In the Matter of:

NAGPRA Tribal Consultation

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings January 12, 2023



3200 East Camelback Road, Suite 177 Phoenix, Arizona 85018

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
10	
11	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
12	NAGPRA CONSULTATION
13	
14	Phoenix, Arizona January 12, 2023
15	10:00 a.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BY: HALEY DAWN WESTRA, RPR, CRR
22	Certified Reporter Certificate No. 50762
23	PREPARED FOR:
24	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
25	(Original)



1	NAGPRA CONSULTATION was taken on	2
2	January 12, 2023, commencing at 10:10 a.m., at the at	
3	the offices of the Bureau of Land Management 9828 North	
4	31st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, before HALEY WESTRA, a	
5	Certified Reporter in the State of Arizona.	
6	-	
7	APPEARANCES:	
8	SPEAKERS:	
9	Bryan Newland, Tribal President Ojibue Shannon A. Estenoz, Assistant Secretary	
10	Melanie O'Brien, Manager of NAGPRA	
11	STAFF:	
12	Oliver Whaley, Director Stephanie Sfiridis, Senior Policy Counselor	
13	Rose Petoskey, Senior Policy Counselor Samuel Kohn, Department Assistant Secretary	
14	Kathryn Isom-Clause, Deputy Assistant Secretary	
	Joaquin Ray Gallegos, Special Assistant Melanie O'Brien, Manager of NAGPRA	
15	Shannon A. Estenoz, Assistant Secretary Bryan Newland, Tribal President Ojibue	
16	Stephen Simpson, Esq., Solicitor's Office Brady Blasco, Esq., Solicitor's Office	
17	TRIBAL LEADERS:	
18	Harold Jacobs	
19	Desiree Duncan Melanie Deer	
20	Gerald "Shane" Anton Darius Enos	
21	Reylynne Williams Brenda Tomaras	
22	Vernelda Grant Larry Benallie, Jr.	
23	Sunday Eiset Fannie Suvlu	
24	Karyn Stricklan	
25		



		3
1	BRYAN NEWLAND: All right. Well, good	
2	morning, everybody.	
3	In Ojibwe, "Minogizhebaawagad."	
4	My name is Bryan Newland. I am a Bay Mills	
5	Indian Community tribal citizen. We're a small band of	
6	Ojibwe people up in northern Michigan, and I have the	
7	privilege of serving as the assistant secretary for	
8	Indian Affairs here at the Department of the Interior.	
9	And I'm really glad to be back doing	
10	in-person tribal consultations, and I'm glad to be here	
11	today.	
12	This is actually the first of four	
13	in-person consultations that we're hosting in the next	
14	day here in this room on different things that the	
15	Department of the Interior is doing. And we're here	
16	this morning to talk about our efforts to amend and	
17	revise the Department's regulations on NAGPRA.	
18	We've had a series of virtual	
19	consultations. We have published a proposed rulemaking	
20	this past fall.	
21	And this week, I think you may have seen,	
22	we've extended the comment deadline by 2 weeks to the	
23	end of January. I know that was a topic that's been	
24	brought up at several of our recent consultations.	
	1	

So you can get your written comments in to

		4
1	us by January 31st.	
2	Before I before we get into the	
3	substance, it's probably best to make sure everyone on	
4	our team gets a chance to introduce themselves to you.	
5	So I will turn to my friend and colleague	
6	Assistant Secretary Estenoz here.	
7	SHANNON ESTENOZ: Yes. Thank you. Thank	
8	you very much, Bryan.	
9	Good morning, everyone. I'm Shannon	
10	Estenoz. I'm the assistant secretary of the Interior	
11	for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.	
12	So in this role, I oversee the National	
13	Park Service, which, of course, administers the	
14	national NAGPRA program.	
15	It is an honor to be with you. It's	
16	wonderful to be here in Phoenix. My first visit to	
17	Phoenix. So this is it's great to spend it with	
18	you.	
19	This morning we're here to receive any	
20	input that you have and want to share with us on the	
21	NAGPRA proposed rule.	
22	There are a couple of areas, if you do have	
23	feelings or thoughts, wisdom in these specific areas,	
24	we would love to hear it from you.	

So, for example, we're keenly interested in

how folks are feeling about how we deal with the timelines in the proposed rule.

So the new regulations impose timelines on museums and federal agencies to carry out repatriation and disposition.

It is not our intent to impose timelines on lineal descendents or tribes or NHOs to request disposition or repatriation.

So how can we further -- you know, what we're really interested in here is further allowing Indian tribes and NHOs the flexibility and discretion in, you know, the step-by-step process while still holding museums and federal agencies accountable for completing the regulatory process.

So it's a balance between giving tribes and NHOs the flexibility they need while still holding everyone's feet to the fire to do this work and do it in a timely way.

The second big category is tribal lands.

So in subpart B, Indian tribes have new responsibilities now for discoveries and excavations on their own tribal lands.

We have provided an option to delegate these responsibilities to the BIA or any other federal agencies, but -- but it has to be done in writing.



2.0

So we just if you've got thoughts about
capacity, for example, in your tribes for completing
this work, we'd love we'd love to hear thoughts in
that area as well.

And then, finally, in the subject area of making requests. In subpart C, Indian tribes and NHOs must make written requests for consultation and repatriation.

So these new regulations, they provide for a more streamlined and -- process, and they try to simplify that process.

If you've got any thoughts about this process, capacity, do you think the proposed provisions are going to impact your tribe's capacity and resources for repatriation, we'd love to hear about that.

Having said that, everything that you have to offer us this morning is of great value, and we -- and we look forward to hearing it.

So, again, thank you for your time today.

BRYAN NEWLAND: All right. I want to also make sure that I'm recognizing all of our team members who have been involved in helping put this together.

So over here, on this side of the room, we've got Indian -- team Indian Affairs, including our deputy assistant secretary, Kathryn Isom-Clause; our



1	policy advisor, Joaquin Gallegos; and we have our
2	our policy counselors, Sam Kohn, Rose Petoskey, and
3	Stephaine Sfiridies, and Oliver Whaley, who was really
4	instrumental in pulling these things together for us.
5	So as we if you have particular
6	questions on things too, we encourage you to collar our
7	folks and ask them questions.
8	And I know we have other folks here from
9	the Solicitor's Office in the back, Stephen Simpson and
10	Brady Blasco.
11	And at this time, I'll turn it over to Mel.
12	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Thank you, Bryan; and
13	thank you, Shannon.
14	I want to echo their appreciation for the
15	opportunity to be here in person.
16	We have done so much of the work on these
17	regulations and in consultation with tribes remotely.
18	It's very good to be back in person to hear
19	from all of you.
20	We do have some information to share about
21	the proposed regulations in case you haven't had a
22	chance to dig into them.
23	But we're really more interested in hearing
24	from all of you, to get your thoughts and your ideas,
25	especially on how we've done in these proposed rules.



		8
1	So do you want me to move into the	
2	presentation?	
3	BRYAN NEWLAND: Sure.	
4	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Okay.	
5	Just a minute to move over. I'll get this	
6	back to you. There's one over there.	
7	BRYAN NEWLAND: Okay. I also forgot to	
8	add, before you begin, Melanie, that we do have Haley,	
9	our court reporter, here in the front taking notes.	
LO	We will take our own notes as well as we go	
11	along, but this is since this is an official	
L2	government-to-government consultation on the part of	
L3	the Department.	
L4	We do create a transcript and record of	
L5	this. And just to let you know that that it's	
L6	important for us as we go out of the formal	
L7	consultation and back to the drawing board, as it were,	
L8	that we have these comments in writing because we do	
L9	reference them when we're going back over the	
20	regulations and making changes based on the	
21	consultations.	
22	So I wanted to make sure you all understood	
23	that.	
24	MELANIE O'BRIEN: All right. Thank you.	
25	Okay. So if many of you know me, but	



2.0

just to be clear, as Bryan and Shannon both said, I'm
the manager of the national NAGPRA program, and it's my
job to assist the assistant secretaries in preparing
these regulations and sharing some of the details with
you.

What I have today is an outline of some of the steps that we've taken so far, but also some of our goals and our hopes for what these proposed rules will do.

So the NAGPRA regulations were first published as final in 1995. They have been amended over time.

The largest amendment was in 2010. And since that, since 2010, the Department has received repeated requests to make a full revision to these regulations.

In the summer of 2021, the Department conducted consultation with Indian tribes and the native Hawaiian community on a draft text, and we received 71 individual comments -- individual letters that yielded over 700 specific comments on what we were proposing.

In addition to that, in the spring of 2022, the Office of Management and Budget conducted its review of the proposed regulations, and that included



		some	interagency	review.
--	--	------	-------------	---------

So that brings us to October of 2022 when we published a proposed rule in the Federal Register.

We have some goals in this proposed rule.

Our main goal here is to simplify and improve the process for repatriation and disposition.

We have incorporated input from the consultations we conducted in 2021. We have incorporated that to the maximum extent possible.

So we took all of those 700-plus comments and tried to evaluate how much of them we could incorporate into this proposed rule.

As a result, we have emphasized consultation in every step of the process and required museums and federal agencies to defer to the customs, traditions, and Native American traditional knowledge of lineal decendents, Indian tribes, and Native Hawaiian organizations.

In the very first paragraph of the regulations, that sentence is the last sentence in the purpose of these regulations, that deference.

What we're hoping this will do is that it will shift the burden off of Indian tribes and NHOs, which is ultimately what Congress intended when they passed NAGPRA in 1990.



2.0

We have imposed deadlines on museums and federal agencies to complete the disposition and repatriation process.

And we hope we have removed the offensive and prohibitive sections of the regulations that are preventing repatriations from occurring.

The benefits that we see in these changes -- and, again, what we're here to do today is to find out if we've got this right, if we have achieved these goals and if we will realize some of these benefits.

In subpart B, which pertains to the protection of human remains and cultural items on federal or tribal lands, we hope that we have simplified the requirements, which will enable more protection of human remains and cultural items.

We have prioritized and required federal agencies take extra time for consultation on any discovery of -- on federal or tribal lands.

And ultimately, we hope we've reduced some of the ongoing burden and cost through the notice publication process for federal or tribal lands.

In subpart C, which pertains to the repatriation of human remains and cultural items, it is our hope that we have realized Congress's goal from



1990 to 1996 that requires the repatriation of human remains and cultural items.

Our hope is that we are resetting the process to require museums and federal agencies to complete their work specifically for human remains and associated funerary objects.

Based on the current rate of repatriation without these proposed changes, we estimate that it will take another 26 years to complete the repatriation of museum collections, so our hope is that we're going to change that timeline.

And lastly, we're hopeful that this is going to reduce ongoing costs, not only for museums and federal agencies in curating these collections that need to be repatriated, but also for Indian tribes and NHOs in conducting the consulation on these.

Our webpage at nps.gov/nagpra, under the regulations, we have provided a lot of different documents related to the proposed rule; so we're hopeful that these documents can assist you in reviewing the proposed rule and formulating comments.

So I'm going to leave it there for today instead of digging into any of the specifics of the proposed rule.

Given that -- the time we have and the



1	opportunity we have to be here with you in person, we'd
2	like to shift into conversation at this point.
3	I'll leave this table of contents,
4	basically, up so we can talk about certain specifics in
5	the regulations if you have questions.
6	And part of our goal here today is to hear
7	your questions as well as to hear your comments.
8	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: I do.
9	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Yes, Cassandra.
10	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Hi.
11	MELANIE O'BRIEN: We have a microphone for
12	you, just for the court reporter.
13	Oh, and just a note, please introduce
14	yourself with your name and your title or your
15	affiliation so that we can have that in the record.
16	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: My good morning. My
17	name is Cassandra J. Atencio. I am the tribal historic
18	preservation officer with the Southern Ute Indian Tribe
19	and the Cultural Preservation Department with in
20	Ignacio, Colorado.
21	And I'm glad to be here and to see faces
22	instead of on a Zoom, first of all this morning. And
23	I like the weather down here. It's snowy at home.
24	How how in line with the law do you
25	think these regs have gotten closer to and within the



14 1 spirit of what the law is? 2 That's my question. 3 BRYAN NEWLAND: Do you want to field that? 4 MELANIE O'BRIEN: I can if you'd like me 5 to. 6 BRYAN NEWLAND: Sure. 7 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: There's kind of been a disconnect. 8 9 MELANIE O'BRIEN: Absolutely. 10 disconnect, I would say, from our perspective, comes 11 largely in the repatriation provision. 12 So for collections and holdings, we feel 13 like the intent of the law in 1990 was to complete this 14 process and make human remains and associated funerary objects, in particular, available to Indian tribes and 15 16 NHOs for repatriation. And the law puts a time frame on that of 17 5 years and 6 months. It is a little bit more than 18 19 5 years and 6 months after November 16, 1990, at this 20 point. 21 So our hope is that we are resetting that 22 process to better align with what the act itself says 23 to require museums and federal agencies to make 24 decisions, specifically about human remains and 25 associated funerary objects, so they can go home. That



1	is our goal here to realign that process.
2	In subpart B, I would say that we are also
3	trying to realign the regulatory process with what is
4	in the act itself.
5	But in subpart B, I would say it's more
6	about making it clear, simplifying the process.
7	From the existing regulations can be
8	somewhat confusing and difficult to follow and
9	difficult to figure out what comes next, so in both
LO	subparts what we've done is put in a step-by-step
L1	process so that it's clear to everyone whether museums,
L2	federal agencies, or Indian tribes or NHOs, what the
L3	next step is, what the process is to get to the return
L4	of these items to their appropriate homes.
L5	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay.
L6	MELANIE O'BRIEN: But part of our question
L7	for you is: Did we get there? You know, that's kind of
L8	what we want to know with the comments is: Have we
L9	realigned the process? Have we reflected the original
20	intent of Congress, in your opinions?
21	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: And the second part
22	am I loud enough?
23	MELANIE O'BRIEN: It's more for the court
24	reporter.
25	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: The second part to



1	that, then, that wanting to go home, knowing that
2	people that reservation lands is not where these
3	people come from.
4	And is there a portion in the process now
5	about lands to put these ancestors on closer to where
6	they were found? Because they were put there in those
7	places for reasons.
8	I know that sometimes where intentional
9	excavations and different things, there's no land.
10	We do have a project, in fact, we're
11	working on that came from tribal private and federal
12	lands, but they're within the same landscape; so we're
13	trying to look for a place.
14	But in Colorado, we have our lands for
15	reburial work group where we try to identify lands that
16	are closer, but it just seems that it's harder.
17	It's good that we want to take them home on
18	one point; but, then, where are you taking them to?
19	And I think that that's a part of the
20	process and a part of that that stalemate because it
21	doesn't do any good. They're still going to sit there.
22	The other thing is that the money available
23	to do that when you're a THPO that specifically set
24	forth for THPO work and not NAGPRA work.



25

And so those budgets for NAGPRA are pretty

1	slim when it comes to competing tribes.
2	Thank you.
3	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Thank you for the
4	question.
5	I think for both lands for reburial as well
6	as funding for this work, those both fall outside of
7	the scope of these regulatory changes; however, I would
8	say that you are very fortunate in Colorado to have one
9	of the best examples of how state, federal, and tribal
LO	nations can work together to come up with a solution.
11	And we often point people to Colorado as a
L2	best practice in identifying lands for reburial.
L3	Unfortunately, it stops at the border of
L4	Colorado, and that's part of the issue.
L5	We do hope that the regulatory process will
L6	facilitate more conversations about what comes next.
L7	Because right now, you know, our
L8	perspective is that a lot of conversations around
L9	NAGPRA are on cultural affiliation or disposition and
20	how things can be returned.
21	And we want to shift that conversation to
22	be about about lands for reburial and about where
23	these things can go once they come home so that the
24	conversation is not about just getting to that point of
_ T	conversacion is not about just getting to that point of



25

being able to return. That -- that's part of our hope

I will say that we have tried to facilitate, in subpart B, better options for federal land managers in terms of reburial.

You know, it's pretty common practice across the United States that Indian tribes prefer human remains or cultural items that are removed from federal land to be reburied nearby.

And we hope that we have explained how a process like that could still work under the proposed rule and make it more seamless in terms of a process on federal lands.

In terms of funding, I'll mention that we are fortunate that in the last -- the newest appropriation, we have additional funds for NAGPRA grants, the largest amount we've ever had, just over \$3 million. So it's been appropriated for NAGPRA grants.

So we're looking for this year being a good year. We encourage everybody to apply for a NAGPRA grant. Those are due by March 10th.

But, again, the hope is that we can shift the work off of the consultation process to lead to repatriation and -- and shift some of that funding into the repatriation work itself.



1	So, again, once we get through the process
2	of of these regulations, our goal would be that
3	there would be more opportunities for Indian tribes to
4	use funding for repatriation.
5	BRYAN NEWLAND: And and thank you,
6	Ms. Atencio.
7	I'll just add that on the federal lands
8	piece, as it relates to reburial, you know, we we
9	know that this whole country, from corner to corner,
10	from sea to sea, was all Indian lands. It is
11	all of our homelands.
12	And so, you know, we can't we can't just
13	confine ourselves in our sacred places to our existing
14	reservation boundaries.
15	And we are working across the board on
16	making sure that all of our land management agencies
17	across the federal government are better incorporating
18	that into their process.
19	And there are as you probably know
20	better far better than I do, there are all kinds of
21	regulations about burying human remains on federal
22	lands outside of the NAGPRA process.
23	That's something that we are paying
24	attention to in trying to give consideration to how we



25

can be more effective and respectful on that side,

1	outside of the NAGPRA rulemaking process.
2	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: So so, then, you
3	know, how you're supposed to consider NAGPRA in all
4	your other when you do Consultation 106, 110,
5	whatever, endangered, and you think about NAGPRA in
6	cases, you know when you do development and ground
7	disturbance?
8	And so do you think that every federal
9	agency has its own policy, like you said, about
10	reburial and about what they do?
11	Is there a way to incorporate NAGPRA into
12	each of your into each of those agencies' thoughts
13	rather?
14	Because it seems like it's one-tracked when
15	it comes to consultation, whether we're talking 106
16	and, you know, 110, or whatever under NHPA.
17	And the Forest is different because it's a
18	farm bill.
19	But is there a way to make this a part of
20	what those are when you're considering your management
21	plans or whatever in those programs?
22	How to make how do we make this more up
23	in the front so people are noticing it and paying
24	attention to it when they're developing their 20-year
2.5	nlang ig what Ilm gawing?



1	BRYAN NEWLAND: Sure.
2	If I can't answer the legal questions
3	about that, but what I can say is that if you have
4	recommendations for us, you know, we would be happy to
5	consider them.
6	Also, just draw your attention to this is
7	something we raised in the boarding school report that
8	came out last year, this very issue that you're talking
9	about; so it's on our radar of things that, you know,
10	we're trying to address.
11	Some of it maybe statutory, which would
12	require an act of Congress. And where we can work with
13	other land management agencies to make this work
14	better, we want to do that.
15	But if you have specific proposals that you
16	want us to consider with your expertise and experience,
17	I'd encourage you to get those to us in writing.
18	And, again, we do we do read all these
19	comments.
20	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay.
21	BRYAN NEWLAND: People often say, "Do you
22	guys really read these comments?"
23	"Yes, we really, really do as part of this
24	process."
25	Yes, sir.



		22
1	LARRY BENALLIE, JR.: Good morning,	
2	everybody.	
3	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Good morning.	
4	LARRY BENALLIE, JR.: Is this on?	
5	Good morning, everybody. My name is Larry	
6	Benallie, and I am the archeological compliance	
7	specialist with the Gila River Indian community, the	
8	Tribal Historic Preservation Officers.	
9	And the initial presentation that I I	
LO	that interested me was that your proposal to have	
L1	to allow tribes to control over data recovery	
L2	excavations.	
L3	I'm assuming it's going to be on our lands	
L4	that we because we because that's what that's	
L5	what I think that's what you mean.	
L6	And I totally agree with that. I totally	
L7	agree with that with that idea.	
L8	But I was wondering if any of you had even	
L9	taken into consideration the ability of tribes to	
20	actually pursue control of data recovery on their	
21	lands.	
22	As far as I know, I can only count I can	
23	count in fingers how many tribes are even capable of	
24	doing that right now.	
25	And some of us are better at it than	



2.0

others. And I give you that. And there's a lot of
tribes who lack that kind of expertise and ability to
provide guidance in this in this kind of data
recovery.

And I always wonder what is the extent that the NAGPRA law revisions are proposing to the tribes to control data recovery on the land and what happens with disposition of the ancestors, the -- the consideration that all of the tribes to excavate is desecration, period.

And -- and from the cultural views, the different -- there's different cultural views, but you'll amazingly find that they're all very similar. We all have the same kind of idea about the thought of excavations.

And have you even considered that cultural aspect?

Have you even considered for the tribes who are not quite in the position to start commenting and taking control of the archeology that's conducted on their lands?

Have you even considered -- are you going to even provide them opportunity or expertise to help them along? Because that's what they definitely need. They need that assistance. And that's never been



1	provided. Nothing has ever been provided in that
2	matter.
3	We get a lot of these we get a lot of
4	these revisions to the law to get, "Oh, and they're
5	going to give you this money."
6	You know, the feds give you money to go
7	build power lines and to extend the Internet service,
8	you know, and cell phone service, and infrastructure.
9	But they never discuss that they have to
L O	comply with Section 106 with access to the Preservation
11	Act.
L2	They never talk about how the people who
L3	get those services are going to have to pay for them
L4	later, you know.
L5	There's no there's no guidance from the
L6	Feds offering that. It's just the money. And, you
L7	know, there's no expertise or revisions in the law
L8	here.
L9	And I'd just like to know and if if
20	the revisions in the law are going to allow for
21	expertise to be given to the tribes to that need it
22	when it comes to controlling data recovery on their
23	lands.
24	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Thank you. I appreciate

25

the input and the question because it focuses on an

1	issue that we have very much tried to address in the
2	revisions to these regulations, and that is what
3	responsibilities tribes have on their tribal lands when
4	it comes to ancestors and items that might be
5	discovered.
6	And it is it is in the act itself, in
7	the law itself, that gives Indian tribes that
8	responsibility to care for their ancestors and items on
9	their lands, on their tribal lands.
LO	And we have tried to highlight that in
11	these revisions. It's in the existing regulations, but
L2	it's often not exercised in that kind of a meaningful,
L3	direct way.
L4	So we've tried to revise that to make it
L5	clear that the tribe, in the first instance, is the one
L6	who can and should take care of those ancestors and
L7	items.
L8	But you raised a good point, which is when
L9	tribes may not have the capacity to do so or the
20	necessary training or skill to do so.
21	And in those instances, the tribe can,
22	then, defer that responsibility or transfer that
23	responsibility to a federal agency or to the BIA, in
24	particular, on tribal lands. That's an option.



