TRUST LAND CONSOLIDATION PROGRAM
REGIONAL TRIBAL CONSULTATION
MEETING HELD OCTOBER 6, 2011
IN OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

CITY REPORTERS, INC.
FIRST FLOOR, 117 PARK AVENUE
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73102
(405) 235-3376

REPORTED BY JUDY THOMPSON, CSR

MS. GILLETTE: First, before we start off, I just want to thank everybody for joining us here today. To really start the day off in a good way, I wanted to ask my good friend from the Comanche Nations, Robert Tippeconnie, to lead us into prayer.

2.2.

2.4

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.

MS. GILLETTE: I asked Robert Tippeconnie to lead us in prayer before we began.

(Invocation by Mr. Tippeconnie)

MS. GILLETTE: Thank you, Robert.

And I wanted to just say from the Department of Interior, we're really glad that we've had such a wonderful turnout at many of the consultations.

This is not the last consultation. We did add another one at the end of the month in Rapid City for the Great Plains Region. I know that we heard from some of you already through the other consultations. There were Oklahoma representatives present at a few of the other consultations.

But I wanted to just bring the message from Washington and from the Secretary's Office that this is a really high priority of the Administration. The Obama Administration was committed to looking at the difficulties of the relationship between the Department of the Interior and the United States and Indian tribes

and how we've had interactions that were sometimes, you know, some pretty dark chapters in the history of the United States. And I just want to acknowledge that up front and know that this Administration is really committed to turning the page to those, to that chapter and starting a new one.

2.2.

2.4

And the Cobell Settlement is probably the biggest example of why and how we want to do that. I think that I've heard both the Secretary and Assistant Secretary, Ethel Hawk, and even the President himself talk about how we do need to get to a place where we have a more trusting and positive relationship with Indian tribes. And for that, to me, what that means is a real commitment to meaningful consultation. That's an initial step that we can take.

And that is something that this whole process that we're going through right now is meant to really listen to the tribes in terms of what you all think would be to the advantage of the goal that we're trying to get to, and that's to make a better future for our children, really, and I think that's something that brings us together in a common purpose.

But we do know that the Cobell Settlement also raises a lot of concerns about -- because it is a reminder and it is -- we understand that we need to do

things in a better way when it comes to land consolidation.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

We also understand that you have many suggestions and solutions to offer. And we, for that reason, we embarked upon doing consultation before we rolled out a strategy or a plan.

And so this is the sixth and -- it's not the last, but it was going to be the last. The final consultation will be at the end of this month. But we wanted to hear from you to know what we could do better with the land consolidation aspect of it.

I'm going to turn it over to Mike to talk about some of his experiences as the Director of the BIA. We know that there is a lot of hesitancy, we've heard a lot of hesitancy in terms of what we're going to be able to accomplish with this settlement. And we'll get into the terms of the settlement in a second here on a slide show.

But the settlement is 3.4 billion dollars.

And 1.8 of that is for this land consolidation piece.

The land consolidation piece is something that is in addition to the settlement of the claims. It is part of the claims, but it is not just the settlement with the class membership. It is to do something proactive to address further fractionation of Indian lands.

2.2.

2.4

And we just come out here in really -- I guess I would like to just speak for myself. But I do come out here in a humble way, because I know that we don't know everything. And most of what we have to learn is going to come from the tribes themselves and the folks that this program is going to impact directly. And so we're coming out to be inclusive.

After this, the next steps after this are going to be laid out, again, in a slide show. But we do have a plan to have another round of consultations, not necessarily -- we might not have time for those to be face-to-face, but we do want to provide folks with an opportunity to comment on a plan that we come up with based on the information that we're hearing in the consultations.

So with that, I am going to turn it over to Mike to just provide some of his welcoming remarks.

MR. BLACK: Good morning, everybody.

My name is Mike Black. I'm Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Welcome. And thank you for your hospitality in welcoming us into your country.

I just want to talk real briefly -- we're not here to talk to you. We're here to listen and get your feedback on what you see the best way for us to implement the Indian land consolidation portion of the

Cobell Settlement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Just a couple of things here. As Jodi stated,

1.9 billion dollars of the settlement is set aside for
the Indian land consolidation portion of the
settlement. That's what we're here to discuss today.

We have received from the Court permission to be able to come out here today and, in all of the consultations, to visit with everybody, talk about the Indian land consolidation portion of the settlement and nothing else.

We haven't been released from the No-Contact Order on the remainder of the settlement or any of the other issues around the Cobell Settlement.

