there to borrow from but we'll definitely comment on that.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you. All right. I see nobody else in the queue for comments on this. I'll give it 30 more seconds if you want to talk and, otherwise, we can move on to the second set of draft regulations. Okay. Seeing nobody else in the queue on the land-into-trust regulations we'll go ahead and walk through the draft revisions of Part 293 regulations and the framing questions that we've shared with you in our Dear Tribal Leader letter.

So, the first question that we framed. Let me back up, the Part 293 Regulations govern the process by which the Department reviews Class III Gaming Compacts negotiated between tribes and states. As I think most folks know those agreements have to be submitted to the Department of the Interior for secretarial review within 45 days under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and
the Secretary can either choose to approve, disapprove or take no action on a gaming compact and IGRA sets out some limited grounds for disapproval.

Over the course of many years the standards for the Secretary's review of Class III Gaming Compacts have really evolved through this administrative case law, if you will, here in the Assistant Secretary's office with decision letters that are available on the website at the Office of Indian Gaming and so what we are attempting with these regulations is to provide some more clarity on the standards for what is and is not permissible in a Class III Gaming Compact, which agreements need to be submitted to the Department for review and try to draw some clear boundaries so that states and tribes have a better understanding in advance of what topics and what issues are in bounds for Class III Gaming Compacts rather than to force folks to define the Department's intent in our policies by reviewing dozens of those compact decision letters and
That's the intent behind this rule making. So, we put forward several framing questions for these regulations as well in our Dear Tribal Leader letter. The first question that we've asked is do the draft revisions increase certainty and clarity in the Secretary's compact review process. Are there additional ways to increase certainty and clarity?

The second question is do the draft revisions provide sufficient guidance to parties engaged in compact negotiations. Are there ways to provide additional guidance?

The third question is should the draft revisions include provisions that facilitate or prohibit the enforcement of state court orders related to employee wage garnishment or patron winnings?

Question number four was should the draft revisions include provisions that facilitate or prohibit state court jurisdiction over the gaming facility or gaming operations? Should this apply
to all claims or only certain types of claims?

Next slide, please. Question number five is should the draft revisions include provisions that identify types of meaningful concessions that a Tribe may request from a state other than protection from state license commercial gaming, i.e., exclusivity for which a tribe could make revenue sharing gains. How would such provisions affect compact negotiations?

Question number six is should the draft revisions include provisions that facilitate statewide remote wagering or internet gaming? And the last question that we've asked is should the draft revisions include provisions that offer or require the submission of electronic records?

So, with that, again, want to make sure that the floor is open for those of you wishing to comment on the Part 293 draft regulations. Those draft regulations should have been included in a link in the Dear Tribal Leader letter that you received and are available on our website as well.

So, again, those of you who want to
comment can use the raise my hand feature, which
is at the bottom of your screen. Those of you
joining by phone can press star nine. And if you
are joining by phone and you press star nine,
please press star six to unmute yourself when
called upon. I see no speakers in the queue.
Give it just a moment. I'm going to take that as
a good sign that we're getting close to the mark
on some of these things maybe. Of course, your
feedback is always welcome, critique or
redirection, any of that all really helps this
process.

Okay. Oh, I'll give it just another
minute or two and if we have no speakers we can
wrap up. I see George Skibine has his hand
raised. George, we'll call on you.

MR. SKIBINE: Can you hear me? All
right. I am George Skibine. I'm self-employed but
I represent several tribes across the country. At
this point I only have one comment and that is on
293.26, may a compact or a (inaudible) engage in
any form of Class III gaming activity. I think
the, it says yes if the state allows any form of
Class III gaming then the state is regulating all
forms of Class III gaming. The state's refusal to
negotiate in a compact for all forms of Class III
gaming not prohibited in the state is considered
evidence of bad faith. I think this provision is
a little unclear because at first it seems to take
the position that any means all so that let's say
if a state permits horse racing, then it means a
tribe can seek to negotiate a compact on slot
machines if any means all.

But in the second part of the second
sentence, it says if and the clause not prohibited
in the state and I think that is where I'm not
sure if it is to be clarified because you have a
lot of states who essentially do not permit any
gaming unless they're specifically permitted and
so states have gone slowly to essentially expand
Class III gaming by providing certain forms of
gaming on lots but not others so I think that this
provision will be controversial with the states to
begin with but it will be needed to be I think
clarified to make sure of what the Department's intent is here.

MR. NEWLAND: Thanks, George, for that flag and that comment. We will certainly go back and make sure that we discuss that. Again, these conversations are always very helpful. As you know, when you sit with work product for a long time, sometimes your eyes blur, but I appreciate you flagging that and, of course, would welcome recommendations or direction or guidance from folks on the direction we should take. Thank you, George.

MR. SKIBINE: You're welcome.

MR. NEWLAND: All right. Once again, you can submit comments in writing to us by midnight on June 30th of this year. You can email those to us at consultation@bia.gov. Okay. I see Rob Porter has his hand raised.

MR. PORTER: Good morning, Mr. Assistant Secretary and team. How are you doing this morning? Thanks for the consultation. Question relates to timeframe in terms of your approach
you'll take comments through the end of June. Do you have a sense of how long it might take to work through the process and what might be an effort to get the regulations finalized?

MR. NEWLAND: Sure. Thanks for the question on that, Rob. Obviously, it takes us a bit of time to go through the comments and sort them out by subject matter and then have the discussion on each one and also any rule making would require a preamble. It's my intention that all of that work would continue here internally over the course of the summer and, you know, again that we are committed to getting to a notice of proposal we'll be making on these. I can't give you a firm date on that because there's a lot of interagency review that goes on on any rule making that is deemed significant and that designation I think as you know there's a lot that goes into that. So, I can say that it's our intent to move these forward to proposed and to final in consultation with tribes. The President made a commitment before taking office that he wanted to
make the land-into-trust process easier and it's our job to make good on that commitment. So, I'll stop there, Rob, and just say that it's not our intention to take any long breaks in this process. We'll get to June 30th, we'll immediately start to work on piercing through the comments and putting the preamble together.

MR. PORTER: Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: All right. There are no speakers in the queue. I want to remind folks, too, that there is another consultation this afternoon at 2:00 p.m. Eastern. We have an additional consultation session this Friday, the 13th at 1:00 p.m. Eastern and again on May 23rd at 1:00 p.m. Eastern. I will of course welcome those of you who want to join and comment at any of these later sessions and submit written comments as well. So, if we don't have any more speakers lined up for this morning, we can wrap up. Thirty more seconds. All right. Well, with that, I want to thank all of you for joining us this morning. For those of you who did share comments, questions
and concerns, our team is really excited about this work. I do want to make sure I take a moment to give credit to everyone on our team who helped pull these together. Our Deputy Assistant Secretary, Kathryn Isom-Clause, you see on your screen here as well, Maria Wiseman from our office, Stephanie Sfiridis, Rose Petoskey and Sam Kohn. We worked very closely with Paula Hart and the team at the Office of Indian Gaming as well as Johnna Blackhair and Darryl LaCounte and folks across the Bureau of Indian Affairs and our great partners in the Solicitor's office including Ann Marie Bledsoe Downes and Eric Shepard. We've got a brilliant team here who's working hard to make sure that we're carrying these things forward to fulfill our trust responsibility and benefit Indian Country. Thank you all for taking time with us this morning. I look forward to seeing you on our travels out and about and wish you all a very happy day. That will conclude our consultation this morning.

(Whereupon, at 10:52 a.m., the
PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

* * * * *
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