Our hope would be that this might improve

1	opportunities for tribes to have better access to
2	technology and to training to facilitate those roles.
3	For NAGPRA, of course, it's going to be
4	limited to those cases where there are ancestors or
5	items that are discovered.
6	What you're talking about certainly goes a
7	little bit broader into other areas of just
8	preservation.
9	But in terms of archaeological data
LO	collection, one issue that we have actually removed
11	from these regulations, on either federal or tribal
L2	land, is any expectation that there will be data
L3	recovery or data collection from a discovery of
L4	ancestors or items.
L5	That is left up to the federal agency and
Lб	the tribes to decide together, again, with deference to
L7	the tribe's opinions about whether there should be data
L8	collection from federal land and discoveries on federal
L9	land.
20	So we have tried to reduce the requirements
21	there for any kind of archaeological data collection
22	from NAGPRA-related activities.
23	I don't think it's quite a full solution to
24	the problem that you stated. And I'm sorry that we



can't go further. But we have tried to at least make

1	it clear what the options are when there is discovery
2	of human remains or cultural items on tribal land, that
3	it is the tribe who can determine what happens next.
4	GERALD "SHANE" ANTON: Good morning,
5	everybody. I am Shane Anton. I'm the tribal historic
6	preservation officer for the Salt River and
7	Pima-Maricopa Indian community.
8	So us, along with Gila River, we have our
9	most knowledgeable people on NAGPRA, not here, they're
LO	en route, so
L1	But they sent me some of the comments. And
L2	I think it's going to cover a lot of these broad ranges
L3	of stuff, but I'm just going to read them off if that's
L4	okay.
L5	I'm not necessarily looking for an answer,
L6	just that you're aware of what we're seeking.
L7	So the goals of the regs: One, to get
L8	funerary objects repatriated with all burials.
L9	Two, to recognize the spiritual nature of
20	sacred animals, now included in the definition of
21	"human remains," that SRP-MIC, our community does
22	support that.
23	Is there transparency in decision-making
24	process?
25	And my my experience in that is that if



1	the agency or well, the agency or fed determine that
2	something is not repatriateable or goes to another
3	tribe or that they decide to keep it under whatever
4	regulation, they never disclose who made that decision.
5	It may be that we're working with the
6	people on the lower level; but if there's a board of
7	regents or somebody else that they answer to, they, a
8	lot of times, will say, "No, we won't do that," but we
9	never get the chance to meet them. So there's no
LO	transparency in that sense.
L1	Have museums directly answer why they won't
L2	repatriate in cases where they won't repatriate.
L3	Recognize PPP loans as federal funding.
L4	Strengthen civil penalties.
L5	Require tribal input on care, handling, and
L6	housing.
L7	Require a moratorium on scientific testing
L8	and research unless there is a written permission from
L9	tribes.
20	Disclose whether or not the ancestors or
21	any protected items have been treated with toxic
22	substances, have been on display, or if ancestors or
23	belongings have been destroyed or discarded.
24	Per recent "plain language" guidelines
25	I'm sorry per recent "plain language" guidelines,



29 1 the regs should remove all references to legal 2 interests and instead use "plain language" decipherable 3 by the average person. 4 11, right of possession cannot ever be 5 established for human remains, funerary objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. No one has the right to 6 7 sell or trade them for any reason. That concludes the list. 8 9 BRYAN NEWLAND: That's really helpful. was trying to keep up. I think that -- I'm sure we'll 10 11 have it all in the transcript. 12 But thank you for the clear articulation of 13 your goals. And I put a star next to the federal 14 funding piece as well. That's a piece I haven't heard 15 before, and I want to make sure that we're giving a 16 thorough discussion internally. SHANNON ESTENOZ: The PPP. 17 18 BRYAN NEWLAND: Yeah. 19 SHANNON ESTENOZ: The PPP funding, yeah. 2.0 BRYAN NEWLAND: Yeah. 21 Thank you. 22 Additional comments or thoughts? 23 No? We're here to hear from you to make 24 sure that we're getting this rulemaking right. 25 GERALD "SHANE" ANTON: I wanted to give



1	other people the opportunity to ask questions if there
2	was any, so we do have one I do have one.
3	And, again, back to the people that aren't
4	here. They're working closely together going through
5	these regs line by line.
6	And so one of the issues that we had a
7	concern on that I did was able to kind of see and
8	I'll be honest, I haven't looked through the regs, you
9	know, in that sense.
LO	But one of the things that they asked me
L1	was this I'm not sure under which guideline it is.
L2	I want to say it's either 10-9 or 10-10.
L3	But it's the stay of repatriation issue.
L4	And it kind of lists how things go in a certain order.
L5	I guess the order of the sequence of events.
L6	But in that sequence of events, there
L7	isn't a it doesn't say when things go to NAGPRA
L8	review committee.

It seems like it goes from a dispute to court or to some kind of federal court or some kind of court proceeding.

22 So that whole section seems kind of muddy.

So I just wanted to make that comment as well.

BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you.

Thank you for that. We'll make sure that



19

20

21

23

24

2.0

we go back and look to see if we can bring some clarity to it.

One of the challenges with drafting regulatory language is leaving yourself enough flexibility to capture different situations but speaking with enough clarity to deal with particular situations.

And it's -- it really is a skill too, but if you -- you know, it's often we're helped in that process by getting guidance and suggested language from people to make sure we're capturing everything.

So, again, we have extended our written comment period to the end of the month.

I know folks, in our most recent consultation, were asking for a much longer extension. And one of the things I want to take the opportunity to explain is that in our roles, time is a finite resource. And this is one of the priorities of the administration.

And even from this point, getting to a proposed rule and then moving into a final rule, there has to be a review of all the public comments, a review of all the tribal comments, a disposition of every one, which getting everybody in the room together to do that, it's very hard to coordinate that, and then



1	drafting a preamble.
2	And then getting final rule language
3	that that gets reviewed by all the relevant federal
4	agencies takes many months.
5	And so even from where we sit today,
6	it's it's getting to a final rule is going to
7	take us many months.
8	And making sure that we're doing this on
9	a on a time frame that allows President Biden's
10	administration to complete this work and put it into
11	implementation means we don't have as much time to
12	extend the comment period as, I think, we all would
13	like. And we're always mindful of the old adage of not
14	letting the perfect solution become the enemy of a good
15	solution.
16	And so, you know, we did extend the comment
17	period to the end of the month, but it will be
18	challenging for us to meet those goals if we were to
19	extend the comment period much beyond that.
20	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: What if our comments
21	are the comments that were from the previous draft
22	before you brought up this new rulemaking? Is that
23	fine?
24	BRYAN NEWLAND: Mm-hmm.
25	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. Because we do



1	have comments from the original and then the proposed,
2	but not the one the newest draft ruling that came
3	out.
4	And so part of ours were, like, a purpose
5	that these regulations provide a systematic process
6	under part A for the purpose, and and we know
7	that so let me read the whole letter.
8	The Honorable Bryan Newland, Assistant
9	Secretary Indian Affairs.
10	The Honorable Shannon Estenoz, assistant
11	secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks and the U.S.
12	Department of Interior.
13	Assistant Secretary Newland and Assistant
14	Secretary "Es-ten-own-ez"?
15	SHANNON ESTENOZ: "Es-ten-knows."
16	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: "Es-ten-knows"?
17	SHANNON ESTENOZ: Mm-hmm.
18	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. The Southern Ute
19	Indian Tribe thanks you for your leadership on behalf
20	of the Department of Interior to conduct
21	government-to-government tribal consultation I had
22	problems with Wi-Fi, anyway on the draft proposal to
23	revise regulations implementing the NAGPRA, on behalf
24	of the Department to conduct government-to-government
25	tribal consultation on the draft proposal to revise



2.0

regulations implementing the Native American Graves
Protection and Repatriation Act.

We recommend and request that this round of comments not be the only opportunity to engage before the final rule and prior to the regular noticed and public comment process.

More than 10 years have passed since the

Department last consulted on the NAGPRA process.

In the interim, with the help of transparency and data reporting from the national NAGPRA program, we have learned much about how the process has, at times, been ineffective for Indian tribes.

We welcome this opportunity to assist in identifying the best way to repair and replace processes that lead to the healing and mending of the trauma that has happened through the collection of our ancestors and their cultural items.

We hope that this efforts leads to a NAGPRA process that also repairs and heals federal agencies and institutions from the burden of historic trauma their collections have caused.

While we appreciate the overview or changes provided by the National Park Service, the full draft proposal is extensive and significantly restructured from the current regulations.



We respectfully request that you provide
us and you already did with the draft preamble
that accompanies this document and the redline markup
of the changes, what you guys, this is this was
before December when we had first put this draft
together.
Subpart A, in general, the purpose, these
regs provide a systematic process for the disposition
and repatriation of Native American human remains,
funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of
cultural patrimony under the Native American Graves
Protection and Repatriation Act of November 16, 1990.
We are concerned about the omission of
lineal descendents, Indian tribes, and NHOs which are
whose which are those who rights to cultural items
will be affected by the NAGPRA processes.
And, CU 25 USCA subsection 3002(A)12(A) and
(B) covering the priority of ownership and control of

And I don't know if you've already addressed these things within that, but, therefore, we recommend amending the purpose to read as follows:

cultural items under NAGPRA.

Purpose: These regulations provide for the systematic process for the disposition and repatriation of Native American human remains, funerary objects,



1	sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony.					
2	Just because the first way it just says					
3	"human remains," which doesn't give you a clear					
4	distinction between Native American and other peoples,					
5	besides us indigenous creatures.					
6	So that was a one portion because, you					
7	know and especially for the layperson because then					
8	you get into we don't NAGPRA only covers tribes					
9	that we only care you know, our only concern is with					
10	Native Americans, so that portion.					
11	And and offers to cultural patrimony to					
12	lineal decendents, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian					
13	organization, and others under the Native American					
14	Graves Protection Act, dot, dot.					
15	Applicability, these regulations pertain to					
16	Native American human remains. We recommend keeping					
17	the phrase "pertain" to the identification and					
18	appropriate disposition of.					
19	And then, 1, discovered on or excavated					
20	from.					
21	I'll just send these to you guys, okay,					
22	rather than going through this line by line? I'm going					
23	to bore everybody. Thank you.					
24	But anyway, but we do have comments.					
25	I just need to know this is the correct email?					



		37		
1	BRYAN NEWLAND: Mm-hmm.			
2	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. Thank you.			
3	BRYAN NEWLAND: And Oliver can help too			
4	troubleshoot the you know, where where the			
5	comments go to and confirming that you got them.			
6	OLIVER SHALEY: Yeah. So if you've got any			
7	questions, the email address up there,			
8	consultation@bia.gov, or you can email me directly.			
9	It's just oliver.shaley@bia.gov.			
10	And then if you need that, you can come and			
11	just find me when we're done here today, and I can take			
12	that for you.			
13	BRYAN NEWLAND: That's the first time I've			
14	heard "indigenous creatures" in a formal			
15	government-to-government consultation.			
16	All right. Any additional comments?			
17	We're here at your disposal.			
18	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Can I?			
19	BRYAN NEWLAND: Sure. Go ahead, ma'am.			
20	MELANIE O'BRIEN: It's always a good			
21	opportunity, especially with the assistant secretaries			
22	here, if you have examples or situations that you			
23	experienced in trying to accomplish a repatriation or a			
24	disposition, examples and real-life scenarios often			
25	help us better understand how we can make the			



1	regulations better fit the actual experience.			
2	So if you feel like you'd like to share			
3	something, that's another way to move forward and to			
4	give us more input, where you've had trouble with these			
5	regulations in the past.			
6	I also know that could take days.			
7	GERALD "SHANE" ANTON: Based on that			
8	question, since you asked, I had a concern, and I'm not			
9	sure how the regs would address it.			
10	But as an example, we've tried to			
11	repatriate things from the BA. And I don't know if			
12	they're under the NAGPRA category. But they were			
13	reluctant or they wouldn't do it or, rather, they went			
14	the permanent loan route; in other words, "We'll			
15	permanently loan it to you, but we won't follow			
16	NAGPRA."			
17	Are there issues that can address that so			
18	they can be repatriated under the way they should be			
19	repatriated?			
20	And why do the agencies take that stance?			
21	What's the reason they don't want to repatriate per the			
22	law?			
23	BRYAN NEWLAND: That's a great question,			
24	and I don't have I don't have an answer for you			



today, but Stephen might. He's got his hand raised in

1	the back there.				
2	Oliver is getting his steps in today.				
3	STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: Yeah, this is				
4	Stephen Simpson with the Solicitor's Office.				
5	The issue is, sometimes, one of authority,				
6	especially for the NAGPRA gives all federal agencies				
7	statutory authority, okay, the power under a statute				
8	for disposition for repatriation, for taking things				
9	items out of agency collections and giving them back to				
10	tribes where they should be. Okay?				
11	But it's only those certain classes of				
12	items.				
13	The other statutes often will sometimes				
14	do that kind of thing for other classes of items that				
15	the Federal Government has, but the BIA doesn't have				
16	that many of those.				
17	And so we've tried and has actually				
18	fewer of those than some other federal agencies do.				
19	So we've tried to work with the BIA has				
20	tried to work with tribes in some cases to be able				
21	to and, quite frankly, has been probably more				
22	flexible than we should than they should be if they				
23	get legally challenged on it, but nobody has challenged				
24	it.				
25	So there's a few a few cases where we've				



been able to do that. But it is -- it is very rare. 1 2 And that's the main reason why, is -- is having the 3 authority from Congress to be able to give -- to be 4 able to give you back what, yes, should be yours. 5 There is -- it's not -- it's not a lack of 6 recognition. And anybody that I've ever worked with, 7 with the BIA, in 23 years of representing the BIA on all of this, it is not -- it is not any lack of desire 8 9 to do that or lack of a recognition that that's what 10 should happen. It's a lack of authority from Congress to 11 12 do it. 13 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Just as a clarifying 14 question, Stephen, just so that I understand --15 STEPHEN SIMPSON: Sure, Shannon. 16 SHANNON ESTENOZ: -- what you're 17 explaining. 18 Are you -- are you saying that objects that 19 are not covered by NAGPRA in this case? Because NAGPRA 20 does apply to BIA; correct? It gives --21 STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESO.: Yes -- no, he's referring to -- I understand the question to be 22 23 referring to objects that are not covered by NAGPRA. 24 SHANNON ESTENOZ: I see. Okay. 25 STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: Yes.



41 1 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Got it. 2 BRADY BLASCO, ESQ.: Brady Blasco, also 3 with the Solicitor's Office. I want to add that just that this authority 4 issue has been on the radar of many agencies for a long 5 6 time. 7 And while there hasn't -- I don't think 8 there's been an opportunity yet to address it for, say, 9 like, archaeological collections across the federal 10 government. 11 There have been some steps taken. 12 particular, the Park Service finalized a rule this last 13 year that created some limited circumstances for the 14 deaccessioning of some archeological collections collected under ARPA and some other laws in the past. 15 16 It is -- it is limited, but it's a first 17 step towards agencies exploring how far they can go to 18 address these other items that are not subject to 19 NAGPRA and how those might be -- "deaccession" is the 20 term museums use. So basically, they're returned or 21 transferred to folks who might have a greater interest 22 in them than the -- than the museums and the agencies. 23 STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: And to add to what

STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: And to add to what Brady was saying on the -- on the further efforts...

In 2010, when we issue -- when we issued



24

1	the regulation on cultural on return of culturally					
2	unidentifiable human remains in the NAGPRA process,					
3	there's a lot of discussion in the preamble of that					
4	regulation of disposition of authority.					
5	And to the and that is one of the					
6	reasons why I think you mentioned earlier why					
7	associate why we say in that reg said in that					
8	regulation and say in the current NAGPRA regulations					
9	that associated funerary objects may be repatriated as					
10	part of that process, but it's up to the federal					
11	agency.					
12	And it depend and we say in that written					
13	NAGPRA and the preamble to that regulation that it					
14	depends upon the agency's disposition authority.					
15	I wanted to note that in this update, in					
16	these proposed regulations, we have changed our					
17	interpretation of that portion of the act and are now					
18	proposing to say that associated funerary objects must					
19	go back.					
20	So we've at least come that far on it.					
21	BRYAN NEWLAND: Shane, thank you for					
22	raising that issue. And that's something these are					
23	always when I come into tribal consultations,					
24	I always leave learning about issues that I didn't					



expect to learn about.

		43
1	And so this is another one I've marked for	
2	a follow-up conversation. So thank you for that.	
3	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: I have a question,	
4	then.	
5	So what about for, like, private museums	
6	and and a state museum that received help during	
7	COVID from the federal agencies? Now are they subject	
8	to NAGPRA?	
9	Because we have a museum that may have	
10	replicas and may have funerary objects that are within	
11	them, and they asked for during COVID, they asked	
12	for federal assistance.	
13	Now can we apply NAGPRA to them to to	
14	engage in consultation?	
15	STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: We are in	
16	conversation with the Small Business Administration on	
17	that point.	
18	And the fact that two of you have now	
19	mentioned it at consultation means that we're going to	
20	have to respond to that point that question in the	
21	final rule, and we will do that.	
22	We don't know yet, but we will	
23	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: And then	
24	STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: but we will	
25	hut we will check it out	



44 1 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Because, you know, 2 we've been trying to figure out how we can make --3 I don't want to say "make," but have this museum adhere 4 and at least engage in -- in our perspective. 5 And so that's kind have been where we're 6 at, especially with a replica on display. 7 STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: We're working on it. 8 9 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: Thank you. 10 11 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: I wanted you to say 12 "yes." STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: I know, but I have 13 14 to -- I knew you did, but I have to talk -- I have to 15 talk to other lawyers first. 16 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Yes -- yes, and --17 my microphone is not working. Hello? 18 MELANIE O'BRIEN: It just takes a moment. 19 SHANNON ESTENOZ: My -- hello? 2.0 I've learned that "yes" and "no" don't seem 21 to be in the Government's vocabulary. Just like "yes, 22 period; no, period." 23 "No" is more frequent than "yes." 24 GERALD "SHANE" ANTON: I quess as a follow-up to that example of issues, so we work closely 25



1	with the Pueblo Grande Museum. And they did a lot of					
2	excavation, I think, back in the '20s, '30s. But					
3	they at that time, the director and I can't					
4	remember his name. My people will help me back					
5	there but he he loaned and I don't know if it					
6	was more of just a gentleman's agreement to a to					
7	a museum in Oklahoma.					
8	And the City recently found out about a					
9	City archaeologists who we work with all the time, the					
10	City of Phoenix, they made it known that I'm sorry.					
11	What's the name of it? Woolaroc Museum, and they're					
12	a private institution.					
13	So the friendship between the previous					
14	director and the gentleman who started Woolaroc was					
15	like I said, that's the gentleman.					
16	But it was under excavation of Pueblo					
17	Grande Museum. And I think the BIA came back and					
18	determined that the gentleman didn't have the					
19	right of didn't have the right to make the loan					
20	based on again, this is back in the '30s and '40s.					
21	So we required of Woolaroc, "Can you let us					
22	know if this BIA has got involved with this?"					
23	They say "Yes." You know, we should have					
24	control of that. Woolaroc has been resistant in					
25	saving, "Well, we're a private museum. We don't					



1 follow -- we don't have any federal funds or any 2 federal nexus; therefore, we do not have to comply," or 3 you know... 4 But we're pretty sure they got PPP loans. 5 And that's the reason for us saying, "Yes, you did get 6 some government money. And, yes, you should comply." 7 But, again, that's just our stance and not 8 a legal stance. Just, I guess, a moral one from our 9 point of view. 10 So that's just another example. And that's 11 still ongoing. We haven't -- we're deciding now 12 whether we are going to litigate or not, but that's 13 where we are. 14 Oh, Od Elsa [phonetic], that's the 15 gentleman from Pueblo Grande. 16 SUNDAY EISET: So --17 BRYAN NEWLAND: Oh. I'm sorry. Can you 18 share your name? 19 SUNDAY EISET: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Sunday 20 Eiset. I'm with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community THPO. I'm a dig archeologist. 21 22 Similar to that, they're dealing with a case where Abel Hourary [phonetic] had lent a 23 24 collection with -- of ancestors and associated objects

25

and other things to the Mexico City, the Museo Nacional

47 1 in Mexico. 2 And they are now -- and that was kind of a 3 loan that -- or not a loan -- that ASM did. 4 And so they're involved in trying -- and 5 the BIA is also involved in trying to work with the Museo to return those collections. And that's been 6 7 very difficult. And I'm, you know, familiar with other --8 9 I'm very familiar with the Yaqui repatriation case, so 10 I know how that can go outside of the NAGPRA process. 11 And I know that there's no real framework 12 for doing this kind of thing within the framework of 13 NAGPRA. 14 But I think I would just kind of raise 15 that, again, as another example where I can see tribes 16 are having problems with museums that are international in scope and respecting the wishes of the tribes. 17 18 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Can I ask a question of 19 Stephen? 2.0 BRYAN NEWLAND: Yes. 21 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Just stick -- just 22 sticking with this topic for just a moment to clarify my understanding, Stephen or Brady, what qualifies as 23 24 federal funding.