So in order for us to be ready to implement that 1.9 billion dollar portion of the Indian Land Consolidation Settlement, we're here to solicit input.

We've been operating an ILCA program for about ten years or so. And, as many of you know, I think the maximum we've ever had in that program in any one year is about 35 million dollars.

Well, this is quite a step up from 35 million dollars. And we have ten years under the settlement in order to be able to obligate all of those funds.

And so in order to have a development plan and be prepared to do that, we really need to come out and

hear from Indian country and the people that will be affected and the tribes that will be affected. Because this is really an effort -- you know, it goes hand-in-hand with some of the things we've been doing over the past year and a half regarding fee to trust, and that is the restoration of tribal homelands.

2.2.

2.4

That's one of the goals of this act, is how we can start to consolidate homelands, put them back into tribal ownership and tribal jurisdiction and tribal control.

So we really are here to hear from you today. I look forward to all of your comments. And all of that will be taken in with all of the rest of the comments we received at the previous five and the last one that will be held in South Dakota. We'll consolidate those comments.

And we'll be coming back out with what's come out of those. The testimony and stuff and the comments are being posted on the website. And Stacie or somebody will probably touch on that and let you know the website where you can go to to see some of the previous testimonies that's been done in other consultations.

And, there, again, we'll be compiling all of those comments, looking at all the different options

and suggestions that are coming in. And then that's what we'll be using, largely, to drive the plan to implement this program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Again, thank you all for coming. We really do appreciate it. And we look forward to hearing from you.

MS. GILLETTE: Thank you, Mike.

Before we get started, what we wanted to do is provide the tribes around the table the opportunity to introduce themselves. I think we will have time to do introductions for everyone. We have quite a few folks in the room, but we would like to know who you're representing. So we'll go around first with the tribal leaders at the table.

And then I did want to just go back to the point Mike made. This government-to-government consultation is really important to what we're doing. And we also want to give the opportunity for others to have input.

But, initially, I think Stacie is going to set this up in a minute here. But just to clarify, the first part of the consultation will be with the tribal governments. And in the afternoon, we will have time to visit with the organization constituents and stakeholders who would like to voice their opinions, as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

And just to reiterate that, we do take the government-to-government relationship that the United States has with tribal governments very seriously and wanted to just reiterate that's something that we are committed to strengthening.

We'll start with just -- I guess I'll start it off.

I don't think I introduced myself before, but I'm Jodi Gillette, and I'm the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior. I'm also an enrolled member of the Standing Rocks Sioux Tribe.

MR. BLACK: Again, Mike Black, Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I'm a member of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, South Dakota.

MS. OOSAHWEE: My name is Sedelta Oosahwee. I'm here with the Cherokee Nation (inaudible).

MR. BROKESHOULDER: Eddie Brokeshoulder from the Absentee Shawnee Tribe. And I work for the Office of the Treasury.

MS. DEERE: Hello. I'm Cathy Deere. I'm the Tribal Treasurer of the Absentee Shawnee Tribe. And I'm glad to be here.