25

So, in other words, for an institution to

1	be pulled under the NAGPRA regulations, is that defined				
2	in the statute or is it an interpretation? Is it a				
3	legal interpretation? Is it in the regs? And what is				
4	it generally?				
5	Because there are all kinds of ways of				
6	getting federal funding one-off federal grants and the				
7	like.				
8					
9	BRADY BLASCO, ESQ.: So there's a wide				
10	variety of versions of federal funding that that				
11	that would count as federal funding under the				
12	regulations, under the act, to make institution that				
13	might not even normally look like a museum qualify as a				
14	museum under the regulations.				
15	We discussed some of that, but I think it				
16	would be best to refer to the preamble where there is				
17	analysis of what some of that some of that includes,				
18	and it's fairly consistent with analysis that was done				
19	in prior durations of the regulations as well.				
20	SHANNON ESTENOZ: Okay. Okay.				
21	BRADY BLASCO, ESQ.: Questions such as				
22	about the PPP loans are difficult for us just because				
23	those are so new compared to some other forms. So we				
24	have to figure out what bucket those actually fit in				



25

SHANNON ESTENOZ: Yeah, okay.

49 1 BRADY BLASCO, ESO.: -- but there's a number 2 of buckets addressed in the preamble, most of them 3 count as federal funding. 4 There are a few exceptions that come up 5 towards the end of that -- of that section, which 6 I could provide a page number or something if you give 7 me a second. STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: And one other point 8 on that is -- and just, Shannon, it is not -- it is not 9 10 in the statute. 11 The statute just says "Receives federal 12 funding," and leaves the agency up to -- leaves that up 13 to all of us to figure out. 14 But one of the great ways we have 15 consistently interpreted it through the years has been 16 that in the instance, for example, of state universities --17 18 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Yeah. STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: And their 19 2.0 museums --21 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Yeah. 22 STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: -- that if --23 that every -- every state receives federal funding; 24 therefore, every entity of the state receives federal 25 funding.



1	And that flows down to state universities.				
2	It flows down to museums that are run by states,				
3	museums that are run by state universities. It flows				
4	down to local localities that get that get				
5	funding money from the state or directly federal				
6	funded and vocal the offices in those localities,				
7	like coroners' offices that you wouldn't think of are				
8	museums but actually are for purposes of this statute.				
9	So it is still a fairly broad reach				
10	SHANNON ESTENOZ: Yeah.				
11	STEPHEN SIMPSON, ESQ.: and and we				
12	keep as Brady said, you know, there some of this				
13	is well established in in the sort of the way				
14	we've been working on the act and in the sort of				
15	federal community.				
16	Because Congress uses this uses this				
17	criterion a lot, and so there's a lot of people who are				
18	working with this with this issue.				
19	The thing with PPP loans is they are new.				
20	We haven't been able to contact figure out who to				
21	contact and then talk to extensively enough with this				
22	particular problem as to whether it how it works in				
23	this issue.				
24	We've heard how it works with people who				

25

get federal grants in general or with not-for-profits

1	who get, you know, in some other contexts, but not in
2	this particular one. And that's what we're trying to
3	work with the SBA on figuring out.
4	SHANNON ESTENOZ: Okay. Thank you.
5	BRYAN NEWLAND: And, Sunday, if I can
6	just with regard to your example, you know, we've
7	got a brand-new law in the books now in the STOP Act
8	that President Biden just signed in the last 2 weeks
9	2 I lose track of times around the holidays, so
10	forgive me but that deals with international
11	trafficking and objects of patrimony.
12	And so we're trying to understand now
13	the the intersection of that with NAGPRA as well and
14	what our obligations and and responsibilities are at
15	the Department of the Interior.
16	And Melanie informs me that we've actually
17	got a briefing up in the very near future to discuss
18	that.
19	So that's on that's on our minds as well
20	as the international context and how that all plays in
21	here.
22	But in a brand-new law, the initial
23	implementation often you know, when a law is first
24	put into effect, the first ways that you use it, like



anything else in life, becomes habit for us.

2.0

So we want to make sure that and
precedent we want to make sure we're getting this
part of it right and and meeting the spirit of the
law.
Maybe the coffee has worn off from

Maybe the coffee has worn off from everyone, but, you know, we can -- we can hold for final comments. We can break early if you want, but, you know, we'll leave it up to you guys.

We had 3 hours scheduled, so we want to make sure we are available to do the formal consultation on the record. And, again, the written comments are incredibly helpful as well.

And let me just add on behalf of the Department is -- that this is -- this is one of the first rules that we took up walking into the Department, the president's administration.

probably within our first 60 days on the job, we were pulling together a team of folks to go forward with this rulemaking because it's important to Secretary Haaland, and it's important to us. And it's our intention to get this rule done and get it to final so that this administration can use it and not only get the rule on the books, but then to make sure that we're setting the first -- you know, we're setting the stones for implementation in creating those good habits for



the Department	for	future	administrations.
----------------	-----	--------	------------------

So we're going to continue to press forward on this, and I just really encourage you to -- you can help us along by getting comments in before the deadline so that we can use them as they're part of the record, which the administrative record, in all of this, getting written comments, getting comments in these transcripts, is very helpful for us when people raise questions or challenges down the line, and we can -- we can point to language in the regulations that are tied back to what we've heard in the consultations.

Yeah.

DESIREE DUNCAN: Good morning. And thank you for having us. I apologize for us being late. We went to the wrong BLM downtown but wanted to introduce ourselves.

I'm Desiree Duncan, the director of Native Lands & Resources with Tlingit & Haida.

And this is Harold Jacobs. He's the cultural resources specialist, and he has a wealth of knowledge.

We are going to submit some written comments, but we wanted to get President Peterson's approval first.

But, Harold, did you want to share anything



1	about your experiences, good or bad?
2	HAROLD JACOBS: Good morning. Thank you.
3	One of the problems we had was where the
4	regulations say, "Upon receipt of a valid claim, the
5	museum has 90 days," but then there's always this word
6	where they'll stick on it and hang on it.
7	So the museums took it upon themselves to
8	determine what was a valid claim and what wasn't.
9	And we just settled a claim in May that
10	took 20 years after we submitted the claim.
11	Another museum we went to, actually, had
12	armed guards in the room watching over the objects
13	while we did a consultation. That shouldn't happen in
14	any museum. That was the Springfield Science Museum.
15	When we first got these inventories in
16	November of '93, the Denver Art Museum sent out a list
17	of five objects that they determined met the
18	requirements of NAGPRA.
19	My predecessor said, "You don't get to make
20	that determination. That's ours." But we still ran
21	into that problem.
22	And with the that same museum, the
23	Denver Art Museum, I was talking with another museum
24	about the problem there, and the director of that
25	museum said, "The problem is when you have a museum



Т	with art collections an art museum as opposed to a
2	museum that has an anthropology section, where art
3	museums only view the monetary value of objects and
4	what it means to their collection and not the, shall
5	I say, human connection that the tribe needs or has.
6	And then there's the museum right in
7	downtown Juneau, which sits in the middle of Tlingit
8	territory, which has, on record, said that they don't
9	have to comply with NAGPRA. It's just an advisory law.
10	But I wanted to comment on the objects
11	taken from graves.
12	We had two museums we had a shaman from
13	her clan, actually, that was buried in 1853, and the
14	objects got distributed to several museums.
15	Two museums said, "Yes, we'll return them
16	as unassociated funerary objects."
17	The other the museum said, "No, his
18	predecessor had the right to sell it, so we're not
19	giving it back."
20	But should these objects be claimed with
21	that or should they since they once had human
22	remains with them be listed in an inventory
23	completion?
24	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Hello. And both of you,
25	welcome from your long journey from Alaska.



1	Harold, I don't know why every time I see
2	you, you, seem to look younger, but it maybe it's
3	the hat.
4	You know, I think that's one of the issues
5	we've tried to really clarify in these revisions.
6	When it comes to whether an object is a
7	funerary object is associated or unassociated, that the
8	only determining factor under the law is where the
9	human remains are presently.
10	So the answer to your question depends on
11	where the remains of that individual are.
12	If they were left alone and not removed,
13	then the objects are unassociated.
14	But if you do know that the human remains
15	were also removed, even if they've been returned, that
16	would qualify the object as associated.
17	So that's a part of the question the
18	answer to your question.
19	But I think, Harold, in light of your
20	experiences, which I have heard echoed across the
21	country by many other individuals, one aspect of these
22	revisions is adding to every definition of a sacred
23	object, an object of cultural patrimony, or a funerary



25

object, that the objects must be identified according

to information provided by Indian tribes and NHOs.

So we've added that requirement to the definitions themselves so that a museum must take into account your identification of the object as a sacred object or an object of cultural patrimony.

And to get to both your situation as well as to what Shane mentioned earlier, where a museum refuses to repatriate an object, we require them to explain that to you when they respond; and, furthermore, in relation to your 20-year problem, we require them to make that response within 60 days.

So if they're not going to accept your valid claim, they must tell you why, and they must do it in a certain amount of time.

It's our hope that those steps, even just making the museum explain why they're not going to repatriate, will prevent the kinds of obstacles that you've faced.

We're hopeful if they don't have to -- if they have an option of repatriating or writing down why they're not going to repatriate that they may not want to write it down or they may then agree to repatriate.

Or when they do write it down, it gives you something to challenge in writing. And that's part of the goal here.

I know all too well that -- the time and



1	effort that it takes to get museums to do what they're
2	supposed to do under the law.
3	So our hope is that these regulatory
4	changes will have an impact.
5	BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you, Melanie.
6	HAROLD JACOBS: Another question. Has
7	the has any museum actually ever been fined for a
8	noncompliance?
9	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Yes. 20 museums have
10	been found to have failed to comply. Not all of them
11	resulted in a payment, but many did.
12	And, again, part of the regulatory changes
13	here are to establish a process so that when the
14	process does not occur, it is easier for a tribe to
15	make an allegation that they failed to comply.
16	So if a museum doesn't respond to you in
17	60 days, or if they respond that they're not going to
18	repatriate, and they don't explain why, those could all
19	be failures to comply, and we could seek civil
20	penalties if that's what you choose to do.
21	So we're hoping to increase the opportunity
22	if not to make those allegations and to fine museums,
23	at least to have that as an extra pressure that can be
24	applied.



BRADY BLASCO, ESQ.: Again, Brady Blasco,

1	Solicitor's	Off	Eice,	for	thos	e wl	no v	walke	ed in	to	know	who	C
2	is talking.												
3		I	iust	want	to	add	on	to M	ſelani	ie's	poir	ıt (or

maybe emphasize that the issues you're describing at present, all of these STOP points where a museum in particular -- since I'm about to talk about civil penalties, we're talking about museums, not federal agencies -- but all of these STOP points that come up with museums currently don't fit any of the listed failures to comply in the civil penalty section.

That's an issue right now under the existing regulations.

What's being proposed now and what Melanie was just talking about is how that listing of specific failures to comply would be removed in the civil penalty section.

A failure to comply would be defined much more broadly to pick up on many of these procedural steps, these procedural elements, where someone isn't responding in a certain time or someone isn't providing a notice at the right time.

It provides substantially more recourse to tribes to raise these issues to the Department and -- and seek a civil penalty investigation.

CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Cassandra, can you give



us an example, like, as far as a penalty that you said "defined more broadly now"? But can you give me an example? Like, is it raised? Is the number -- the amount of penalty raised and -- and...

BRADY BLASCO, ESQ.: So, yeah, I -- the penalty amount isn't itself raised -- Melanie, correct me if I -- if I misspeak -- but the factors by which the Department can consider how high or how low it should be are broad.

The point I was trying to get at before is less about the amount, though, and more about what can actually constitute a failure to comply in the first place.

Whereas, right now, without a time frame requirement for a response from a museum, there is no failure to comply with the act. The act didn't define a compliance element there.

By adding time frames in, by adding requirements for responses and what those look like, there's more process in place now that can be considered part of the systematic process, part of what compliance looks like.

And then, in conjunction with the changes to the civil penalties section, failure to comply with those elements are now potentially subject to a civil



- penalty, which they weren't before.
- Because, again, there are about 11 listed
- 3 | failures to comply. They're very specific in the
- 4 current regulations.
- 5 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. And now I have a
- 6 question, and that leads me to a question.
- 7 So what about -- so a museum sends you
- 8 | out -- because we're getting bombarded now, right, from
- 9 all the different universities and museums to do that.
- 10 | But there -- I have two interns and me.
- 11 And -- and so being able to consult
- 12 | effectively within those time frames and answer -- and
- 13 | provide a response is kind of -- is kind of a hindrance
- 14 | for us because we have so much other beyond besides the
- 15 NAGPRA, and many tribal offices are the same.
- 16 It's how are we -- how can we
- 17 | effectively -- is it written in there effectively --
- 18 | communicate with each other to make sure that we stay
- 19 | within those time frames?
- Because I don't want, like, say, us as a
- 21 | tribe wanting to culturally affiliate with the -- with
- 22 | the remains from a museum and somebody else step in,
- 23 and we're just bombarded.
- 24 Is there a way to make sure that -- because
- 25 | I know that tribes are under no -- no time frame line,



1	but museums are.
2	So that that works. So then, therefore,
3	we are too. And so I'm just trying to make sure that
4	we're not doing just being a clearinghouse for
5	remains to get off and go to somewhere without proper
6	consultation, I guess is my point.
7	And how do we make sure because if what
8	you were talking about, for penalties?
9	But just in those time frames, it made me
10	think about how do we as a tribe stay engaged to make
11	sure beyond just looking at the Federal Register every
12	day?
13	Because I can tell you right now, we you
14	know, it's, like, once a week, maybe, if I'm lucky.
15	And not just not not just not NAGPRA stuff but
16	everything.
17	And maybe and and besides looking at
18	National NAGPRA Review and what the universities are
19	doing, and plus whatever is on the website.
20	I just want to make sure that because we
21	have two museums that want to talk to us within this
22	next month in consultation and the costs.
23	So, I guess, getting to those places,
24	utilizing NAGPRA because it takes time for grant money,



25

is there a way for us to stay engaged within those

1	timelines? That's my basic question after all of that.
2	And then, as far as broadened penalties, is
3	there a way that is there a person that we can talk
4	to who do we send the penalties to are the
5	conversation from a tribe, and then is there someone
6	that can help us write that if we're not capable?
7	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Yeah, so your first
8	question, Cassandra, is is one of the challenges of
9	these regulations, is how do we balance requiring
10	museums to take actions by certain timelines and yet
11	providing opportunities for tribes to engage and
12	consult if they wish to do so.
13	You know, we have tried to strike that
14	balance when it comes to human remains and associated
15	funerary objects.
16	We have required museums under the
17	proposed rule, a museum would be required to update
18	their inventory within 2 years.
19	And the first step in updating an inventory
20	is to initiate consultation with tribes.
21	Tribes can, then, choose whether to respond
22	and whether to engage in consultation or not and can
23	set a timeline for that, but it must fit within that
24	2-year requirement unless a museum is wants to apply



for an extension to that 2-year time frame.

2.0

And that extension would require evidence
that they have reached out to tribes and that the
tribes are in agreement that the process should
continue and take additional time.

And I'll say that, you know, in terms of responsibilities for approving an extension, that rests with the Assistant Secretary Estenoz.

She's the one who will decide whether museums can have extensions or not and whether they have worked effectively with tribes to allow for that timeline to be extended.

Likewise, with civil penalties, my office is where you would send the allegation. And it doesn't matter what exactly the allegation says. If there's not enough information, we'll come back to you and ask for more information to clarify.

CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay.

MELANIE O'BRIEN: But, again, the -- the responsibility for that action, that civil penalty, rests with the assistant secretary.

So, you know, I think that, you know, you see me a lot, and -- and I talk about this a lot, but the opportunity here with both of the assistant secretaries here is that these are really the -- the officials that make many of these decisions ultimately



1	about civil penalties and extensions and certainly
2	about what goes into these regulations.
3	So I think it's just an opportunity to
4	highlight that chain of responsibility that we have
5	within the Department.
6	And, you know, we certainly welcome anyone
7	to ask questions that are related to a civil penalty
8	action.
9	I think that many of you know we've hired a
10	full-time investigator. So his job is to talk to you
11	about an allegation and what he can do to help
12	understand what the issue is and try to bring it to a
13	resolution.
14	I will say that we're hampered right now
15	because of the regulations and what constitutes a
16	failure to comply.
17	I don't know if you want to add?
18	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: I have one more
19	question.
20	SHANNON ESTENOZ: Only that that's you
21	know, that that's yet another it's another reason
22	why finalizing these regulations is so important.
23	Because then when the you know, then
24	I am the person that gets to implement those and gets
25	to, as Bryan mentioned, start to build that muscle



1	memory for the person, then, who comes after me.
2	So if I'm able to make decisions under the
3	new regulations, that starts to set precedent so that
4	the next assistant secretary who comes, then, is
5	more is, you know, not necessarily bound. It is
6	that discretionary decision, but certainly the
7	precedent is there.
8	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay.
9	SHANNON ESTENOZ: So thank you for for
10	surfacing this because this is, I think, a really
11	important element that we haven't talked about that
12	hasn't surfaced in previous consultations.
13	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: And then as far as
14	having the delivery of written documentation under the
15	regs, C, "Duty of Care," and it would "Duty of
16	Care," it would be 1E no, it would be just E how
17	do we make sure that these aren't FOIA-able for those
18	documents that we send?
19	MELANIE O'BRIEN: It's a very good
20	question. And the only confident answer I can give you
21	on protection of sensitive information is not to submit
22	it in writing.
23	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: But it is.
24	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Well, and that's where



I think you need to look at closely at what is required

to be submitted in writing.

You are required to submit requests for repatriation. That is true. And that request for repatriation may need to contain certain information.

But does that -- does the request require information beyond an assertion that this is an object of cultural patrimony or a sacred object? Not necessarily.

And if that's information that the museum requests of you, then that's information that you protect by saying, "Let's consult on it, land we can explain to you further why it's a sacred object or why it's not an object of cultural patrimony," or you may say it just is.

And, "Museum, you have to make a decision based on our assertion."

I think that there -- there is a requirement for written documentation in these regulations, but we have tried repeatedly to make clear that specific information, which may be sensitive information, is not required to be put in writing because it ultimately could be subject to some kind of disclosure, whether under FOIA or other state laws.

CASSANDRA ATENCIO: So, then, what if you have two -- what if you have two competing -- two



1	tribes that are making the same claim, though, and then
2	you're trying to think about preponderance of evidence,
3	right, and this is the museum, then would it be easier
4	to do group affiliation? Is that a part of this too?
5	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Absolutely. Yes.
6	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: All right.
7	MELANIE O'BRIEN: So we try to make very
8	clear that a joint request is not a competing
9	request
10	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay.
11	MELANIE O'BRIEN: And that the only time
12	that a museum must evaluate multiple requests is that
13	if they are, in fact, competing, if they are opposing
14	each other.
15	And in those circumstances, then, there is
16	information that's needed, and the museum must evaluate
17	it, but it's not necessary that the specific details be
18	provided in writing.
19	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Can that be I think
20	that would be a comment to be insert in there as part
21	of confidentiality, some sort of clause within the
22	regs.
23	Like how we have Section 304. There's not
24	very meat in it, very much for 106, but we have that
25	confidentiality glauge. And I think there needs to be



1	some sort of language that kind of helps a part of
2	that. That's off my head.
3	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Yeah, and this is where
4	we bump up against, you know, the limits of NAGPRA.
5	Because NAGPRA, the law, does not provide
6	for those kinds of exemptions like NHPA does.
7	So we are limited in relying on other
8	statutes like NHPA or ARPA or FOIA, but to protect
9	information.
10	NAGPRA itself does not contain those
11	protections.
12	BRADY BLASCO, ESQ.: While we do run into a
13	statutory authority issue there, we don't have a
14	statutorily provided FOIA exemption.
15	Congress can do that. And they have, in
16	fact, included some confidentiality components in the
17	STOP Act.
18	Those don't apply to other laws, but it's
19	something Congress could theoretically do or plan.
20	It's happened elsewhere, as we were talking
21	about at ARPA and the NHPA, and then most recently,
22	specifically in the STOP Act.
23	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay.
24	BRYAN NEWLAND: All right. Well, I've
25	learned a lot already this morning. And it's been a



good discussion.

- I just want to pause here and make sure,
- 3 | you know, we -- doing the time check. We've got about
- 4 | 1 hour left in our scheduled time.
- 5 We don't have to use all of it if you don't
- 6 | want, but we're available that long.
- 7 So I want to see if there are any
- 8 | additional comments. I know we've had a few folks join
- 9 us in progress.
- 10 | I want to see if there's any -- anything
- 11 | you wish to comment today.
- 12 Yes.
- VERNELDA GRANT: Good morning. My name is
- 14 | Vernelda Grant. I'm the director for the Historic
- 15 | Preservation Archeology Department, the THPO, tribal
- 16 | arc, and NAGPRA rep as well.
- So I -- gosh, where do we start, like, from
- 18 | the first day of creation to now? It seems like
- 19 | there's a lot of things that we've been bombarded with.
- 20 And -- and amidst the actions from
- 21 | Secretary Haaland, the -- you know, on a lot of the --
- 22 | I think -- I see it as a lot of small projects that can
- 23 | could be -- that are positive, like the changing the
- 24 | name for Squaw Peak. You know, I see a lot of small
- 25 | things that are being -- that are being addressed to



make good and to do good, you know, by the government with the tribes.

There's bigger issues that -- that I think that really need attention, you know, and I think that we're still dealing with these issues, and it affects almost, you know, everything we do on our traditional lands, our homelands, our way of life. It affects every bit of it, our mental capacity, our -- you know, just our minds, our body, our health, our spirit.

And there's been such a quick -- especially with this administration, possibly because of the last one, that there's been such a race, it seems like, to -- to address some of the small things, you know.

And what I mean by that is, there's good intentions behind what the government is doing, what you-all are tasked to do, and with the people that you are -- you know, you selected to work with who are Native American, American Indian, Native Hawaiian members, you know, that you're working with to help do work with tribal nations and Indian country and with the Native Hawaiian organizations.

But it seems like we're slammed. We're still constantly doing -- and I have to say this over and over and over because things really haven't really changed dramatically because every new administration



that comes in, it's a whole new thing, a whole new ball that keeps -- that starts to roll again.

And as far as consultation goes, there's a reiteration or a resupport of, you know, the president's initiative to work with native tribes to consult to conduct meaningful government-to-government consultation.

And when -- you know, each time there's one or two words adding saying, "What is really meaningful?"

And then there's a whole swarm of federal agencies that -- that come around and start throwing the projects in our face, you know, throwing it into the tribal nation's laps, into, you know, hiring consultant companies liaisons, you know, that are career building for themselves or that want some sort of attention. Some of them are native people too; some are nonnative.

And so we -- you know, you put all of those things into the mix. And then you have, you know, big, huge organizations and corporations coming in to extract minerals or energy resources from our tribal lands, holy, sacred places, cultural landscapes.

And then you have, you know, those entities coming in buying off different portions of people that



2.0

work for our government, and congressional representatives included.

And in this entire mix -- you know, in our case, for San Carlos, there's only two of us from my department, myself and an archeology aide.

And so we're supposed to, you know, jump on to every scenario and consult with everyone, you know, and, you know, do the things we need to do that we're tasked to do within our exterior boundaries of our reservation, in our reservation lands too, to prove that we as native professionals, experts in the areas that we're, you know, put on in these Indian reservations to manage to prove to the government that we can manage these tribal lands.

So you take all these things. You know, you take -- I'm tasked to oversee and to manage cultural resources, natural -- assist in natural resource projects to assist and to, you know, guide and to meet with all these individuals.

If you can just imagine putting yourself in those situations and then, you know, thinking, okay, we have 30 days for each one of these federal agencies, you know, DOI, how many are under -- how many, you know, is under the Department of Ag? How many is under the Department of DOI, DOT, you know, every single



1 agency, and every -- every president's cabinet member 2 has their slew of people working for them. 3 So take all of that, and we're working with 4 every single organization and the projects they're 5 proposing and all these other elements, you know, institutions, you know, private institutions, 6 7 educational institutions. 8 So we're just -- you know, we're trying to 9 focus -- focus on things that are being thrown at us. 10 And through these years, it seems like some of these things have benefitted the tribes, have 11 12 benefitted the government and the tribes. 13 And there's things that began that were 14 forgotten because something else came up. 15 So what I'm trying to say is that there's been layers of, you know, consultation of reaching out 16 17 to have listening sessions and, in particular, for 18 this, you know.

So with me bringing up all these other things right now, it's just -- if you can just imagine being in this arena and then trying to also legally understand the laws behind this, you know, let alone the Indian laws, then the white man's laws, and then the federal Indian laws, which jumbles everything up, and nobody wants to touch it when it comes -- you know,



19

20

21

22

23

24

when you introduce, you know, that type of specific scenario.

And then you introduce what we're doing with Oak Flood [phonetic] and Mount Graham is really just rights.

Nobody wants to talk about religion in the court system too, is what we're -- we're dealing with.

And so in this whole mix of everything that we're dealing with as cultural resource managers, it's really hard to just kind of jump on board, you know, and to -- to say, "Hey, you know, this is cool. This is good. You know, okay, you guys, you know, everything you're proposing will be for the best of everyone," but it's -- we really have to be really careful, careful because it's -- we're dealing with really sensitive matters and issues, the remains of our -- our -- our loved ones, the remains of our ancestors, the remains of our children, you know, wrongfully taken away from us.

These discussions that we have are about holy places where something that has occurred that was beyond this world that has everything to do with my health and well-being for me as a person, for my niece or my mom, for all of us in this room, whether you're a native or not.



And it's just -- it feels like where we're on this high and going 100 miles an hour, you know, and we're thrown all of these things to think about and to consider and to make final rulings on immediately because that was something that somebody else, a career builder or some other person that doesn't know what they're doing, somebody that doesn't think about how -- where our mind set is coming from is putting together.

You know, so I just wanted to just share that, even though it might not seem, like, nothing. It might -- it doesn't matter taking stuff like this into consideration because it's not going to be written in any of your final rules and regulations.

But it's something that -- this is where we come from and this is our way of life. It's our thought. It's our thinking. And, you know, it's -- a lot of the stuff that that's in these laws have everything to do that affects us, our mind, our mental/spiritual, you know, physical health and well-being.

The laws don't address that. You know, nobody's going to be able to -- you know, how do you -- you know, that's not going to be able to be addressed in a courtroom because there's nothing -- there's no guidelines. There's nothing that can -- you know, that



I can say that'll make a difference, so...

But I just wanted to just share that with people here, that this is, you know, where tribes' mind sets comes from. This is what our thoughts are behind the questions that they ask, the statements that are read.

You know, it's more than just, well, you know, okay, these are the questions that the -- you know, are addressed to tribal leaders. There's five or six questions. I guess we just need to answer this and give it back to them within 30 days, you know.

So, you know, just for the purposes of your understanding is that it's a bigger deal. It's a bigger thing. And it really matters.

But it seems, like, in a lot of cases, you know, it's another thing that could possibly be thought of as rushed because I think some of these comments -- and not this comment now for this particular NAGPRA, the final rules and regs portion that we're here for, but I think the initial one came during the pandemic, you know.

So I'm not sure who really put the words and regulations and wording together for that. And then it's expected that, you know, the tribes submit comments.



78 1 I think the original comments periods 2 before that were maybe 10 to 12 years ago, maybe 2011, 3 2010, 2012. 4 And so how far back -- you know, like, I 5 quess, one of the questions that I'm asking is how far back are some of those comments that the tribes 6 7 submitted back then, like 10 to 12 years ago and then 2 years ago during the pandemic, and now? Will those 8 9 be -- comments be considered and have they been entered 10 into some of the wording of the final ruling? That's 11 one question. And then, you know, I had some concerns 12 13 over the definitions, like Indian group, you know, 14 versus federally Indian-recognized tribes putting 15 claims in. 16 Definitions under possessions and control. There's a lot of specifics. And, you know, 17 18 of course, we'll be turning in comments on these 19 specifics. But, you know, like, another thing 20 that I -- a third thing is, you know, there's --21 there's tribal comments that we're -- that you're 22 seeking, but also I think there's public comments too, 23 and what is the difference between -- if you can 24 clarify the deadlines between the two. You know,



25

that -- that's something that I was kind of curious on.

NAGPRA Tribal Consultation

79

1	Funding, of course. You know, I think
2	people brought that up before, but I think there's
3	issues between you know, I think concerns would be,
4	you know, funding and maybe a transition time
5	between this was brought up in discussion earlier,
6	like the changing the enforcement from the BIA to the
7	tribes on, you know, lands that are adjacent to the
8	reservation.
9	You know, like, I think there could be
10	difficulties without any, you know, transition time or,
11	you know, funding available.
12	I think we work so well with our BIA
13	regional archaeologists that I can't see this to be,
14	myself, an easy task to take on, you know, and to
15	having to write right plan of actions and different
16	things on top of it. I don't think it could be
17	something that could be a good thing for other tribes
18	as well.
19	And also a side note from that, if that's
20	being proposed, would it have an effect on existing PL,
21	you know, 93-638 contracts that are specifically
22	written for Section 106 activities? Would something
23	like that change those type of contracts? And if so,
24	would additional funding go into those contracts?



25

Because I under- -- you know, I know that

1	in the TPA process for that tribes go through under
2	the BIA natural resources, and where I'm located is not
3	even close to, you know, priorities under my tribe at
4	all.
5	So if we're taking additional things, you
6	know, that BIA is you know, that we do successfully
7	now with BIA and place it with tribes, I just have
8	concerns that you know, that it might affect
9	something that's already working well across the board.
10	I know that the let's see. And then I'm
11	wondering if there's going to be future amendments to
12	NAGPRA due to the STOP Act, and this is mentioned
13	before, that was passed?
14	Because the STOP Act does I know
15	everybody focuses just on one thing, which was the
16	increase in penalties, but I know that there's other
17	specifics under NAGPRA and the STOP Act that I would
18	think there would be amendments to the NAGPRA
19	regulations because of what's passed and written under
20	the STOP Act.
21	So I'm just wondering is that something
22	that we need to look forward to in the future?
23	There's more, but, you know, these are just
24	some of the things that we're looking into.
25	Just starting off with just the statement



1	or the comments of just how inundated extremely
2	beyond you know, extremely inundated that we are
3	we somehow do the best we can to be here and to be
4	present and to be active.
5	Somehow we still we still do what we
6	need to do. Miraculously somehow Creator puts us in
7	this path and somehow Creator guides us to meet these
8	demands or to make these statements or comments or to
9	testify or to do the things we need to do because of
10	the greater things that we're dealing with, you know,
11	when it comes to really being in a room full of human
12	remains, being in a room full of our ceremonial items,
13	you know, being in a room full of things eagle feathers
14	on it that we consider that are still alive like a
15	human person.
16	So that when it comes down to that, it just
17	seems like a lot of this stuff doesn't matter, but it
18	does matter because of the world that we live in.
19	So I hope that these comments that tribes
20	submit are really, you know, entered in some way,
21	really thought of and considered.
22	And, you know, thank you for this time.
23	BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you, Ms. Grant, for
24	your comments but also for taking time to be here with
25	us today.



2.0

1 Just want to 1 want to acknowledge and
affirm what you said about being inundated by federal
agencies. And we know and I know that that the tribal
office and tribal departments, people wear many hats
and have many responsibilities and that you're tasked
with doing many other important things besides
responding to federal officials seeking your comment.
We understand that.

And one of the things we've tried to do is to bunch together our consultations like we've done here this week so that we're not doing it every week someplace else with different timelines so people can travel and be here for multiple consultations.

But I do want to just affirm that I know very well what it's like to get a different consulta- -- a "Dear Tribal Leader" letter in your -- my inbox every day from some agency, and then you have to take time to say is this worth responding to, is this worth going to, who are we going to send from the tribe to represent us?

And then you've got to circulate the comments within the tribal government, and someone on the council has probably got a different view of what should be said, and it -- but we -- I hear you.

And so I appreciate the fact that you've



taken that all of you have taken the time to be with	
us today because you all have other very important	
responsibilities that you have to attend to.	
And then in response to your last question,	
will these comments matter and make their way in,	
I just want to tell you that as somebody who has spent	
a good part of my career writing tribal consultation	
responses for tribes and attending these on behalf of	
tribes, I know what it's like to sit there and wonder,	
"Is any of these bureaucrats up there going to actually	
read these things?"	
We do. Land those of us here representing	
the Federal Government and the Department of the	

the Federal Government and the Department of the
Interior today know that if you're going to take the
time and energy and effort to point us in a good
direction on these things, that we owe it to you to
take our time, energy, and effort to give thoughtful
consideration to what is said.

And that's partly why this -- a lot of the policy-making process takes so long.

So I do want to say that there were a number of things that you raised particularly with -- you referenced the STOP Act. We're trying to understand, again, the intersection between STOP Act and NAGPRA. And that's new.



You had referenced some of the definitions
that you had concerns with, particularly as it relates
to the tribe federally recognized tribes and other
groups, and those are things that I want to make sure
that we're discussing.
You had asked, just on a process question,
about the difference between public consultation and
public comment.
One of the things I want to make sure that
I'm being clear and emphatic on is that tribal
consultation is different than public comment, which is
why we're having these two tracts.
So in the under federal law when
agencies do regulations, we're required to hear from
the public, but we are we are not lumping in tribal
comments into that process.
This meeting today in our consultations are
government-to-government because of our trust
relationship and our trust responsibility, and we've
had this is the second round that we've had on this
rulemaking.

But we certainly consider them to be different processes even though they're speaking on the same rulemaking.

So, you know, we're -- and when we go back



to the drawing board and consider comments, there's a separate meeting/a process to consider the tribal comments versus the public comments.

So inside the building, it operates separate as well.

So I'll stop there, but I just wanted to acknowledge your frustration about hearing from lots of federal agencies while also making sure you do your job with the limited funding that you get and the limited capacity you have.

I appreciate that you took the time to be here with us to comment. And then out of respect and in response to that, we're going to take our time and be thoughtful about everything that is said during this process.

CASSANDRA ATENCIO: So I have a couple of comments on discoveries. We give this to somebody else, but I have -- on discoveries, number 2, and it talks about on tribal lands in Alaska and continental about how the Indian tribe can delegate its responsibility, I think that the old -- some of the old language needs to still stay there as far as tribal lands.

Like for us, for instance, we have our own burial protection policy as a tribe, but this seems to



16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	almost negate it because there's not a reference to,
2	like, if a tribe has its own policy. So maybe there
3	should I recommend language that pertains to the old
4	where it says it's up to the tribe, or however the old
5	language read, to mimic to kind of also assert that
6	if a tribe has its own policy, that's what we'll follow
7	beyond that, because we do.
8	The other point that I wanted to make is
9	that by doing geographical and cultural affiliation,
10	geographical is already a line of affiliation, and does
11	that place hierarchy on it, or is that just because
12	you're calling it out and you're redefining it, and
13	it's already a line of evidence as far as
14	preponderance?
15	And so I don't know if that places it in a

And so I don't know if that places it in a hierarchy for geographic as far as, you know, lineal or kinship or the other lines of evidence.

Thank you.

MELANIE O'BRIEN: So it's a good guestion on the geographical versus cultural affiliation.

And the way that the regulations are drafted for repatriation provisions under subpart C, a museum or federal agency would be required to identify both cultural and geographical affiliation to Indian tribes.



1	The priority would come only if there were
2	competing claims.
3	So where multiple tribes requested
4	repatriation, and they did not agree on a joint
5	repatriation, that museum would have to prioritize.
6	And, in that case, cultural affiliation
7	would be prioritized over geographical affiliation.
8	But certainly, lineal descendent remains
9	the very first priority under either subpart B or
10	subpart C.
11	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Should we take "land
12	claims" out of there?
13	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Unfortunately, the Indian
14	court of claims or other court of claims decisions is a
15	part of the act itself, so we are we have that.
16	It's still there and will continue to be there.
17	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. I have one more
18	thing, of course.
19	You guys know you wanted me to be here with
20	all of these questions.
21	So the time frame for a plan of action,
22	okay. This is a tricky one, I think, because a we
23	have a federal agency who because of its it's a BOR,
24	okay.
25	So it's a BOR And because that has to do



1	with water and lakes and reservoirs, some of these
2	reservoirs always have unanticipated and inadvertent
3	discoveries from washing up and from the wakes.
4	And we have a regional office that's
5	located in a different state but holds the original.
6	When the original reservoir was built,
7	those those individuals, over 400 of them, that
8	they've held them for over 400 years, but now we still
9	have a yearly or seasonal every year more and more
LO	discoveries, unanticipated discoveries and inadvertents
L1	are coming up.
L2	And so now we're having a bigger
L3	discussion, and you're asking for a plan of action
L4	under the proposed rules of 30 days.
L5	It takes that long just for them to
L6	initialize consultation.
L7	Is that 30 days to initialize consultation
L8	and then another 30 days to come up with the plan of
L9	action?
20	Because we're already our first
21	consultation is when they decide that they're going to
22	get ready at the beginning of this year, but our
23	discoveries were 2 months ago. And the ones that they
24	hold that we're just learning about is over 20 years,



so how do we -- that plan of action seems too soon to

1	be able to come up with a plan of action prior to
2	consultation, which would probably take 30 days to get
3	all the tribes that are affiliated to come to the table
4	to have a discussion about what we're going to do with
5	that and to move forward.
6	So are those extensions are those soft
7	timelines or hard timelines is, I guess, my question?
8	And how to we address things in those instances?
9	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Certainly.
10	So, again, just to clarify the distinction.
11	The collections that you're talking about
12	that maybe came from the original inundation would be
13	subject to subpart C and repatriation because they
14	predated the act in 1990.
15	And then new discoveries, things that are
16	discovered today or since 1990 are handled under the
17	plan of action process.
18	It is a hard time frame, the 30 days for a
19	plan of action. And that relates to the statutory
20	requirements for inactivity that may be occurring on
21	federal land.
22	So if an activity discovered human
23	remains and by "activity," I mean
24	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Intentional.
25	MELANIE O'BRIEN: logging, construction,



other kinds of activities on federal land, if those resulted in a discovery, then the federal agency has to allow that activity to resume.

And so we've built out the time frame to provide the plan of action and that same time frame that Congress required in the act for the activity to resume.

What you're talking about with an inadvertent discovery through erosion or some other kind of exposure would still cover under the same timeline, but it would seem to me there is some -- an advantage to the federal agency anticipating those kinds of exposures and building a plan of action without the time frame of a discovery.

So rather than waiting for the discovery to occur and starting the plan of action, the plan of action could anticipate a discovery might occur, and here's what the tribes agree to happen.

So if that makes sense that the way that the plan of action is structured, the timeline is firm after a discovery; however, there's no reason you couldn't start a plan of action before a discovery even occurred in anticipation that the discovery might happen, and then the plan of action would be ready to go if that discovery did occur.



91 1 Does that make sense? 2 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: No. 3 MELANIE O'BRIEN: I've totally confused 4 you. Okay. 5 SHANNON ESTENOZ: Well, Melanie, can I? 6 MELANIE O'BRIEN: Yeah. 7 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: I get it, but not 8 really, no. 9 SHANNON ESTENOZ: So I imagine that when 10 these regulations become final that one of the things we could do as a matter of policy and practice is to 11 12 begin to socialize them, provide trainings to federal 13 agencies, and in how to -- and, you know, even museums, 14 I suppose we could do that too. 15 And that's a really good example, Melanie, of how we, you know, could recommend to agencies who 16 can predict, like the OR, who can predict discoveries, 17 18 "Hey, get a head start now and develop a plan of action 19 so that when the discovery is made and the clock starts 20 ticking, you've got a plan already. You're not just 21 taken unawares and then suddenly everyone has to 22 scramble to meet that 30-day time frame." 23 And then a question, Melanie, just to 24 clarify. 25 Is there a provision for extending those



1	deadlines, or are those deadlines solid?
2	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Right now, those are firm
3	deadlines. And, again, it relates to the statutory
4	requirement of allowing an activity to resume.
5	So we've had to structure a time frame;
6	however, again, there's no reason why the planning
7	couldn't happen before a discovery occurred. And that
8	certainly would be a best practice. And it's certainly
9	how the regulations are written and encouraging that
10	effort to plan before something happens so that there's
11	a plan in place and everyone knows, and especially the
12	federal agency knows, what the tribe's preferences are
13	for treatment in handling.
14	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: So when it says
15	"appropriate official," are we talking about that
16	federal agency official, or can that be in
17	collaboration with the tribal, with the NAGPRA
18	coordinator, say, or the THPO, as far as that official
19	for that activity to resume?
20	MELANIE O'BRIEN: So the appropriate
21	official is going to be the federal land manager.
22	CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Okay. Because I think
23	there should be some language in there that talks about
24	the distances.
25	So we've allowed things in consultation for



1	activities to resume before 30 days, but only because
2	we come up with something that says, "You're going to
3	be way over there when you start, and we're going to be
4	way over there. And in between here, we're going to
5	keep it no activity, but your activity can go there,
6	and you can restart over there, and but in this
7	middle until we take care of these ancestors and
8	possible funerary AFOs that" you know, and is that
9	the same thing as what's being said here, or can we do
10	it that way, or are we can that be written into
11	that?
12	MELANIE O'BRIEN: Yeah, that is the purpose
13	of a plan of action, to accommodate those kinds of
14	requests and decisions by the tribe.
15	The plan of action, again, remember,
16	requires consultation and and specifically requires
17	federal agencies seek consensus on what that plan will
18	be.
19	And where the federal agency cannot
20	cannot come to a consensus of the tribes of distance or
21	time frames or treatments, then that has to be recorded
22	by the federal agency, again, explaining why they're
23	unable to accommodate the tribes' requests.
24	BRYAN NEWLAND: Okay. Just



MELANIE O'BRIEN:

Sorry. I turned it off.

1	BRYAN NEWLAND: Okay. Just for a time			
2	check here and housekeeping, we're at 12:20.			
3	We're scheduled until 1:00. We typically			
4	leave the last 5 or 10 minutes to make sure we read			
5	back what we think we heard in case there's any			
6	clarifying points or if we missed any big themes.			
7	So I just wanted to make sure you all knew			
8	how much time we had left here for this.			
9	REYLYNNE WILLIAMS: Okay. I have a			
10	comment.			
11	BRYAN NEWLAND: Sorry. Could you introduce			
12	yourself?			
13	REYLYNNE WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.			
14	My name is Reylynne Williams. I am the			
15	cultural resource specialist for the Gila River Indian			
16	Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the			
17	designated NAGPRA representative.			
18	Thank you for this opportunity to provide			
19	verbal comments on the proposed rule for the Native			
20	American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.			
21	We worked jointly with the Salt River			
22	Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Tribal Historic			
23	Preservation Office in providing comments on the draft			
24	regulations for NAGPRA in September of 2021 and on			
25	behalf of the four southern tribes of Arizona,			



consisting of the Ak-Chin Indian community and the Tohono O'odham Nation, respectively.

So far in our joint review of the proposed rule for NAGPRA, we have seen that some of our comments were included in this current draft.

We strongly believe that we can create an efficient and effective government-to-government effort to assist with the development of a new proposed rule for NAGPRA.

So we would like to request that another round of tribal consultations occur before any final notice of proposed rulemaking moves forward because of the opportunity for public comment, which includes the public and museums and institutions and federal agencies.

Under the definition of "human remains," the four southern tribes in previous comments recommend to include and recognize formally entered animal burials; for example, dogs, birds of prey, or animals of cultural significance, with or without associated funerary objects, being whole or partial, as part of an intentional archeological excavation or inadvertent discovery and/or encountered in a museum or federal agency collections and documented in the archaeological record.



1	We were able to work with Arizona State
2	Museum to include and recognize formally entered animal
3	burials in the project specific burial discovery
4	agreement that is in compliance with the Arizona
5	Revised Statutes that we refer to as Arizona burial
6	discovery laws because that language is similar to
7	NAGPRA and was passed in the same year as NAGPRA.
8	We believe that the animals have a
9	spiritual connection to not only our tribal communities
10	but to other tribes across the U.S. who also view
11	animals in such a way.
12	We have also made comments, previous
13	comments, requiring a moratorium on scientific testing
14	and research of any ancestral and human remains,
15	funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of
16	cultural patrimony unless there is written permission
17	from the tribes.
18	We have also worked diligently with Arizona
19	State Museum and some of the institutions here in
20	requiring a written letter or statement from the tribe
21	for any future research.
22	We've also commented that and we'd like
23	to reiterate that the right of possession cannot ever
24	be established for human remains, funerary objects, or
25	objects of cultural patrimony.