MR. MAYNAHONAH: My name is Louis Maynahonah,

```
Chairman of the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma. (Inaudible)
1
2
              MS. EDWARDS: I'm Brenda Edwards. I'm
3
     Chairman of the Caddo Nations.
               MR. STANDING: I'm Leslie Standing. I'm the
4
5
     President of the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes from
6
     Anadarko.
7
              MR. KODASEET: Good morning, I'm Michael
     Kodaseet. I'm the Speaker of the Third Legislature of
8
9
     the Cheyenne Arapaho Tribes.
               MR. NOWLIN: Rupert Nowlin. I'm the Arapaho
10
11
     District 3 Legislator of the Cheyenne Arapaho Tribes.
12
              MR. TIPPECONNIE: Robert Tippeconnie,
13
      Secretary/Treasurer of the Comanche Nation.
              MR. GOVER: I'm Marshall Gover. I'm President
14
15
     of the Pawnee Nation.
16
              MR. FIELDS: Good morning. Jim Fields, Tribal
     Counsel, Pawnee Nation.
17
18
              MR. FERGUSON: Good morning. My name is James
19
     Ferguson. I'm an attorney with the Department of
2.0
     Solicitors.
21
              MR. WALTERS: My name is Tony Walters.
2.2.
     Counselor to the Deputy Assistant Secretary Jodi
23
     Gillette in the Washington, D.C., Department of Indian
     Affairs. Member of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma in
2.4
25
      Tahlequah.
```

```
MR. PITCHER: I'm Greg Pitcher, Shawnee Tribal
1
2
     Counsel.
               MR. UNDERWOOD: David Underwood, stakeholder
3
      and member of the Chickasaw Nation.
4
5
               MS. PIAKITAH (PH): I'm Sheila Piakitah.
     with the Chickasaw Nation.
6
7
               MS. FINKENBERG: Loretta Finkenberg, Finance
8
     Director of the Kickapoo Tribe (inaudible).
9
               MS. WILSON: Kristen Wilson, Executive
     Director of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma and an
10
11
     enrolled member of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma.
12
               MS. EASTMAN: Shauna Eastman, Tribal Attorney
13
      for the Assisted Living (inaudible) and also a tribal
14
     member.
15
               MR. RONDELL: I'm Winfield Rondell. I'm the
     Tribal Secretary, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Tribal
16
17
     Reservation, South Dakota.
18
               MR. ROUSSEAU: Good morning. My name is
19
     Garryl Rousseau. I'm from Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, and
2.0
      I'm the Vice Chairman.
21
               MR. SMITH: My name is Craig Smith. I'm with
2.2.
     U.S. Senator Tom Coburn's Office. Welcome to Oklahoma.
23
               MR. MALLOY: Charles Malloy with the Citizen
2.4
     Potawatomie Nation.
25
               MS. BUTCHER: Rhonda Butcher, Self-Goverance
```

```
1
      Director, Citizen Pawnee Nation.
 2
               MR. CASIAS: I'm Robert Casias. I'm the Chief
 3
      Cadastral Surveyor for the Bureau of Land Management
 4
      for this region.
 5
               MR. WHITMORE: I'm Richard Whitmore.
 6
      Bureau of Land Management, Indian land surveyor with
 7
      the Southern Plains Regional Office.
               MS. ANDERSON: Julie Anderson, Acquisition and
 8
 9
      Disposal Specialist in the Anadarko Agency.
               MR. (INAUDIBLE): Monty (inaudible) from the
10
11
      Anadarko Agency, Tribal Operations Office.
12
               MR. JACOBS: Eddie Jacobs, Oklahoma Indian
13
     Mineral Association, member of the Muskogee Creek
      Tribe.
14
15
               MS. JACOBS: Marciana (ph) Jacobs, Cheyenne
     Arapahoe, Cheyenne member of the Cheyenne Arapahoe
16
      Tribes -- Cheyenne Arapahoe Indian land and mineral
17
18
      owner.
19
               MS. NIGHTWALKER: Jane Nightwalker, Arapaho
2.0
      Third Legislator from the Cheyenne Arapaho Tribes.
21
               MS. WHITESKUNK: Fiona Whiteskunk, Cheyenne
2.2.
      District 4 Legislator with the Cheyenne Arapahoe
23
      Tribes.
2.4
               MS. WORK: I'm Susan Work, Assistant Attorney
25
      General, Cherokee Nation.
```

```
MS. PHILLIPS: Good morning. My name is Robin
1
2
     Phillips. I'm the Superintendent at the Anadarko
3
     Agency, Southern Plains Region.
              MS. LANE: Good morning. I'm the
4
5
     Superintendent of Pawnee Agency under the Southern
6
     Plains Region and (inaudible.)
7
               Oh, my name is Terry Lane.
8
               MR. HARRAGARRA: Lester Harragarra with the
9
     Otoe-Missouri Land Development Authority.
              MS. ROBERSON: Good morning. My name is Rose
10
11
     Roberson. I'm a Management Analyst with the Southern
12
     Plains Regional Office.
13
               MR. TALLEY: Roland Talley, Program Analyst,
      Southern Plains Region.
14
              MR. MOORE: Daniel Moore, Regional Director,
15
16
     Southern Plains Regional Office, Anadarko.
17
              MR. MAYTUBBY: Good morning. Bruce Maytubby,
     Deputy Regional Director for Southern Plains Region.
18
19
              MS. DENNEY: Hi. I'm Dale Denney. I'm the
2.0
     Realty Officer for the Makah Tribe and a member.
21
              MS. BELLMARD: Robin Bellmard, Superintendent
2.2.
     of the Horton Agency, Southern Plains Region.
23
               MS. TIPPECONNIE: Good morning. Danny
2.4
      Tippeconnie, Superintendent Council Agency, Southern
25
     Plains.
```

```
1
               MS. TSOTADDLE: I'm Lea Tsotaddle, Probate
      Specialist with the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma, and I'm a
2
3
     member of the Iowa Tribe.
               MR. NIMMO: I'm David Nimmo. I'm President
4
5
      and Chief Executive Officer of Chickasaw Nation
6
      Industries.
7
               MR. HARP: Ron Harp, Vice President of Upper
8
     Mohawk, Inc.
9
               MS. SOUTHERN:
                             Jacqueline Southern, member of
     the Sac and Fox Tribe.
10
               MR. WILLIAMS: Tom Williams. I work with
11
12
     Choctaw Nation, American Real Property Management.
13
      a mineral owner, I'm a tribal member, and I also own
     some surfaces.
14
15
               MS. ACOYA: Peggy Acoya, member of the Sac and
     Fox Tribe and an owner of property.
16
               MR. CAMPBELL: Ray Campbell, member of the
17
18
     Gila River Indian Community in Arizona. I work for
19
     Jimmy Walker & Associates there.
20
               MS. SMITH: Hi, everyone.
                                          I'm Stacie Smith.
21
      I'm a facilitator. I've been asked by the Department
2.2.
     to help organize logistics and help out facilitating
23
     these events, and also, helping to consolidate all of
2.4
     the input that we're hearing in all of these different
```