2.0

No one has a right to sell or trade our
ancestors and cultural objects for any reason. And
it's an unfortunate situation, you know, that our
ancestors are in possession of people that have no
connection to no relation to, no familiar no
family bond to, you know, and so they don't they
don't own these ancestors.

And we want to ensure that and remind them that the ancestors belong to us. They're our families. They're are relatives. And we want them home.

So I thank you for allowing me to make the comments. And do want to follow up with -- to Cassandra's comment regarding the NAGPRA plan of action and training.

We have come to realize that there is a lot of turnover within federal agencies and a lot of the staff that we work with to develop NAGPRA plan of action.

Some don't have the experience or understanding under NAGPRA and what the law requires and what previous staff members have done to ensure that a NAGPRA plan of action is in place.

I would -- I would recommend contacting some of the federal agencies here, staff people here, in Arizona as they are very familiar with how to



1	develop a NAGPRA plan of action and how they work with
2	the tribes in developing that plan of action prior to a
3	project specific or in the event of an inadvertent
4	discovery.
5	And I believe that they we work with
6	them so much here in Arizona that I feel confident that
7	their level of understanding is is up there, and
8	they would be a good asset in providing assistance in
9	this area when the proposed rule is finalized.
LO	Thank you.
11	MELANIE O'BRIEN: If I could just follow up
L2	on that last point, Reylynne, and are there specific
L3	federal agencies, bureaus, department level that you
L4	would recommend?
L5	REYLYNNE WILLIAMS: The Bureau of
L6	Reclamation oh, the National Park Service, the
L7	Forest Service
L8	SUNDAY EISET: Tonto.
L9	REYLYNNE WILLIAMS: yeah, Tonto National
20	Forest, Coronado National Forest, and the local and
21	national parks, the Casa Grande Ruins national
22	monument, Montezuma, Tuzigoot National Moment.
23	SUNDAY EISET: Pueblo Grande.
24	REYLYNNE WILLIAMS: No, they're not
25	federal.



		99
1	Those are the ones we work with very	
2	closely.	
3	BRYAN NEWLAND: Any additional comments	
4	today?	
5	Thank you very much, Ms. Williams.	
6	GERALD "SHANE" ANTON: Good afternoon,	
7	again. Just to follow up on the last comments about	
8	training.	
9	In my early, early days of NAGPRA, when	
10	they held the review committee meetings a day prior,	
11	they had trainings for anybody that wanted it.	
12	So if you arrived a day earlier, you could	
13	take the training. And it was free.	
14	Now, I don't know. I think NAGPRA	
15	contracts with I don't know who it is exactly to do	
16	trainings.	
17	But there's also that again, that	
18	financial burden on tribes to you know, travel isn't	
19	cheap these days. It's kind of sketchy even to begin	
20	with, so based on the flight schedules recently.	
21	So if there's a way to provide free	
22	training to both Feds and the tribes too so that we	
23	can that they can fully better engulf themselves in	
24	the law, in the regulations, I think that would be a	
25	lot of help.	



1	BRYAN NEWLAND: All right. We'll start
2	looking to wind down, make sure, folks, if you have
3	final comments or final thoughts or you haven't weighed
4	in yet, we certainly want to hear from you.
5	So I think maybe what Melanie and Assistant
6	Secretary Estenoz and I can do is maybe just give a
7	read-back of what we think we heard this morning,
8	general themes captured.
9	You know, we started off with some comments
10	about making sure that these regulations are aligned
11	with the NAGPRA statute and the emphasis on the need to
12	make sure that there's tribal capacity, including
13	funding available for implementation.
14	We also discussed about the availability of
15	federal lands and other state public lands or even
16	private lands to rebury ancestors close to where they
17	were found.
18	We there were comments about data
19	recovery.
20	And, again, on tribal capacity with respect
21	to implementation, there were comments about making
22	making sure that we were reburying associated funerary
23	objects with human remains, recognizing the spiritual
24	value of animals, transparency in decision-making.



25

There were several comments about expanding

1	the reach of NAGPRA through through another look at
2	what constitutes federal funding, a reference to
3	different COVID programs, including paycheck protection
4	loans for private museums.
5	There were comments about a moratorium on
6	scientific research.
7	And there was one comment about needing
8	clarification on what a "stay of repatriation
9	proceedings" means and just making sure oh, we had
10	the reference to "indigenous creatures," which, again,
11	I appreciate hearing in a formal
12	government-to-government consultation.
13	Let me see. There were questions about the
14	BIA's legal authority to return items that were outside
15	the scope of NAGPRA. And there was a lot of
16	back-and-forth conversation about that.
17	There was some there were comments about
18	the international component. And then, you know, we
19	had to explain that we were going to look at the STOP
20	Act as it relates to NAGPRA and how how we're going
21	to sort through that as a department.
22	The comments about the the ability of
23	museums to determine for themselves the timeline for
24	compliance, with some examples provided.
25	And then there were comments more



1	comments relating to the process that museums use for
2	compliance and some comments also about FOIA.
3	There were a few comments about the process
4	that we're using, in consultations in general, and some
5	very specific comments, one about 638 contracting and
6	Section 106 programs.
7	The recent discussion that we just had
8	about discoveries on federal lands and that process.
9	Again, more comments about recognizing the
10	spiritual value and components of animals that are
11	buried with human remains and another request for a
12	moratorium on scientific research.
13	And then we wrapped up with a discussion on
14	training, the importance of training for federal
15	officials and the amount of turnover that happens
16	across federal agencies.
17	Melanie, did you want to walk through maybe
18	some of your impressions and thoughts?
19	MELANIE O'BRIEN: I think that was a really
20	effective summary of what we've heard today, and some
21	of it is our comments that we haven't heard
22	previously and others are echoing comments we have
23	received.



24

25

echoing of other comments as to -- to our requirements

I think both are valuable, certainly the

1	to respond fully and as as much as we can to those
2	comments, but also the new comments, the new topics
3	that we need to consider in revising these regulations
4	for a final rule is important.
5	I think that for me the value is always in
6	hearing your stories and hearing your experiences and
7	better understanding how these regulations really play
8	out in your lives and in real-world scenarios because
9	that only improves our ability to make them effective,
10	even in the stale regulatory language. We can envision
11	them in real scenarios when you provide that kind of
12	feedback. So I really appreciate that.
13	I certainly appreciate the opportunity to
14	see many of you in person that I haven't seen for so
15	long. That's also very nice.
16	I don't know if Shannon, if there was
17	anything you wanted to add.
18	SHANNON ESTENOZ: No. Just a couple of
19	Bryan takes very complete notes, and so they tracked
20	closely with mine. I noticed his handwriting is better
21	than mine, so I'm always glad he goes first in these
22	things, these recaps.

Just a couple of little details to fill in.

On the FOIA matter, we, you know, made clear that it's important that the -- that we put in --



24

1	we put in writing what the statute rules require and					
2	not more than that, and that there are other					
3	although NAGPRA doesn't have its own FOIA exemptions,					
4	there are other laws that we rely on to provide for					
5	confidentiality. And those would, of course, be taken					
6	in concert with any action under NAGPRA.					
7	I also wanted to repeat the suggestion that					
8	when it comes to building our training curricula and					
9	think about who our trainers might be that we come to					
10	Arizona and because, apparently, there is a lot of					
11	knowledge and experience here in Arizona in our own					
12	agencies, like the OR and National Park Services and					
13	our sister agencies over at USDA like the Forest					
14	Service.					
15	So I have learned a lot. The PPP					
16	conversation was absolutely fascinating.					
17	I just want to remind us that we understand					
18	that there's a conversation with the Small Business					
19	Administration. We've asked these questions. And so					
20	we're also waiting to hear what the answer to that is.					
21	So					
22	BRYAN NEWLAND: So with that, we can wrap					
23	up the formal government-to-government consultation on					
24	this and, again, remind you we have extended the					



25

deadline -- we have extended the deadline to

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

105

	January	31st	for	written	comments.
--	---------	------	-----	---------	-----------

2 Cassandra, did you have one additional --3 anything else?

4 CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Yes. Of course. course I have two more questions.

I think, A, when you said "plans of actions that could be developed beforehand," I think that's kind of hard because plans of action should include those tribes to be included about what that plan of action should look like, you know.

And so I think that yes, a federal agency could do that, but in that consultation with the tribe to say, "This is what they should be."

I mean, they could maybe do the precursor with using the steps, but if you don't have tribes in there inserting an opinion or being there in collaboration about what that POA should be and should look like, then it's only one-sided.

The other thing is I think there still should be something in there like what she stated about scientific research not being that component because I didn't see it in the -- in the new draft regs, and I think that that insertion -- that assertion and the old regs about scientific research not going beyond because of DNA collection, some of us have that -- that

1	taboo and and within our own burial policies, that			
2	there will be nondestructive analysis and and beyond			
3	that, and I think that wording should stay within the			
4	new regs.			
5	Thank you. I'll leave you with that.			
6	SHANNON ESTENOZ: May I ask just a quick			
7	question?			
8	BRYAN NEWLAND: You're the boss.			
9	SHANNON ESTENOZ: So I I just offer up			
10	maybe just food for thought, when we're thinking about			
11	plans of actions, I wonder if, particularly in cases			
12	where you've got a specific activity that might be			
13	unfolding on federal land the construction of a			
14	reservoir, a new logging plan or something like that,			
15	where, you know, you have a known area that's going to			
16	be disturbed or impacted whether a federal agency			
17	you know, whether there's a best management practice			
18	before you authorize that before the commencement of			
19	that activity, a plan of action be drawn up in			
20	consultation with tribes, right?			
21	You haven't made a discovery yet, but by			
22	golly you know that once you start moving things			
23	around, you might. And so you begin that plan of			
24	action.			
25	Cassandra, I think your point is absolutely			



spot on.	Those	should	not	be	developed	without
consultat	ion wit	h tribe	es.			

But I do think there's going to be a category of activities on federal land where that preplanning can happen because enough is known in the event of a discovery that, then, steps can be taken in those 30 days in a more realistic way.

CASSANDRA ATENCIO: Which is what we kind of did when we did our Animas-La Plata thing. We developed a NAGPRA component within the MOA, under 106. And we developed a component of a POA would be developed within the plan, and then we talked about that.

But that started with the 106 process, and then that developed that NAGPRA plan into that agreement document, so...

BRYAN NEWLAND: As we wrap up too I want to -- just a couple of other housekeeping items.

So we have a second consultation here this afternoon at the departmental level -- what time are we starting that -- at 2:00 p.m., on how whether and how the Department should add in other programs beyond the BIA and to self-determination -- being available for self-determination contracts and self-governance compacting.



108

1	We have two consultations tomorrow as well
2	on our proposed land into trust regulations as well as
3	our proposed regulations on tribal state gaming
4	compacts.
5	And if by the end of tomorrow you haven't
6	had enough of us, don't worry, we will be back here in
7	Phoenix next week because Secretary Haaland and I are,
8	next Friday what's the date on that, Joaquin?
9	JOAQUIN GALLEGOS: The 20th.
10	BRYAN NEWLAND: The 20th.
11	We will be at Gila River Road to Healing
12	Tour where the secretary and I will be hearing from
13	people who attended federal Indian boarding schools as
14	well as their family members about their experiences.
15	So we invite you and your community members to join us
16	there.
17	And then 2 days after that, Secretary
18	Haaland and I will be up at the Navajo Nation for
19	another boarding school listening session there.
20	So we're going to be very busy here doing
21	very what I think are meaningful and important and
22	healing work on behalf of the Department.
23	So I want to thank you-all very much for
24	your time with us this morning. Again, I know how busy

25

you are, how many hats you wear, all of the

responsibilities you have, especially at the start of a new year, the to-do list builds up real quickly over the holidays. We understand this. So much gratitude to all of you for taking your time and sharing with us today. And that will conclude our consultation and hope you-all have safe travels back home. (12:43 p.m.)



		110
1	STATE OF ARIZONA.)	
2) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA)	
3	BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings	
4	were taken before me; that the witness before testifying was duly sworn by me to testify to the whole truth; that the foregoing pages are a full, true, and	
5	accurate record of the proceedings, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were	
6	taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.	
7		
8	I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.	
9	interested in the outcome nereor.	
10	[] Review and signature was requested. [] Review and signature was waived.	
11	[X] Review and signature not required.	
12	I CERTIFY that I have complied with the	
13	ethical obligations set forth in ACJA $7-206(F)(3)$ and ACJA $7-206(F)(3)$ and	
14	Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 25th day of	
15	January, 2023.	
18	HALEY DAWN WESTRA, RPR, CRR	
	Certified Reporter	
19	Arizona CR No. 50762	
20	* * * * *	
21	I CERTIFY that GRIFFIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC,	
22	has complied with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA $7-206$ (J)(1)(g)(1) through (6).	
23		
24		
25	GRIFFIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC Registered Reporting Firm Arizona RRF No. R1005	



			1	1
	9:11	30	54:5	17,19 90:5,13,16,
\$	1996	73:22 77:11 88:14,	93	17,20,22,24 91:18
·	12:1	17,18 89:2,18 93:1	54:16	93:13,15 97:13,18,
\$3	1:00	107:7	93-638	22 98:1,2 104:6
18:17	94:3	30-day	79:21	105:8,10 106:19,
	1E	91:22	77.21	24
(66:16	3002(A)12(A)		actions
	00:10	35:17	A	63:10 70:20 79:15
(B)		304	Abel	105:6 106:11
35:18	2	68:23	46:23	active
				81:4
1	2 22 51 0 0 62 10	30s	ability	activities
	3:22 51:8,9 63:18	45:2,20	22:19 23:2 101:22	26:22 79:22 90:1
1	78:8 85:18 88:23	31st	103:9	93:1 107:4
36:19 70:4	108:17	4:1 105:1	absolutely	
10	2-year		14:9 68:5 104:16	activity
34:7 78:2,7 94:4	63:24,25	4	106:25	89:22,23 90:3,6
10-10	20		accept	92:4,19 93:5
30:12	54:10 58:9 88:24	400	57:11	106:12,19
	20-year	88:7,8	access	actual
10-9	20:24 57:9	40s	24:10 26:1	38:1
30:12	2010	45:20	accommodate	adage
100	9:13,14 41:25 78:3		93:13,23	32:13
76:2	2011	5	accompanies	add
106	78:2		35:3	8:8 19:7 41:4,23
20:4,15 24:10		5		52:13 59:3 65:17
68:24 79:22 102:6	2012	14:18,19 94:4	accomplish	103:17 107:22
107:10,14	78:3	,	37:23	added
10th	2021	6	account	57:1
18:21	9:17 10:8 94:24	0	57:3	adding
11	2022	6	accountable	56:22 60:18 72:9
29:4 61:2	9:23 10:2	14:18,19	5:13	
110	20s	60	achieved	addition
20:4,16	45:2	52:17 57:10 58:17	11:10	9:23
	20th		acknowledge	additional
12	108:9,10	638	82:1 85:7	18:15 29:22 37:16
78:2,7	23	102:5	act	64:4 70:8 79:24
12:20	40:7		14:22 15:4 21:12	80:5 99:3 105:2
94:2		7	24:11 25:6 34:2	address
12:43	25.17		35:12 36:14 42:17	21:10 25:1 37:7
109:8	35:17	700	48:12 50:14 51:7	38:9,17 41:8,18
16	26	9:21	60:16 69:17,22	71:13 76:21 89:8
14:19 35:12	12:9	700-plus	80:12,14,17,20	addressed
1853	2:00	10:10	83:23,24 87:15	35:21 49:2 70:25
55:13	107:21	71	89:14 90:6 94:20	76:23 77:9
1990		9:20	101:20	adhere
	3			44:3
10:25 12:1 14:13,		9	action	adjacent
19 35:12 89:14,16	3		64:19 65:8 87:21	79:7
1995	52:9	90	88:13,19,25 89:1,	17.1



		I	I	1
administers	59:8 72:12 73:22	amazingly	anticipating	Arizona
4:13	82:3 84:14 85:8	23:13	90:12	94:25 96:1,4,5,18
administration	91:13,16 93:17	amend	anticipation	97:25 98:6 104:10,
31:19 32:10 43:16	95:15 97:16,24	3:16	90:23	11
52:16,22 71:11,25	98:13 102:16	amended	Anton	armed
104:19	104:12,13	9:11	27:4,5 29:25 38:7	54:12
administrations	agencies'	amending	44:24 99:6	ARPA
53:1	20:12	35:22	apologize	41:15 69:8,21
administrative	agency	amendment	53:14	arrived
53:6	20:9 25:23 26:15	9:13	apparently	99:12
advantage	28:1 39:9 42:11	amendments	104:10	art
90:12	49:12 74:1 82:17	80:11,18	Applicability	54:16,23 55:1,2
advisor	86:23 87:23 90:2,		36:15	articulation
7:1	12 92:12,16 93:19,	American		29:12
	22 95:24 105:11	10:16 34:1 35:9,	applied 58:24	
advisory 55:9	106:16	11,25 36:4,13,16 71:18 94:20		ASM
	agency's		apply	47:3
Affairs	42:14	Americans	18:20 40:20 43:13	aspect
3:8 6:24 33:9	agree	36:10	63:24 69:18	23:17 56:21
affect	22:16,17 57:21	amidst	appreciation	assert
80:8	87:4 90:18	70:20	7:14	86:5
affected	agreement	amount	appropriated	assertion
35:16	45:6 64:3 96:4	18:16 57:13 60:4,	18:17	67:6,16 105:23
affects	107:16	6,11 102:15	appropriation	asset
71:5,7 76:18	ahead	analysis	18:15	98:8
affiliate	37:19	48:17,18 106:2	approval	assist
61:21	aide	ancestors	53:24	9:3 12:20 34:13
affiliated	73:5	16:5 23:8 25:4,8,	approving	73:17,18 95:8
89:3	Ak-chin	16 26:4,14 28:20,	64:6	assistance
affiliation	95:1	22 34:17 46:24	arc	23:25 43:12 98:8
13:15 17:19 68:4	Alaska	75:18 93:7 97:2,4,	70:16	assistant
86:9,10,20,24	55:25 85:19	7,9 100:16	archaeological	3:7 4:6,10 6:25 9:3
87:6,7	align	ancestral	26:9,21 41:9 95:24	33:8,10,13 37:21
affirm	14:22	96:14	archaeologists	64:7,20,23 66:4
82:2,14	aligned	and/or	45:9 79:13	100:5
AFOS	100:10	95:23	archeological	associate
93:8		animal	22:6 41:14 95:22	42:7
afternoon	alive 81:14	95:18 96:2		assuming
99:6 107:20		animals	archeologist 46:21	22:13
Ag	allegation	27:20 95:19 96:8,		Atencio
73:24	58:15 64:13,14 65:11	11 100:24 102:10	archeology 23:20 70:15 73:5	13:8,10,16,17 14:7
agencies		Animas-la		15:15,21,25 19:6
5:4,13,25 10:15	allegations	107:9	area	20:2 21:20 32:20,
11:2,18 12:4,14	58:22	anthropology	6:4,5 98:9 106:15	25 33:16,18 37:2
14:23 15:12 19:16	allowed	55:2	areas	43:3,23 44:1,9,11
21:13 32:4 34:19	92:25	anticipate	4:22,23 26:7 73:11	59:25 61:5 64:17
38:20 39:6,18	allowing	90:17	arena	65:18 66:8,13,23
41:5,17,22 43:7	5:10 92:4 97:11		74:21	67:24 68:6,10,19



Index: attend..capturing

69:23 85:16 87:11,	3:5	bill	bring	88:6 90:4
17 89:24 91:2,7	based	20:18	31:1 65:12	bump
92:14,22 105:4	8:20 12:7 38:7	birds	bringing	69:4
107:8	45:20 67:16 99:20	95:19	74:19	
attend	basic	bit		bunch 82:10
83:3	63:1	14:18 26:7 71:8	brings 10:2	
attended				burden
108:13	basically	Blasco 7.10.41.2.49.0.21	broad	10:23 11:21 34:20
	13:4 41:20	7:10 41:2 48:9,21 49:1 58:25 60:5	27:12 50:9 60:9	99:18
attending 83:8	Bay	49:1 58:25 60:5 69:12	broadened	Bureau
	3:4		63:2	98:15
attention	began	BLM	broader	bureaucrats
19:24 20:24 21:6	74:13	53:15	26:7	83:10
71:4 72:17	begin	board	broadly	bureaus
authority	8:8 91:12 99:19	8:17 19:15 28:6	59:18 60:2	98:13
39:5,7 40:3,11	106:23	75:10 80:9 85:1	brought	burial
41:4 42:4,14 69:13	beginning	boarding	3:24 32:22 79:2,5	85:25 96:3,5 106:1
101:14	88:22	21:7 108:13,19	Bryan	burials
authorize	behalf	body	3:1,4 4:8 6:20 7:12	27:18 95:19 96:3
106:18	33:19,23 52:13	71:9	8:3,7 9:1 14:3,6	buried
availability	83:8 94:25 108:22	bombarded	19:5 21:1,21 29:9,	55:13 102:11
100:14	belong	61:8,23 70:19	18,20 30:24 32:24	
average	97:9	bond	33:8 37:1,3,13,19	burying
29:3		97:6	38:23 42:21 46:17	19:21
aware	belongings 28:23	books	47:20 51:5 58:5	Business
27:16		51:7 52:23	65:25 69:24 81:23	43:16 104:18
27770	Benallie		93:24 94:1,11 99:3	busy
	22:1,4,6	BOR 97.22.25	100:1 103:19	108:20,24
B	benefits	87:23,25	104:22 106:8	buying
BA	11:7,11	border	107:17 108:10	72:25
38:11	benefitted	17:13	bucket	
back	74:11,12	bore	48:24	C
3:9 7:9,18 8:6,17,	BIA	36:23	buckets	
19 30:3 31:1 39:1,	5:24 25:23 39:15,	boss	49:2	cabinet
9 40:4 42:19 45:2,	19 40:7,20 45:17,	106:8	Budget	74:1
4,17,20 53:11	22 47:5 79:6,12	bound	9:24	calling
55:19 64:15 77:11	80:2,6,7 107:23	66:5	budgets	86:12
78:4,6,7 84:25	BIA's	boundaries	16:25	capable
94:5 108:6 109:7	101:14	19:14 73:9		22:23 63:6
back-and-forth	Biden	Brady	build	capacity
101:16	51:8	7:10 41:2,24 47:23	24:7 65:25	6:2,13,14 25:19
bad	Biden's	48:9,21 49:1 50:12	builder	71:8 85:10 100:12.
54:1	32:9	58:25 60:5 69:12	76:6	20
	big	brand-new	building	capture
balance	5:19 72:20 94:6	51:7,22	72:16 85:4 90:13	31:5
5:15 63:9,14		·	104:8	
ball	bigger	break 52.7	builds	captured
72:1	71:3 77:13,14	52:7	109:2	100:8
band	88:12	briefing	built	capturing 31:11
	I	51:17	I.	1 21.11



care	challenge	101:8	Colorado	compacting
25:8,16 28:15 36:9	57:23	clarify	13:20 16:14 17:8,	107:25
66:15,16 93:7	challenged	47:22 56:5 64:16	11,14	compacts
career	39:23	78:24 89:10 91:24	commencement	108:4
72:16 76:5 83:7	challenges	clarifying	106:18	companies
careful	31:3 53:9 63:8	40:13 94:6	comment	72:15
75:15	challenging	clarity	3:22 30:23 31:13	compared
Carlos	32:18	31:1,6	32:12,16,19 34:6	48:23
73:4	chance	classes	55:10 68:20 70:11	competing
carry	4:4 7:22 28:9	39:11,14	77:18 82:7 84:8,11	17:1 67:25 68:8,1
5:4	change	clause	85:12 94:10 95:13	87:2
Casa	12:11 79:23	68:21,25	97:13 101:7	complete
98:21	changed	clear	commented	11:2 12:5,9 14:13
case	42:16 71:25	9:1 15:6,11 25:15	96:22	32:10 103:19
7:21 40:19 46:23		27:1 29:12 36:3	commenting	completing
47:9 73:4 87:6	changing 70:23 79:6	67:19 68:8 84:10	23:19	5:14 6:2
94:5		103:25	comments	
cases	cheap	clearinghouse	3:25 8:18 9:20,21	completion 55:23
20:6 26:4 28:12	99:19	62:4	10:10 12:21 13:7	
39:20,25 77:15	check		15:18 21:19,22	compliance
106:11	43:25 70:3 94:2	clock 91:19	27:11 29:22 31:22,	22:6 60:17,22 96: 101:24 102:2
Cassandra	children		23 32:20,21 33:1	
13:8,9,10,16,17	75:18	close	34:4 36:24 37:5,16	comply
14:7 15:15,21,25	choose	80:3 100:16	52:7,12 53:4,7,23	24:10 46:2,6 55:9
20:2 21:20 32:20,	58:20 63:21	closely	70:8 77:17,25	58:10,15,19 59:10
25 33:16,18 37:2	circulate	30:4 44:25 66:25	78:1,6,9,18,21,22	15,17 60:12,16,24 61:3 65:16
43:3,23 44:1,9,11	82:21	99:2 103:20	81:1,8,19,24 82:22	
59:25 61:5 63:8	circumstances	closer	83:5 84:16 85:1,3,	component 101:18 105:21
64:17 65:18 66:8,	41:13 68:15	13:25 16:5,16	17 94:19,23 95:4, 17 96:12,13 97:12	107:10,11
13,23 67:24 68:6,	citizen	coffee	99:3,7 100:3,9,18,	
10,19 69:23 85:16	3:5	52:5	21,25 101:5,17,22,	components 69:16 102:10
87:11,17 89:24	City	collaboration	25 102:1,2,3,5,9,	
91:2,7 92:14,22	45:8,9,10 46:25	92:17 105:17	21,22,25 103:2	concern
105:2,4 106:25	civil	collar	105:1	30:7 36:9 38:8
107:8	28:14 58:19 59:6,	7:6	committee	concerned
Cassandra's	10,15,24 60:24,25	colleague	30:18 99:10	35:13
97:13	64:12,19 65:1,7	4:5		concerns
category	claim	collected	common 18:5	78:12 79:3 80:8
5:19 38:12 107:4	54:4,8,9,10 57:12	41:15		84:2
caused	68:1	collection	communicate 61:18	concert
34:21	claimed	26:10,13,18,21		104:6
cell	55:20	34:16 46:24 55:4	communities	conclude
24:8	claims	105:25	96:9	109:6
ceremonial	78:15 87:2,12,14	collections	community	concludes
81:12		12:10,14 14:12	3:5 9:19 22:7 27:7,	29:8
chain	clan	34:21 39:9 41:9,14	21 46:21 50:15	conduct
65:4	55:13	47:6 55:1 89:11	94:16,22 95:1	33:20,24 72:6
	clarification	95:24	108:15	1 '



conducted	constitutes	continental	country	95:20 96:16,25
9:18,24 10:8 23:20	65:15 101:2	85:19	19:9 56:21 71:20	97:2
conducting	construction	continue	couple	culturally
12:16	89:25 106:13	53:2 64:4 87:16	4:22 85:16 103:18,	42:1 61:21
confident	consulation	contracting	23 107:18	curating
66:20 98:6	12:16	102:5	court	12:14
confidentiality	consult	contracts	8:9 13:12 15:23	curious
68:21,25 69:16	61:11 63:12 67:11	79:21,23,24 99:15	30:20,21 75:7	78:25
104:5	72:6 73:7	107:24	87:14	current
confine	consulta-	control	courtroom	12:7 34:25 42:8
19:13	82:16	22:11,20 23:7,20	76:24	61:4 95:5
confirming	consultant	35:18 45:24 78:16	cover	curricula
37:5	72:15	controlling	27:12 90:10	104:8
confused	consultation	24:22	covered	customs
91:3	6:7 7:17 8:12,17	conversation	40:19,23	10:15
confusing	9:18 10:14 11:18	13:2 17:21,24	covering	
15:8	18:23 20:4,15	43:2,16 63:5	35:18	
Congress	31:15 33:21,25	101:16 104:16,18	covers	
10:24 15:20 21:12	37:15 43:14,19	conversations	36:8	data
40:3,11 50:16	52:11 54:13 62:6,	17:16,18	COVID	22:11,20 23:3,7
69:15,19 90:6	22 63:20,22 72:3,7	cool	43:7,11 101:3	24:22 26:9,12,13
Congress's	74:16 83:7 84:7,11	75:11	create	17,21 34:9 100:1
11:25	88:16,17,21 89:2	coordinate	8:14 95:6	date
congressional	92:25 93:16 101:12 104:23	31:25	created	108:8
73:1	101:12 104:23	coordinator	41:13	day
conjunction	103.12 100.20	92:18	creating	3:14 62:12 70:18
60:23	consultation@bia.	corner	52:25	82:17 99:10,12
connection	gov	19:9	creation	days
55:5 96:9 97:5	37:8	Coronado	70:18	38:6 52:17 54:5
	consultations	98:20	Creator	57:10 58:17 73:2
consensus 93:17,20	3:10,13,19,24 8:21	coroners'	81:6,7	77:11 88:14,17,1
consideration	10:8 42:23 53:11	50:7	·	89:2,18 93:1 99:
19:24 22:19 23:8	66:12 82:10,13	corporations	creatures 36:5 37:14 101:10	19 107:7 108:17
76:12 83:18	84:17 95:11 102:4	72:21		deaccession
	108:1		criterion	41:19
considered	consulted	correct 36:25 40:20 60:6	50:17	deaccessioning
23:16,18,22 60:21 78:9 81:21	34:8		CU	41:14
	contact	cost	35:17	deadline
consistent	50:20,21	11:21	cultural	3:22 53:5 104:25
48:18	·	costs	11:13,16,24 12:2	deadlines
consistently	contacting 97:23	12:13 62:22	13:19 17:19 18:7	11:1 78:24 92:1,
49:15		council	23:11,12,16 27:2	deal
consisting	contents	82:23	29:6 34:17 35:11,	5:1 31:6 77:13
95:1	13:3	counselors	15,19 36:1,11 42:1 53:20 56:23 57:4	dealing
constantly	context	7:2	67:7,13 72:23	46:22 71:5 75:7,
71:23	51:20	count	73:17 75:9 86:9,	15 81:10
constitute	contexts	22:22,23 48:11	20,24 87:6 94:15	deals
60:12	51:1	49:3	20,2 7 07.0 77.13	



98:4 106:21 107:6 51:10 70:15 73:5,24,25 105:7 107:1,10,11, documented 83:13 98:13 12.15 95:24 Dear discretion 101:21 107:22 82:16 developing 5:11 documents 108:22 20:24 98:2 12:19,20 66:18 **December** discretionary Department's 35:5 development 66:6 dogs 3:17 20:6 95:8 95:19 decendents discuss departmental 10:17 36:12 difference 24:9 51:17 DOI 107:20 77:1 78:23 84:7 73:23,25 decide discussed departments 26:16 28:3 64:8 difficult 48:15 100:14 dot 82:4 88:21 15:8,9 47:7 48:22 36:14 73:25 discussing depend deciding difficulties 84:5 downtown 42:12 46:11 79:10 53:15 55:7 discussion depends decipherable dig 29:16 42:3 70:1 draft 42:14 56:10 29:2 7:22 46:21 79:5 88:13 89:4 9:19 32:21 33:2, deputy 102:7.13 22.25 34:23 35:2.5 decision digging 6:25 94:23 95:5 105:22 28:4 66:6 67:15 12:23 discussions descendent 75:20 drafted decision-making diligently 86:22 87:8 27:23 100:24 96:18 display descendents 28:22 44:6 drafting decisions direct 5:7 35:14 31:3 32:1 14:24 64:25 66:2 disposal 25:13 describing dramatically 87:14 93:14 37:17 direction 59:4 71:25 defer 83:16 disposition 10:15 25:22 desecration 5:5,8 10:6 11:2 draw directly 23:9 17:19 23:8 31:23 21:6 deference 28:11 37:8 50:5 35:8.24 36:18 10:21 26:16 designated drawing director 37:24 39:8 42:4,14 94:17 8:17 85:1 define 45:3,14 53:17 dispute 60:16 desire 54:24 70:14 drawn 30:19 40:8 106:19 defined discarded distance 48:1 59:17 60:2 **Desiree** 28:23 due 93:20 53:13,17 18:21 80:12 definition disclose distances 27:20 56:22 95:16 destroyed 28:4.20 Duncan 92:24 28:23 53:13,17 definitions disclosure distinction 57:2 78:13,16 84:1 details 67:23 durations 36:4 89:10 9:4 68:17 103:23 48:19 delegate disconnect distributed 5:23 85:20 determination 14:8,10 **Duty** 55:14 54:20 66:15 delivery discovered disturbance 66:14 determine 25:5 26:5 36:19 20:7 27:3 28:1 54:8 89:16,22 demands \mathbf{E} 101:23 disturbed 81:8 discoveries eagle 106:16 determined 5:21 26:18 85:17, Denver 81:13 45:18 54:17 18 88:3,10,23 **DNA** 54:16.23 earlier 89:15 91:17 102:8 105:25 determining department 42:6 57:6 79:5 56:8 document discovery 3:8,15 8:13 9:14, 99:12 11:19 26:13 27:1 35:3 107:16 17 13:19 33:12,20, develop 90:2,9,14,15,17, early 24 34:8 51:15 91:18 97:17 98:1 documentation 52:7 99:9 21,22,23,25 91:19 66:14 67:18 52:14,16 53:1 developed



59:23 60:8 65:5

92:7 95:23 96:3,6

easier	27:10	33:14	69:14	104:24,25
58:14 68:3	enable	ESQ	exemptions	extending
easy	11:15	39:3 40:21,25	69:6 104:3	91:25
79:14	encountered	41:2,23 43:15,24	exercised	extension
echo	95:23	44:7,10,13 48:9,21	25:12	31:15 63:25 64:1
7:14	encourage	49:1,8,19,22 50:11	existing	extensions
echoed	7:6 18:20 21:17	58:25 60:5 69:12	15:7 19:13 25:11	64:9 65:1 89:6
56:20	53:3	establish	59:12 79:20	extensive
echoing	encouraging	58:13	expanding	34:24
102:22,25	92:9	established	100:25	extensively
educational	end	29:5 50:13 96:24	expect	50:21
74:7	3:23 31:13 32:17	Estenoz	42:25	extent
effect	49:5 108:5	4:6,7,10 29:17,19	expectation	10:9 23:5
51:24 79:20	endangered	33:10,15,17 40:13,	26:12	exterior
effective	20:5	16,24 41:1 44:16,	expected	73:9
19:25 95:7 102:20	enemy	19 47:18,21 48:20,	77:24	
103:9	32:14	25 49:18,21 50:10		extra
		51:4 64:7 65:20	experience 21:16 27:25 38:1	11:18 58:23
effectively 61:12,17 64:10	energy 72:22 83:15,17	66:9 91:5,9 100:6	97:19 104:11	extract
	· ·	103:18 106:6,9		72:22
efficient 95:7	enforcement 79:6	estimate	experienced 37:23	extremely
		12:8		81:1,2
effort	engage	evaluate	experiences	
58:1 83:15,17	34:4 43:14 44:4	10:11 68:12,16	54:1 56:20 103:6	F
92:10 95:7	63:11,22	event	108:14	
efforts	engaged	98:3 107:6	expertise	face
3:16 34:18 41:24	62:10,25	events	21:16 23:2,23	72:13
Eiset	engulf	30:15,16	24:17,21	faced
46:16,19,20 98:18,	99:23	everyone's	experts	57:17
23	ensure	5:17	73:11	faces
element	97:8,21	evidence	explain	13:21
60:17 66:11	entered	64:1 68:2 86:13,17	31:17 57:8,15	facilitate
elements	78:9 81:20 95:18	examples	58:18 67:12	17:16 18:3 26:2
59:19 60:25 74:5	96:2	17:9 37:22,24	101:19	fact
Elsa	entire	101:24	explained	16:10 43:18 68:1
46:14	73:3	excavate	18:9	69:16 82:25
email	entities	23:9	explaining	factor
36:25 37:7,8	72:24		40:17 93:22	56:8
emphasis	entity	excavated 36:19	exploring	factors
100:11	49:24		41:17	60:7
emphasize	envision	excavation	exposure	failed
59:4	103:10	45:2,16 95:22	90:10	58:10,15
emphasized	erosion	excavations	exposures	failure
10:13	90:9	5:21 16:9 22:12	90:13	59:17 60:12,16,2
		23:15	extend	65:16
emphatic	Es-ten-knows	exceptions	24:7 32:12,16,19	
84:10	33:15,16	49:4		failures
en	Es-ten-own-ez	exemption	extended	58:19 59:10,15 61:3
	1		3:22 31:12 64:11	1 01.3



fairly	feedback	fire	forgot	frustration
48:18 50:9	103:12	5:17	8:7	85:7
fall	feel	firm	forgotten	full
3:20 17:6	14:12 38:2 98:6	90:20 92:2	74:14	9:15 26:23 34:23
familiar	feeling	Fish	formal	81:11,12,13
47:8,9 97:5,25	5:1	4:11 33:11	8:16 37:14 52:10	full-time
families	feelings	fit	101:11 104:23	65:10
97:9	4:23	38:1 48:24 59:9	formally	fully
family	feels	63:23	95:18 96:2	99:23 103:1
97:6 108:14	76:1	flexibility	forms	funded
farm	feet	5:11,16 31:5	48:23	50:6
20:18	5:17	flexible	formulating	funding
fascinating	fewer	39:22	12:21	17:6 18:13,24 19:4
104:16	39:18	flight	fortunate	28:13 29:14,19
feathers	field	99:20	17:8 18:14	47:24 48:6,10,11
81:13	14:3	Flood	forward	49:3,12,23,25 50:5 79:1,4,11,24 85:9
fed	figure	75:4	6:18 38:3 52:19	100:13 101:2
28:1	15:9 44:2 48:24	flows	53:2 80:22 89:5	funds
federal	49:13 50:20	50:1,2,3	95:12	18:15 46:1
5:4,13,24 10:3,15	figuring	focus	found	
11:2,14,17,19,22	51:3	74:9	16:6 45:8 58:10	funerary 12:6 14:14,25
12:4,14 14:23	fill	focuses	100:17	27:18 29:5 35:10,
15:12 16:11 17:9	103:23	24:25 80:15	frame	25 42:9,18 43:10
18:3,8,12 19:7,17,	final	FOIA	14:17 32:9 60:14	55:16 56:7,23
21 20:8 25:23	9:11 31:21 32:2,6	67:23 69:8,14	61:25 63:25 87:21	63:15 93:8 95:21
26:11,15,18 28:13 29:13 30:20 32:3	34:5 43:21 52:7,21	102:2 103:24	89:18 90:4,5,14 91:22 92:5	96:15,24 100:22
34:19 39:6,15,18	76:4,13 77:19	104:3		future
41:9 42:10 43:7,12	78:10 91:10 95:11	FOIA-ABLE	frames 60:18 61:12,19	51:17 53:1 80:11,
46:1,2 47:24 48:6,	100:3 103:4	66:17	62:9 93:21	22 96:21
10,11 49:3,11,23,	finalized	folks	framework	
24 50:5,15,25 59:7	41:12 98:9	5:1 7:7,8 31:14	47:11,12	G
62:11 72:11 73:22	finalizing	41:21 52:18 70:8	·	
74:24 82:2,7 83:13	65:22	100:2	frankly 39:21	Gallegos
84:13 85:8 86:23	finally	follow		7:1 108:9
87:23 89:21 90:1,	6:5	15:8 38:15 46:1	free 99:13,21	gaming
2,12 91:12 92:12,	financial	86:6 97:12 98:11	·	108:3
16,21 93:17,19,22	99:18	99:7	frequent 44:23	general
95:14,23 97:16,24 98:13,25 100:15	find	follow-up		35:7 50:25 100:8
101:2 102:8,14,16	11:9 23:13 37:11	43:2 44:25	Friday	102:4
105:11 106:13,16	fine	food	108:8	generally
107:4 108:13	32:23 58:22	106:10	friend	48:4
federally	fined	Forest	4:5	gentleman
78:14 84:3	58:7	20:17 98:17,20	friendship	45:14,15,18 46:15
	fingers	104:13	45:13	gentleman's
fode		forgive	front	15.6
feds 24:6 16 99:22	22:23	_		45:6
feds 24:6,16 99:22	22:23 finite	51:10	8:9 20:23	45:6 geographic



geographical	government-to-	guides	hat	hindrance
86:9,10,20,24 87:7	government	81:7	56:3	61:13
GERALD	8:12 33:21,24	guys	hats	hired
27:4 29:25 38:7	37:15 72:6 84:18	21:22 35:4 36:21	82:4 108:25	65:9
44:24 99:6	95:7 101:12	52:8 75:12 87:19	Hawaiian	hiring
Gila	104:23		9:19 10:18 36:12	72:14
22:7 27:8 94:15	Graham	H	71:18,21	historic
108:11	75:4		head	13:17 22:8 27:5
give	Grande	Haaland	69:2 91:18	34:20 70:14 94:16.
19:24 23:1 24:5,6	45:1,17 46:15	52:20 70:21 108:7,		22
29:25 36:3 38:4	98:21,23	18	healing	
40:3,4 49:6 59:25	grant	habit	34:15 108:11,22	hold
60:2 66:20 77:11	18:21 62:24 70:13,	51:25	heals	52:6 88:24
83:17 85:17 100:6	14 81:23		34:19	holding
		habits	health	5:13,16
giving	grants	52:25	71:9 75:23 76:19	holdings
5:15 29:15 39:9	18:16,18 48:6	Haida	hear	14:12
55:19	50:25	53:18	4:24 6:3,15 7:18	holds
glad	gratitude	Haley	13:6,7 29:23 82:24	88:5
3:9,10 13:21	109:3	8:8	84:14 100:4	
103:21	graves	hampered	104:20	holidays
goal	34:1 35:11 36:14	65:14		51:9 109:3
10:5 11:25 13:6	55:11 94:20		heard	holy
15:1 19:2 57:24		hand	29:14 37:14 50:24	72:23 75:21
	great	38:25	53:11 56:20 94:5	home
goals	4:17 6:17 38:23	handled	100:7 102:20,21	13:23 14:25 16:1,
9:8 10:4 11:10	49:14	89:16	hearing	17 17:23 97:10
27:17 29:13 32:18	greater	handling	6:18 7:23 85:7	109:7
golly	41:21 81:10	28:15 92:13	101:11 103:6	homelands
106:22	ground	handwriting	108:12	19:11 71:7
good	20:6	103:20	held	
3:1 4:9 7:18 13:16	group		88:8 99:10	homes
16:17,21 18:19	16:15 68:4 78:13	hang		15:14
22:1,3,5 25:18		54:6	helped	honest
27:4 32:14 37:20	groups	happen	31:9	30:8
52:25 53:13 54:1,2	84:4	40:10 54:13 90:18,	helpful	honor
66:19 70:1,13	guards	24 92:7 107:5	29:9 52:12 53:8	4:15
71:1,14 75:12	54:12	happened	helping	Honorable
79:17 83:7,15	guess	34:16 69:20	6:22	
86:19 91:15 98:8	30:15 44:24 46:8		helps	33:8,10
99:6	62:6,23 77:10 78:5	happy	69:1	hope
	89:7	21:4		11:4,14,20,25
gosh		hard	Hey	12:3,10 14:21
70:17	guidance	31:25 75:10 89:7,	75:11 91:18	17:15,25 18:9,22
government	23:3 24:15 31:10	18 105:8	hierarchy	25:25 34:18 57:14
19:17 39:15 41:10	guide	harder	86:11,16	58:3 81:19 109:7
46:6 71:1,15 73:1,	73:18	16:16	high	hopeful
	guideline	Harold	60:8 76:2	12:12,20 57:18
13 74:12 82:22	Salacinic			
	30:11			·
13 74:12 82:22	_	53:19,25 54:2 56:1,19 58:6	highlight 25:10 65:4	hopes 9:8