events and making sure that the Department takes that

25

synthesis as they're developing their plan.

2.2.

2.4

We have a transcript Court Reporter. And she is trying to get down everything that she hears. I know these microphones are not ideal and they're not perfectly spaced. But I do ask for people to try to speak into the microphones, even though you might be able to hear each other, we want to make sure that she can hear so that she can get these transcripts so that we really have a good record of what goes on here today.

MS. GILLETTE: I think, first, we wanted to start off, we've been doing the same PowerPoint presentation. I know some of you were in the first consultation in Billings. And this hasn't changed much from the first time that we sent it out. And there were questions — there have been questions and whether or not we were going to modify what we are consulting on, based upon what we are hearing.

And, to that, you know, we can respond that we want to hear from everybody. So we wanted to make sure that we had a dialogue with the tribes of Oklahoma. If there were any other interested people that wanted to come down and have the same information provided at the first one as the later ones, so that, if you have input, you could comment on that original content.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

And, really, the first part of this PowerPoint is going to talk about the -- it's really going to discuss the terms of the settlement. And this gives some basics on that, because what we found is that sometimes all the press releases and all of the information that gets sent out in Indian Country doesn't often capture just, you know, exactly what it is.

And so these slides are all based upon what is being discussed and what has been settled by the Court, the Court and the parties involved.

The Cobell Settlement was approved by Congress on November 30, 2010. It was the Claims Resolution Act of 2010, and it was signed by President Obama on December 8th of 2010.

The 3.4 billion dollar Cobell settlement includes two major components. A fund of \$1.5 billion is for class members to compensate them for their h historical accounting trust fund and asset mismanagement claims. That's an area that we're not really -- we are completely forbidden to talk about here. So that's an area that we just -- we're not addressing here at all.

But we are talking about the 1.9 billion dollar fund for the voluntary buy-back and

consolidation of fractionated interest.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

And I do want to emphasize the voluntary. This is a fund that was meant to purchase interests that people want to sell. We're not going out and making anybody sell.

The total amount for the land consolidation component of the settlement, the 1.9 billion dollar fund for the voluntary buy-back and consolidation of fractionated land interests, up to 15 percent -- this is the terms of the settlement itself. Up to 15 percent or 285 million dollars can be used for administrative costs. So that "up to" means that no more than \$285 million dollars can be used for administrative costs.

And, as an additional incentive for land consolidation, up to 60 million dollars will be set aside to provide scholarships for higher education for American Indian and Alaskan Native use.

And that 60 million dollars isn't a part of the 285, just so that's clear.

1.615 billion dollars for land purchase and scholarship funds up to 60 million. So that figure comes from 1.9, and you subtract the 285 million dollars. And so that's the actual funding that we'll be able to provide to purchase.

The terms of the settlement in respect to the land consolidation funds, they can be only used for specific purposes, and that's acquiring fractional interests in trust or restricted lands, including administrative costs related to such acquisitions, cannot be — and this is a really important point. It cannot be used for the purpose of fee lands.

2.2.