	1	1	1	1
hoping	impact	including	88:16,17	interim
10:22 58:21	6:14 58:4	6:24 100:12 101:3	initiate	34:9
hosting	impacted	incorporate	63:20	Interior
3:13	106:16	10:12 20:11	initiative	3:8,15 4:10 33:12,
hour	implement	incorporated	72:5	20 51:15 83:14
70:4 76:2	65:24	10:7,9	input	internally
Hourary	implementation	incorporating	4:20 10:7 24:25	29:16
46:23	32:11 51:23 52:25	19:17	28:15 38:4	international
hours	100:13,21	increase	insert	47:16 51:10,20
52:9	implementing	58:21 80:16	68:20	101:18
housekeeping	33:23 34:1	incredibly	inserting	Internet
94:2 107:18	importance	52:12	105:16	24:7
housing	102:14	Indian	insertion	interns
28:16	important	3:5,8 5:11,20 6:6,	105:23	61:10
huge	8:16 52:19,20	24 9:18 10:17,23	inside	interpretation
72:21	65:22 66:11 82:6	12:15 13:18 14:15	85:4	42:17 48:2,3
	83:2 103:4,25	15:12 18:6 19:3,10		interpreted
human	108:21	22:7 25:7 27:7	instance	49:15
11:13,16,24 12:1,5 14:14,24 18:7	impose	33:9,19 34:12	25:15 49:16 85:24	intersection
19:21 27:2,21 29:5	5:3,6	35:14 36:12 46:20	instances	51:13 83:24
35:9,25 36:3,16	imposed	56:25 71:18,20	25:21 89:8	introduce
42:2 55:5,21 56:9,	11:1	73:12 74:23,24	institution	4:4 13:13 53:15
14 63:14 81:11,15	impressions	78:13 85:20 86:24	45:12 47:25 48:12	75:1,3 94:11
89:22 95:16 96:14,	102:18	87:13 94:15,22	institutions	· ·
24 100:23 102:11	improve	95:1 108:13	34:20 74:6,7 95:14	inundated 81:1,2 82:2
	10:5 25:25	Indian-recognized	96:19	•
I		78:14	instrumental	inundation
	improves 103:9	indigenous	7:4	89:12
idea		36:5 37:14 101:10	intended	inventories
22:17 23:14	in-person	individual	10:24	54:15
ideas	3:10,13	9:20 56:11	intent	inventory
7:24	inactivity	individuals	5:6 14:13 15:20	55:22 63:18,19
identification	89:20	56:21 73:19 88:7	intention	investigation
36:17 57:3	inadvertent	ineffective	52:21	59:24
identified	88:2 90:9 95:22	34:12	intentional	investigator
56:24	98:3	information	16:8 89:24 95:22	65:10
identify	inadvertents	7:20 56:25 64:15,	intentions	invite
16:15 86:23	88:10	16 66:21 67:4,6,9,	71:15	108:15
identifying	inbox	10,20,21 68:16	interagency	involved
17:12 34:14	82:17	69:9	10:1	6:22 45:22 47:4,5
Ignacio	include	informs	interest	Isom-clause
13:20	95:18 96:2 105:8	51:16	41:21	6:25
imagine	included	infrastructure	interested	issue
73:20 74:20 91:9	9:25 27:20 69:16	24:8	4:25 5:10 7:23	17:14 21:8 25:1
immediately	73:2 95:5 105:9	initial	22:10	26:10 30:13 39:5
76:4	includes	22:9 51:22 77:20	interests	41:5,25 42:22
70.1	48:17 95:13	initialize	29:2	50:18,23 59:11
				65:12 69:13



issued	keenly	19:7,10,22 22:13,	82:16	light
41:25	4:25	21 23:21 24:23		56:19
		25:3,9,24 53:18	leaders 77:9	
issues 30:6 38:17 42:24	keeping 36:16	71:7 72:23 73:10,		Likewise 64:12
44:25 56:4 59:4,23		14 79:7 85:19,23	leadership	
71:3,5 75:16 79:3	kind	100:15,16 102:8	33:19	limited
	14:7 15:17 23:2,3,	landscape	leads	26:4 41:13,16 69:7
items	14 25:12 26:21	16:12	34:18 61:6	85:9
11:13,16,24 12:2	30:7,14,20,22		learn	limits
15:14 18:7 25:4,8,	39:14 44:5 47:2,	landscapes	42:25	69:4
17 26:5,14 27:2	12,14 61:13 67:22	72:23	learned	lineal
28:21 34:17 35:15,	69:1 75:10 78:25	language	34:11 44:20 69:25	5:7 10:17 35:14
19 39:9,12,14	86:5 90:10 99:19	28:24,25 29:2	104:15	36:12 86:16 87:8
41:18 81:12	103:11 105:8	31:4,10 32:2 53:10	learning	lines
101:14 107:18	107:8	69:1 85:22 86:3,5	42:24 88:24	24:7 86:17
	kinds	92:23 96:6 103:10		list
J	19:20 48:5 57:16	laps	leave	29:8 54:16 109:2
	69:6 90:1,13 93:13	72:14	12:22 13:3 42:24	
Jacobs	kinship	largely	52:8 94:4 106:5	listed
53:19 54:2 58:6	86:17	14:11	leaves	55:22 59:9 61:2
January	knew		49:12	listening
3:23 4:1 105:1	44:14 94:7	largest 9:13 18:16	leaving	74:17 108:19
Joaquin	knowing		31:4	listing
7:1 108:8,9	16:1	Larry	left	59:14
job		22:1,4,5	26:15 56:12 70:4	lists
9:3 52:18 65:10	knowledge	lastly	94:8	30:14
85:8	10:16 53:21	12:12	legal	litigate
	104:11	late	21:2 29:1 46:8	46:12
join 70.0.100.15	knowledgeable	53:14	48:3 101:14	
70:8 108:15	27:9	law		live
joint	Kohn	13:24 14:1,13,17	legally	81:18
68:8 87:4 95:3	7:2	23:6 24:4,17,20	39:23 74:21	lives
jointly		25:7 38:22 51:7,	lent	103:8
94:21	L	22,23 52:4 55:9	46:23	loan
journey		56:8 58:2 69:5	let alone	38:14,15 45:19
55:25	lack	84:13 97:20 99:24	74:22	47:3
JR	23:2 40:5,8,9,11	laws	letter	loaned
22:1,4	lakes	41:15 67:23 69:18	33:7 82:16 96:20	45:5
	88:1	74:22,23,24 76:17,	letters	loans
jumbles		21 96:6 104:4	9:20	28:13 46:4 48:22
74:24	land			50:19 101:4
jump	16:9 18:4,8 19:16	lawyers	letting 32:14	local
73:6 75:10	21:13 23:7 26:12, 18,19 27:2 67:11	44:15		50:4 98:20
Juneau	83:12 87:11 89:21	layers	level	
55:7	90:1 92:21 106:13	74:16	28:6 98:7,13	localities
	107:4 108:2	layperson	107:20	50:4,6
K		36:7	liaisons	located
	lands	lead	72:15	80:2 88:5
Kathryn	5:19,22 11:14,19,	18:23 34:15	life	logging
6:25	22 16:2,5,12,14,15	Leader	51:25 71:7 76:15	89:25 106:14
	17:5,12,22 18:12			



long	18:11 20:19,22	meaningful	mention	mix
41:5 55:25 70:6	21:13 25:14 26:25	25:12 72:6,10	18:13	72:20 73:3 75:8
83:20 88:15	29:15,23 30:23,25	108:21	mentioned	Mm-hmm
103:15	31:11 37:25 44:2,3	means	42:6 43:19 57:6	32:24 33:17 37:1
longer	45:19 48:12 52:1,	32:11 43:19 55:4	65:25 80:12	MOA
31:15	2,10,23 54:19	101:9	met	107:10
looked	57:10 58:15,22	meat	54:17	mom
30:8	61:18,24 62:3,7,	68:24	Mexico	75:24
lose	10,20 64:25 66:2,	meet	46:25 47:1	moment
51:9	17 67:15,19 68:7	28:9 32:18 73:19	Michigan	44:18 47:22 98:22
lot	70:2 71:1 76:4	81:7 91:22	3:6	
12:18 17:18 23:1	77:1 81:8 83:5	meeting		monetary
24:3 27:12 28:8	84:4,9 86:8 91:1	52:3 84:17	microphone	55:3
42:3 45:1 50:17	94:4,7 97:11		13:11 44:17	money
64:22 69:25 70:19,	100:2,12 103:9	meeting/a	middle	16:22 24:5,6,16
21,22,24 76:17	makes	85:2	55:7 93:7	46:6 50:5 62:24
77:15 78:17 81:17	90:19	meetings	miles	Montezuma
83:19 97:15,16	making	99:10	76:2	98:22
99:25 101:15	6:6 8:20 15:6	Mel	million	month
104:10,15	19:16 32:8 57:15	7:11	18:17	31:13 32:17 62:22
	68:1 85:8 100:10,	Melanie	Mills	months
lots 85:7	21,22 101:9	7:12 8:4,8,24 13:9,	3:4	14:18,19 32:4,7
	man's	11 14:4,9 15:16,23	mimic	88:23
loud	74:23	17:3 22:3 24:24	86:5	monument
15:22	manage	37:18,20 44:18		98:22
love	73:13,14,16	51:16 55:24 58:5,9	mind	
4:24 6:3,15	management	59:13 60:6 63:7	76:8,18 77:3	moral
loved	9:24 19:16 20:20	64:18 66:19,24	mindful	46:8
75:17	21:13 106:17	68:5,7,11 69:3	32:13	moratorium
low		86:19 87:13 89:9,	minds	28:17 96:13 101::
60:8	manager 9:2 92:21	25 91:3,5,6,15,23	51:19 71:9	102:12
lower		92:2,20 93:12,25	mine	morning
28:6	managers	98:11 100:5	103:20,21	3:2,16 4:9,19 6:1
lucky	18:4 75:9	102:17,19	minerals	13:16,22 22:1,3,5
62:14	March	Melanie's	72:22	27:4 53:13 54:2
	18:21	59:3	Minogizhebaawaga	69:25 70:13 100:
lumping	marked	member	d	108:24
84:15	43:1	74:1	3:3	Mount
	markup	members		75:4
\mathbf{M}	35:3	6:21 71:19 97:21	minute	move
	matter	108:14,15	8:5	8:1,5 38:3 89:5
made	24:2 64:14 76:11	·	minutes	moves
28:4 45:10 62:9	81:17,18 83:5	memory	94:4	95:12
91:19 96:12	91:11 103:24	66:1	Miraculously	
103:24 106:21		mending	81:6	moving
main	matters	34:15	missed	31:21 106:22
10:5 40:2	75:16 77:14	mental	94:6	muddy
make	maximum	71:8	misspeak	30:22
4:3 6:7,21 8:22	10:9	mental/spiritual	60:7	multiple
0.15 14.14 23		76:10	55.7	68:12 82:13 87:3



9:15 14:14,23

76:19

68:12 82:13 87:3

muscle 65:25 Museo 46:25 47:6 museum 12:10 43:6,9 44:3 45:1,7,11,17,25 48:13,14 54:5,11, 14,16,22,23,25 55:1,2,6,17 57:2,6, 15 58:7,16 59:5 60:15 61:7,22 63:17,24 67:9,15 68:3,12,16 86:23

museums

5:4,13 10:15 11:1 12:4,13 14:23 15:11 28:11 41:20, 22 43:5 47:16 49:20 50:2,3,8 54:7 55:3,12,14,15 58:1,9,22 59:7,9 61:9 62:1,21 63:10,16 64:9 91:13 95:14 101:4, 23 102:1

87:5 95:23 96:2,19

N

Nacional 46:25

NAGPRA

3:17 4:14.21 9:2. 10 10:25 16:24,25 17:19 18:15,17,20 19:22 20:1.3.5.11 23:6 26:3 27:9 30:17 33:23 34:8, 10,18 35:16,19 36:8 38:12,16 39:6 40:19,23 41:19 42:2,8,13 43:8,13 47:10,13 48:1 51:13 54:18 55:9 61:15 62:15,18,24 69:4,5,10 70:16 77:18 80:12,17,18 83:25 92:17 94:17, 24 95:4,9 96:7 97:13,17,20,22 98:1 99:9,14 100:11 101:1,15, 20 104:3,6 107:10,

NAGPRA-RELATED

26:22

Nation

95:2 108:18

nation's 72:14

national

4:12,14 9:2 34:10, 23 62:18 98:16,19, 20,21,22 104:12

nations

17:10 71:20

native

9:19 10:16,17 34:1 35:9,11,25 36:4, 10,12,13,16 53:17 71:18,21 72:5,17 73:11 75:25 94:19

natural 73:17 80:2

nature 27:19

Navajo 108:18

nearby

necessarily 27:15 66:5 67:8

needed

68:16 **needing** 101:7

negate

86:1 newest

18:14 33:2

Newland 3:1,4 6:20 8:

3:1,4 6:20 8:3,7 14:3,6 19:5 21:1, 21 29:9,18,20 30:24 32:24 33:8, 13 37:1,3,13,19 38:23 42:21 46:17 47:20 51:5 58:5 69:24 81:23 93:24 94:1,11 99:3 100:1 104:22 106:8 107:17 108:10

nexus 46:2

NHOS 5:7.11.16 6:6

10:23 12:16 14:16 15:12 35:14 56:25

NHPA

20:16 69:6,8,21

nice 103:15

niece 75:23

nobody's 76:22

noncompliance 58:8

nondestructive 106:2

nonnative 72:18

northern 3:6

not-for-profits 50:25

note

13:13 42:15 79:19

notes

8:9,10 103:19

notice

11:21 59:21 95:12

noticed

34:5 103:20

noticing 20:23

November

14:19 35:12 54:16

nps.gov/nagpra

12:17

number

49:1,6 60:3 83:22 85:18

0

O'BRIEN

7:12 8:4,24 13:9, 11 14:4,9 15:16,23 17:3 22:3 24:24 37:18,20 44:18 55:24 58:9 63:7 64:18 66:19,24 68:5,7,11 69:3 86:19 87:13 89:9, 25 91:3,6 92:2,20 93:12,25 98:11 102:19

O'ODHAM

95:2

Oak

75:4

object

56:6,7,16,23,24 57:3,4,7 67:6,7,12, 13

objects

12:6 14:15,25 27:18 29:5,6 35:10,25 36:1 40:18,23 42:9,18 43:10 46:24 51:11 54:12,17 55:3,10, 14,16,20 56:13,24 63:15 95:21 96:15, 24,25 97:2 100:23

obligations 51:14

obstacles 57:16

occur

58:14 90:16,17,25 95:11

occurred

75:21 90:23 92:7

occurring 11:6 89:20

. .

October

10:2

Od

46:14

offensive

11:4 **offer**

6:17 106:9

offering

24:16

offers 36:11

office

7:9 9:24 39:4 41:3 59:1 64:12 82:4 88:4 94:16,23

officer 13:18 27:6

Officers 22:8

offices 50:6,7 61:15

official

8:11 92:15,16,18, 21

officials

64:25 82:7 102:15

Ojibwe

3:3,6 Oklahoma

Okianoma 45:7

Oliver

7:3 37:3,6 39:2 **oliver.shaley@bia.**

gov.

37:9

omission 35:13

one-off 48:6

one-sided 105:18

one-tracked 20:14

ongoing

11:21 12:13 46:11

operates



85:4 paragraph 24:8 penalty point 10:19 59:10,16,24 60:1, 13:2 14:20 16:18 opinion phonetic 4,6 61:1 64:19 17:11,24 25:18 **Park** 105:16 46:14.23 75:4 65:7 31:20 43:17,20 4:13 34:23 41:12 opinions phrase 46:9 49:8 53:10 98:16 104:12 people 15:20 26:17 36:17 59:3 60:10 62:6 3:6 16:2.3 17:11 parks opportunities physical 83:15 86:8 98:12 20:23 21:21 24:12 4:11 33:11 98:21 76:19 19:3 26:1 63:11 106:25 27:9 28:6 30:1,3 part opportunity pick 31:11 45:4 50:17, points 8:12 13:6 15:16, 59:18 7:15 13:1 23:23 24 53:8 71:16 59:5,8 94:6 21.25 16:19.20 30:1 31:16 34:4,13 piece 72:17,25 74:2 77:3 policies 17:14,25 20:19 37:21 41:8 58:21 19:8 29:14 79:2 82:4,12 97:4, 106:1 21:23 33:4,6 42:10 64:23 65:3 94:18 24 108:13 Pima-maricopa 52:3 53:5 56:17 policy 95:13 103:13 27:7 46:20 94:22 peoples 7:1,2 20:9 85:25 57:23 58:12 60:21 opposed PL 36:4 68:4,20 69:1 83:7 86:2,6 91:11 55:1 79:20 87:15 95:21 perfect policy-making opposing 32:14 place partial 83:20 68:13 16:13 60:13,20 95:21 period portion option 80:7 86:11 92:11 23:10 31:13 32:12, partly 16:4 36:6,10 42:17 5:23 25:24 57:19 97:22 17.19 44:22 83:19 77:19 options places periods passed portions 18:3 27:1 16:7 19:13 62:23 78:1 10:25 34:7 80:13, 72:25 order 72:23 75:21 86:15 19 96:7 permanent position 30:14.15 plain 38:14 23:19 past 28:24,25 29:2 organization 3:20 38:5 41:15 permanently positive 36:13 74:4 plan 38:15 path 70:23 organizations 69:19 79:15 87:21 81:7 permission possession 10:18 71:21 72:21 88:13,18,25 89:1, 28:18 96:16 29:4 96:23 97:4 patrimony 17,19 90:5,13,16, original 29:6 35:11 36:1,11 person possessions 20,22,24 91:18,20 15:19 33:1 78:1 51:11 56:23 57:4 7:15,18 13:1 29:3 78:16 92:10.11 93:13.15. 88:5.6 89:12 67:7,13 96:16,25 63:3 65:24 66:1 17 97:13,17,22 possibly outline 75:23 76:6 81:15 pause 98:1,2 105:9 71:11 77:16 9:6 103:14 70:2 106:14,19,23 potentially oversee perspective 107:12,15 pay 60:25 4:12 73:16 14:10 17:18 44:4 24:13 planning power overview pertain pavcheck 92:6 24:7 39:7 34:22 36:15,17 101:3 plans PPP owe pertains paving 20:21,25 105:6,8 28:13 29:17,19 83:16 11:12.23 86:3 19:23 20:23 106:11 46:4 48:22 50:19 ownership Peterson's payment Plata 104:15 35:18 53:23 58:11 107:9 practice Petoskey Peak play 17:12 18:5 91:11 P 7:2 70:24 103:7 92:8 106:17 **Phoenix** penalties plays preamble p.m. 4:16,17 45:10 28:14 58:20 59:7 51:20 32:1 35:2 42:3,13 107:21 109:8 108:7 60:24 62:8 63:2,4 48:16 49:2 **POA** pandemic 64:12 65:1 80:16 phone 105:17 107:11 precedent 77:20 78:8



52:2 66:3,7 previously prove processes puts 102:22 34:15 35:16 84:23 73:10,13 14:17 81:6 precursor putting 105:14 prey professionals provide 95:19 73:11 6:9 23:3,23 33:5 73:20 76:8 78:14 predated 35:1,8,23 49:6 89:14 prior program 61:13 69:5 90:5 34:5 48:19 89:1 4:14 9:2 34:10 predecessor 0 91:12 94:18 99:21 98:2 99:10 54:19 55:18 programs 103:11 104:4 qualifies priorities 20:21 101:3 102:6 predict 47:23 provided 31:18 80:3 107:22 91:17 5:23 12:18 24:1 qualify prioritize progress prefer 34:23 56:25 68:18 48:13 56:16 87:5 70:9 18:6 69:14 101:24 question prioritized prohibitive preferences providing 14:2 15:16 17:4 11:17 87:7 11:5 92:12 59:20 63:11 94:23 24:25 38:8,23 priority project preparing 98:8 40:14.22 43:3.20 35:18 87:1,9 16:10 96:3 98:3 9:3 provision 47:18 56:10,17,18 private projects preplanning 14:11 91:25 58:6 61:6 63:1,8 16:11 43:5 45:12, 70:22 72:13 73:18 107:5 65:19 66:20 78:11 provisions 25 74:6 100:16 74:4 preponderance 83:4 84:6 86:19 6:13 86:22 101:4 proper 68:2 86:14 89:7 91:23 106:7 public privilege 62:5 present questions 31:22 34:6 78:22 3:7 proposal 59:5 81:4 7:6,7 13:5,7 21:2 84:7,8,11,15 85:3 problem 22:10 33:22,25 30:1 37:7 48:21 presentation 95:13,14 100:15 34:24 26:24 50:22 54:21. 53:9 65:7 77:5,8, 8:2 22:9 publication 24,25 57:9 10 78:5 87:20 proposals presently 11:22 problems 21:15 101:13 104:19 56:9 published 33:22 47:16 54:3 105:5 proposed preservation 3:19 9:11 10:3 3:19 4:21 5:2 6:13 procedural quick 13:18.19 22:8 Pueblo 59:18,19 7:21,25 9:8,25 71:10 106:6 24:10 26:8 27:6 45:1.16 46:15 10:3,4,12 12:8,19, proceeding quickly 70:15 94:16,23 98:23 21,24 18:10 31:21 109:2 30:21 President pulled 33:1 42:16 59:13 proceedings 32:9 51:8 53:23 48:1 63:17 79:20 88:14 101:9 R president's 94:19 95:3,8,12 pulling process 52:16 72:5 74:1 98:9 108:2,3 7:4 52:18 race 5:12,14 6:10,11,13 press proposing purpose 71:12 10:6.14 11:3.22 53:2 9:22 23:6 42:18 10:21 33:4.6 35:7. radar 12:4 14:14,22 pressure 74:5 75:13 22.23 93:12 21:9 41:5 15:1,3,6,11,13,19 58:23 protect purposes 16:4,20 17:15 raise pretty 50:8 77:12 67:11 69:8 18:10,11,23 19:1, 47:14 53:9 59:23 16:25 18:5 46:4 protected 18,22 20:1 21:24 pursue raised prevent 22:20 27:24 31:10 33:5 28:21 21:7 25:18 38:25 57:16 34:6,8,11,19 35:8, put protection 60:3,4,6 83:22 24 42:2,10 47:10 preventing 11:13,16 34:2 6:22 15:10 16:5,6 raising 58:13.14 60:20.21 11:6 35:12 36:14 66:21 29:13 32:10 35:5 42:22 64:3 80:1 83:20 51:24 67:21 72:19 85:25 94:20 101:3 previous ran 84:6,16 85:2,15 73:12 77:22 32:21 45:13 66:12 protections 54:20 89:17 102:1,3,8 103:25 104:1 95:17 96:12 97:21 69:11 107:14



ranges	reburied	recovery	regulations	relying
27:12	18:8	22:11,20 23:4,7	3:17 5:3 6:9 7:17,	69:7
rare	rebury	24:22 26:13	21 8:20 9:4,10,16,	remains
40:1	100:16	100:19	25 10:20,21 11:5	11:13,16,24 12:2,
rate	reburying	redefining	12:18 13:5 15:7	14:14,24 18:7
12:7	100:22	86:12	19:2,21 25:2,11	19:21 27:2,21 29:
reach		redline	26:11 33:5,23	35:9,25 36:3,16
50:9 101:1	recaps 103:22	35:3	34:1,25 35:23	42:2 55:22 56:9,
		reduce	36:15 38:1,5 42:8,	11,14 61:22 62:5
reached	receipt	12:13 26:20	16 48:1,12,14,19	63:14 75:16,17,18
64:2	54:4		53:10 54:4 59:12	81:12 87:8 89:23
reaching	receive	reduced	61:4 63:9 65:2,15,	95:16 96:14,24
74:16	4:19	11:20	22 66:3 67:19	100:23 102:11
read	received	refer	76:13 77:23 80:19	remember
21:18,22 27:13	9:14,20 43:6	48:16 96:5	84:14 86:21 91:10	45:4 93:15
33:7 35:22 77:6	102:23	reference	92:9 94:24 99:24	
83:11 86:5 94:4	receives	8:19 86:1 101:2,10	100:10 103:3,7	remind 97:8 104:17,24
read-back	49:11,23,24	referenced	108:2,3	· ·
100:7	recent	83:23 84:1	regulatory	remotely
			5:14 15:3 17:7,15	7:17
ready 88:22 90:24	3:24 28:24,25 31:14 102:7	references 29:1	31:4 58:3,12	remove
			103:10	29:1
real	recently	referring	reiterate	removed
47:11 103:11	45:8 69:21 99:20	40:22,23	96:23	11:4 18:7 26:10
109:2	Reclamation	reflected		56:12,15 59:15
real-life	98:16	15:19	reiteration	rep
37:24	recognition	refuses	72:4	70:16
real-world	40:6,9	57:7	related	
103:8	recognize	reg	12:19 65:7	repair
realign	27:19 28:13 95:18	42:7	relates	34:14
15:1,3	96:2		19:8 84:2 89:19	repairs
		regard	92:3 101:20	34:19
realigned	recognized	51:6	relating	repatriate
15:19	84:3	regents	102:1	28:12 38:11,21
realistic	recognizing	28:7		57:7,16,20,21
107:7	6:21 100:23 102:9	regional	relation	58:18
realize	recommend	79:13 88:4	57:9 97:5	repatriateable
11:10 97:15	34:3 35:22 36:16	Register	relationship	28:2
realized	86:3 91:16 95:17	10:3 62:11	84:19	
11:25	97:23 98:14		relatives	repatriated
	recommendations	regs 13:25 27:17 29:1	97:10	12:15 27:18 38:18 19 42:9
reason 29:7 38:21 40:2	21:4	30:5,8 35:8 38:9	relevant	
		· ·	32:3	repatriating
46:5 65:21 90:21	record	48:3 66:15 68:22	religion	57:19
92:6 97:2	8:14 13:15 52:11	77:19 105:22,24	75:6	repatriation
reasons	53:6 55:8 95:25	106:4		5:4,8 6:8,15 10:6
16:7 42:6	recorded	regular	reluctant	11:3,24 12:1,7,9
reburial	93:21	34:5	38:13	14:11,16 18:24,25
16:15 17:5,12,22	recourse	regulation	rely	19:4 30:13 34:2
	70.00	20 4 40 4 4 0 40	104:4	1
18:4 19:8 20:10	59:22	28:4 42:1,4,8,13	104.4	35:9,12,24 37:23



86:23 90:6 Revised 86:22 87:4,5 89:13 17 63:21 103:1 24 95:12 94:20 101:8 96:5 requirement responding rules repatriations 57:1 60:15 63:24 59:20 82:7,18 revising 7:25 9:8 52:15 11:6 67:18 92:4 103:3 76:13 77:19 88:14 response 104:1 requirements 57:10 60:15 61:13 revision repeat 104:7 83:4 85:13 11:15 26:20 54:18 9:15 ruling 60:19 89:20 33:2 78:10 repeated responses revisions 102:25 9:15 60:19 83:8 23:6 24:4,17,20 rulings requires 25:2,11 56:5,22 76:4 repeatedly responsibilities 12:1 93:16 97:20 67:19 5:21,24 25:3 51:14 Revlynne run 64:6 82:5 83:3 94:9,13,14 98:12, 50:2,3 69:12 requiring replace 63:9 96:13.20 109:1 15.19.24 34:14 rushed responsibility rights 77:17 research replica 28:18 96:14.21 25:8.22.23 64:19 35:15 75:5 44:6 101:6 102:12 65:4 84:19 85:21 River replicas S 105:21,24 22:7 27:6,8 46:20 restart 43:10 93:6 94:15,21 108:11 sacred reservation report 16:2 19:14 73:10 19:13 27:20 35:10 restructured Road 21:7 79:8 36:1 56:22 57:3 34:24 108:11 reporter 67:7,12 72:23 reservations rests role 8:9 13:12 15:24 96:15 73:13 64:6,20 4:12 reporting safe reservoir result roles 34:10 109:7 88:6 106:14 10:13 26:2 31:17 represent Salt reservoirs resulted roll 82:20 27:6 46:20 94:21 88:1,2 58:11 90:2 72:2 representative Sam resetting resume room 94:17 7:2 12:3 14:21 90:3,7 92:4,19 3:14 6:23 31:24 representatives San resistant 93:1 54:12 75:24 81:11, 73:2 73:4 45:24 12,13 resupport representing **SBA** resolution 72:4 Rose 40:7 83:12 51:3 65:13 7:2 return request scenario 15:13 17:25 42:1 round resource 5:7 34:3 35:1 67:3. 73:7 75:2 34:3 84:20 95:11 31:18 73:18 75:9 47:6 55:15 101:14 5 68:8,9 95:10 94:15 scenarios returned route 102:11 37:24 103:8.11 17:20 41:20 56:15 27:10 38:14 resources requested scheduled 6:14 53:18,20 review Ruins 87:3 52:9 70:4 94:3 72:22 73:17 80:2 9:25 10:1 30:18 98:21 requests 31:22 62:18 95:3 schedules respect rule 6:6,7 9:15 67:2,10 99:20 85:12 100:20 99:10 4:21 5:2 10:3,4,12 68:12 93:14,23 respectful reviewed 12:19,21,24 18:11 school require 19:25 32:3 31:21 32:2,6 34:5 21:7 108:19 12:4 14:23 21:12 41:12 43:21 52:21, respectfully reviewing schools 28:15,17 57:7,10 23 63:17 94:19 108:13 35:1 12:21 64:1 67:5 104:1 95:4,8 98:9 103:4 Science respecting revise required rulemaking 54:14 47:17 3:17 25:14 33:23, 10:14 11:17 45:21 3:19 20:1 29:24 25 scientific 63:16,17 66:25 respond 32:22 52:19 84:21, 67:2,21 84:14 43:20 57:8 58:16, 28:17 96:13 101:6



102:12 105:21,24	sensitive	41:1 44:16,19	situation	106:12
scope	66:21 67:20 75:16	47:18,21 48:20,25	57:5 97:3	specifically
17:7 47:17 101:15	sentence	49:9,18,21 50:10	situations	12:5 14:24 16:23
scramble	10:20	51:4 65:20 66:9	31:5,7 37:22 73:21	69:22 79:21 93:16
91:22	separate	91:5,9 103:16,18	sketchy	specifics
sea	85:2,5	106:6,9	99:19	12:23 13:4 78:17,
19:10	September	share	skill	19 80:17
seamless	94:24	4:20 7:20 38:2	25:20 31:8	spend
18:11	sequence	46:18 53:25 76:9	slammed	4:17
seasonal	30:15,16	77:2	71:22	spent
88:9	series	sharing	slew	83:6
	3:18	9:4 109:4	74:2	spirit
secretaries		shift		14:1 52:3 71:9
9:3 37:21 64:24	service	10:23 13:2 17:21	slim	
secretary	4:13 24:7,8 34:23	18:22,24	17:1	spiritual
3:7 4:6,10 6:25	41:12 98:16,17	side	small	27:19 96:9 100:23
33:9,11,13,14	104:14	6:23 19:25 79:19	3:5 43:16 70:22,24	102:10
52:20 64:7,20 66:4	services	signed	71:13 104:18	spot
70:21 100:6 108:7,	24:13 104:12	51:8	snowy	107:1
12,17	serving		13:23	spring
section	3:7	significance	socialize	9:23
24:10 30:22 49:5	session	95:20	91:12	Springfield
55:2 59:10,16	108:19	significantly	soft	54:14
60:24 68:23 79:22	sessions	34:24	89:6	Squaw
102:6	74:17	similar		70:24
sections		23:13 46:22 96:6	Solicitor's	SRP-MIC
11:5	set 16:23 63:23 66:3	simplified	7:9 39:4 41:3 59:1	27:21
seek	76:8	11:15	solid	
58:19 59:24 93:17		simplify	92:1	staff
seeking	sets	6:11 10:5	solution	97:17,21,24
27:16 78:22 82:7	77:4	simplifying	17:10 26:23 32:14,	stale
	setting	15:6	15	103:10
selected	52:24		someplace	stalemate
71:17	settled	Simpson	82:12	16:20
self-determination	54:9	7:9 39:3,4 40:15,	sort	stance
107:23,24	Sfiridies	21,25 41:23 43:15,	50:13,14 68:21	38:20 46:7,8
self-governance	7:3	24 44:7,10,13	69:1 72:16 101:21	star
107:24	SHALEY	49:8,19,22 50:11	southern	29:13
sell	37:6	single	13:18 33:18 94:25	
29:7 55:18 97:1		73:25 74:4	95:17	start
send	shaman	sir		23:19 65:25 70:17
36:21 63:4 64:13	55:12	21:25	speaking 31:6 84:23	72:12 90:22 91:18
66:18 82:19	Shane	sister		93:3 100:1 106:22
sends	27:4,5 29:25 38:7	104:13	specialist	109:1
61:7	42:21 44:24 57:6	sit	22:7 53:20 94:15	started
	99:6	16:21 32:5 83:9	specific	45:14 100:9
sense	Shannon	sits	4:23 9:21 21:15	107:14
28:10 30:9 90:19	4:7,9 7:13 9:1	55:7	59:14 61:3 67:20	starting
91:1	29:17,19 33:10,15,	33.1	68:17 75:1 96:3	80:25 90:16
	17 40:13,15,16,24		98:3,12 102:5	107:21



starts	stick	substance	103:19	thing
66:3 72:2 91:19	47:21 54:6	4:3	taking	16:22 39:14 47:12
state	sticking	substances	8:9 16:18 23:20	50:19 72:1 77:14,
17:9 43:6 49:16,	47:22	28:22	39:8 76:11 80:5	16 78:19,20 79:17
23,24 50:1,3,5	stones	substantially	81:24 109:4	80:15 87:18 93:9
67:23 88:5 96:1,19	52:24	59:22	talk	105:19 107:9
100:15 108:3	stop	successfully	3:16 13:4 24:12	things
stated	51:7 59:5,8 69:17,	80:6	44:14,15 50:21	3:14 7:4,6 16:9
26:24 105:20	22 80:12,14,17,20	suddenly	59:6 62:21 63:3	17:20,23 21:9
statement	83:23,24 85:6	91:21	64:22 65:10 75:6	30:10,14,17 31:16
80:25 96:20	101:19		talked	35:21 38:11 39:8
statements	stops	suggested 31:10	66:11 107:12	46:25 70:19,25
77:5 81:8	17:13		talking	71:13,24 72:20
states	stories	suggestion	20:15 21:8 26:6	73:8,15 74:9,11,
18:6 50:2	103:6	104:7	54:23 59:2,7,14	13,20 76:3 79:16
		summary	62:8 69:20 89:11	80:5,24 81:9,10,13
statute	streamlined	102:20	90:8 92:15	82:6,9 83:11,16,22
39:7 48:2 49:10,11	6:10	summer	talks	84:4,9 89:8,15
50:8 100:11 104:1	Strengthen	9:17	85:19 92:23	91:10 92:25
statutes	28:14	Sunday	task	103:22 106:22
39:13 69:8 96:5	strike	46:16,19 51:5	79:14	thinking
statutorily	63:13	98:18,23		73:21 76:16
69:14	strongly	support	tasked	106:10
statutory	95:6	27:22	71:16 73:9,16 82:5	thought
21:11 39:7 69:13	structure	suppose	team	23:14 76:16 77:16
89:19 92:3	92:5	91:14	4:4 6:21,24 52:18	81:21 106:10
stay	structured	supposed	technology	thoughtful
30:13 61:18 62:10,	90:20	20:3 58:2 73:6	26:2	83:17 85:14
25 85:22 101:8	stuff	surfaced	term	thoughts
106:3	27:13 62:15 76:11,	66:12	41:20	4:23 6:1,3,12 7:24
step	17 81:17		terms	20:12 29:22 77:4
10:14 15:13 41:17	subject	surfacing 66:10	18:4,11,13 26:9	100:3 102:18
61:22 63:19	6:5 41:18 43:7		64:5	ТНРО
step-by-step	60:25 67:22 89:13	swarm	territory	16:23,24 46:21
5:12 15:10	submit	72:11	55:8	70:15 92:18
Stephaine	53:22 66:21 67:2	system	testify	throwing
7:3	77:24 81:20	75:7	81:9	72:12,13
Stephen	submitted	systematic	testing	thrown
7:9 38:25 39:3,4	54:10 67:1 78:7	33:5 35:8,24 60:21	28:17 96:13	74:9 76:3
40:14,15,21,25			text	ticking
41:23 43:15,24	subpart	T	9:19	91:20
	5:20 6:6 11:12,23			tied
·	15.0 5 10.0 25.7	4 1 1	that'll	
44:7,10,13 47:19, 23 49:8,19,22	15:2,5 18:3 35:7	table	77.1	53.11
44:7,10,13 47:19,	86:22 87:9,10	13:3 89:3	77:1	53:11
44:7,10,13 47:19, 23 49:8,19,22 50:11	86:22 87:9,10 89:13		themes	time
44:7,10,13 47:19, 23 49:8,19,22 50:11 steps	86:22 87:9,10 89:13 subparts	13:3 89:3	themes 94:6 100:8	time 6:19 7:11 9:12
44:7,10,13 47:19, 23 49:8,19,22 50:11	86:22 87:9,10 89:13 subparts 15:10	13:3 89:3 taboo	themes 94:6 100:8 theoretically	time 6:19 7:11 9:12 11:18 12:25 14:17
44:7,10,13 47:19, 23 49:8,19,22 50:11 steps 9:7 39:2 41:11	86:22 87:9,10 89:13 subparts	13:3 89:3 taboo 106:1	themes 94:6 100:8	time 6:19 7:11 9:12



totally 34:16,20 71:2 72:5 74:11,12 88:2,10 56:1 57:13,25 22:16 91:3 77:24 78:6.14 59:20,21 60:14,18 travel unassociated 79:7,17 80:1,7 61:12,19,25 62:9, touch 82:13 99:18 55:16 56:7.13 24 63:25 64:4 81:19 83:8,9 84:3 74:25 unawares travels 68:11 70:3,4 72:8 86:25 87:3 89:3 Tour 109:7 91:21 79:4.10 81:22.24 90:18 93:20 94:25 108:12 treated under-95:17 96:10,17 82:18 83:1,15,17 28:21 79:25 toxic 85:11,13 87:21 98:2 99:18.22 28:21 treatment understand 89:18 90:4,5,14 105:9.15 106:20 TPA 92:13 37:25 40:14,22 91:22 92:5 93:21 107:2 80:1 51:12 65:12 74:22 treatments 94:1.8 107:20 tribes' 82:8 83:24 104:17 track 93:21 108:24 109:4 77:3 93:23 109:3 51:9 timeline tribal tricky understanding tracked 3:5,10 5:19,22 12:11 63:23 64:11 87:22 47:23 77:13 97:20 90:11,20 101:23 103:19 11:14,19,22 13:17 trouble 98:7 103:7 16:11 17:9 22:8 tracts timelines 38:4 understood 25:3,9,24 26:11 5:2,3,6 63:1,10 84:12 troubleshoot 27:2,5 28:15 31:23 8:22 82:12 89:7 trade 37:4 33:21,25 42:23 unfolding timely 29:7 97:1 true 61:15 70:15 71:20 106:13 5:18 traditional 67:3 72:14,22 73:14 unfortunate times 10:16 71:6 77:9 78:21 82:3,4, trust 97.3 28:8 34:11 51:9 traditions 16,22 83:7 84:10, 84:18,19 108:2 unidentifiable title 10:16 15 85:2,19,22 turn 42:2 13:14 trafficking 92:17 94:16,22 4:5 7:11 United **Tlingit** 51:11 95:11 96:9 100:12, turned 18:6 53:18 55:7 20 108:3 trainers 93:25 universities 104:9 to-do tribe turning 49:17 50:1,3 61:9 109:2 13:18 25:15,21 training 78:18 62:18 27:3 28:3 33:19 today 25:20 26:2 97:14 turnover 55:5 58:14 61:21 update 99:8,13,22 102:14 3:11 6:19 9:6 11:8 97:16 102:15 62:10 63:5 80:3 42:15 63:17 12:22 13:6 32:5 104:8 **Tuzigoot** 82:20 84:3 85:20, 37:11 38:25 39:2 updating trainings 98:22 25 86:2.4.6 93:14 70:11 81:25 83:2, 63:19 91:12 99:11,16 96:20 105:12 type 14 84:17 89:16 **USCA** transcript 75:1 79:23 99:4 102:20 109:5 tribe's 35:17 8:14 29:11 typically 6:14 26:17 92:12 Tohono **USDA** transcripts 94:3 95:2 tribes 104:13 53:8 5:7,11,15,20 6:2,6 tomorrow Ute transfer 7:17 9:18 10:17,23 U 108:1.5 13:18 33:18 25:22 12:15 14:15 15:12 **Tonto** utilizing transferred U.S. 17:1 18:6 19:3 98:18,19 62:24 41:21 33:11 96:10 22:11,19,23 23:2, top transition 6,9,18 24:21 25:3, ultimately 79:16 79:4,10 7,19 26:1,16 28:19 10:24 11:20 64:25 topic 34:12 35:14 36:8, transparency 67:22 valid 3:23 47:22 12 39:10,20 47:15, 27:23 28:10 34:9 unable 54:4,8 57:12 topics 17 56:25 59:23 100:24 93:23 valuable 103:2 61:25 63:11,20,21 trauma unanticipated



64:2,3,10 68:1

102:24

V

variety	watching	wondering	5:25 8:18 21:17
48:10	54:12	22:18 80:11,21	57:19,23 66:22
verbal	water	Woolaroc	67:1,21 68:18 83:7
94:19	88:1	45:11,14,21,24	104:1
Vernelda	ways	word	written
70:13,14	48:5 49:14 51:24	54:5	3:25 6:7 28:18
versions	wealth	wording	31:12 42:12 52:11
48:10	53:20	77:23 78:10 106:3	53:7,22 61:17 66:14 67:18 76:12
versus	wear	words	79:22 80:19 92:9
78:14 85:3 86:20	82:4 108:25	38:14 47:25 72:9	93:10 96:16,20
view	weather	77:22	105:1
46:9 55:3 82:23	13:23	work	wrong
96:10	webpage	5:17 6:3 7:16 12:5	53:15
views	12:17	16:15,24 17:6,10	wrongfully
23:11,12	website	18:10,23,25 21:12,	75:19
virtual	62:19	13 32:10 39:19,20 44:25 45:9 47:5	
3:18	week	51:3 71:17,20 72:5	Y
visit	3:21 62:14 82:11	73:1 79:12 96:1	
4:16	108:7	97:17 98:1,5 99:1	Yaqui
vocabulary	weeks	108:22	47:9
44:21	3:22 51:8	worked	year
vocal	weighed	40:6 64:10 94:21	18:19,20 21:8
50:6	100:3	96:18	41:13 88:9,22 96:7
	well-being	working	109:2
\mathbf{W}	75:23 76:20	16:11 19:15 28:5	yearly
	Whaley	30:4 44:7,17	88:9
waiting	7:3	50:14,18 71:19	years
90:15 104:20	white	74:2,3 80:9	12:9 14:18,19 34:7
wakes	74:23	works	40:7 49:15 54:10
88:3	Wi-fi	50:22,24 62:2	63:18 74:10 78:2,
walk	33:22	world	7,8 88:8,24
102:17	wide	75:22 81:18	yielded
walked	48:9	worn	9:21
59:1	Wildlife	52:5	you-all
walking	4:11 33:11	worry	71:16 108:23
52:15	Williams	108:6	109:7
wanted	94:9,13,14 98:15,	worth	younger
8:22 29:25 30:23	19,24 99:5	82:18,19	56:2
42:15 44:11 53:15,	wind	wrap	
23 55:10 76:9 77:2 85:6 86:8 87:19	100:2	104:22 107:17	Z
94:7 99:11 103:17	wisdom	wrapped	Zoom
2 111 22111 IUJ111	4:23	102:13	13:22
		1	<u>-</u>
104:7	wishes	write	
104:7 wanting	wishes 47:17	write 57:21,22 63:6	
104:7			