2.4

So when we're talking about land consolidation from the perspective of the Department of Interior in this consultation, we have a pretty set definition that's by law. And we really aren't able to discuss changing that. And we do hear from the tribes in the field that land consolidation, to them, is more holistic in the way that they look at it. So just to make that clear upfront.

And for every land sale, a portion of the sale will be set aside in a scholarship fund for Native Americans and Alaskan Native students up to a cap of 60 million.

I'm recused from that issue, so I'm not going to really go into it. But if you have questions, either Tony or Mike can speak broadly about that.

And the only thing that I'm going to say is that there's not been -- it's very preliminary. There aren't decisions that have been put on the table yet.

I don't even -- I'm not sure. I'll let Tony speak to that. But I don't think we even have preliminary plans in place.

2.2.

2.4

So costs associated with supporting the work of the Secretarial Commission on Trust Reform, that's something we went out recently in July to -- we had a Federal Register Notice and asked people to submit names for that Trust Reform Commission. And the important thing to note about this Commission is that it's just not the land consolidation or on the Cobell Settlement, but it's broadly on all trust issues.

The background on the Cobell Settlement, that status of the settlement, I'm going to turn this over to our Solicitor's Office so he can provide that timeline.

MR. FERGUSON: The status of the settlement, on December 21, 2010, Judge Hogan granted preliminary approval of the Cobell Settlement.

June 20, 2011, Judge Hogan approved the settlement after holding an extended hearing on the subject.

On August 4, 2011, Judge Hogan entered final approval, triggering the 60-day appeals window.

The settlement becomes final and funds become available for disbursement after any appeal from Judge

Hogan's approval has been resolved.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

And I'd like to spend a brief moment on that.

The Cobell litigation had two orders that were issued that barred communications with Class Members.

And, although the parties have entered into a settlement, those communication orders are still in place.

So in order for this consultation to take place, the Department had to go to the judge and ask for permission to hold these consultations.

That permission was granted, but it was given very strict parameters. And that is what Jodi and Mike were referring to earlier. And as much as they would like to be responsive to the comments and questions that are asked, there are limits on what they can speak about.

And so that's why they are limited to speaking about the land consolidation portion of the settlement. So often you may hear them, they want to respond, but they have these parameters in which they have to stay in place.

So we would very much appreciate it and think our time will be well used if we could just keep that in mind.

The Appeals Process: Currently -- so the

Cobell Settlement is not final until the appeals 1 2 process is over. And that definition of when this 3 settlement is final is in the Settlement Agreement itself. And it is also in the legislation which 4 5 approved the settlement. And so until all the appeals 6 have been concluded, the settlement is not final. 7 Currently, there have been six appeals that 8 have been filed. 9 What will happen going forward, there will be a Scheduling Order from the judge, laying out a 10 11 timeline. And so until that happens, there's no way 12 for us to say or for Jodi and Mike to tell you how long 13 the process will take. The Court has said it will expedite the issue, but exactly how long that will 14 15 take, we do not know. I haven't seen a Scheduling Order. I've heard 16 17 that they hope for it to happen as early as January. 18 But I have not seen that Order. And so I'm hesitant to 19 give you a timeline of which I am unsure. 2.0 Jodi.

MS. GILLETTE: I'm going to turn the rest of the slide presentation over to Mike.

MR. BLACK: Key features of the Land Consolidation Program.

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Basically, in the settlement, they went along

with the Indian Land Consolidation Act and statutory authority that's set forth therein. That's what we'll be following in the implementation of the settlement and the open portion of it.

2.2.

2.4

The purpose of ILCA and the Cobell Land Consolidation Program, there's a quote down there that comes straight from the law. And, basically, it is to acquire as many fractionated interests as economically feasible and to consolidate these land interests into tribal ownership to promote and enhance tribal selfdetermination, economics, social and cultural development needs.

And that kind of goes hand-in-hand with one of our big pushes this last year or a year and a half to restore -- restoration of tribal homelands.

Consultations, really what we're here to do is to hear from everybody on how you feel would be the best way for us to implement the Land Consolidation Program.

Internally, we have identified some ideas and some potential guiding principles for moving this program forward. And these are really just laid out to provoke some input. And there's nothing set in stone. There's no priority on these things that we're going to be outlining to you. These are just some different

options and ideas that we've thrown out, and we're looking for that input hoping to provoke some comments and some discussion on it.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

Potential approach program should serve multiple goals. These are some of the things that we talked and looked at, and that is to reduce land fractionation in the highly-fractionated areas, implement a plan that is time and cost efficient.

As you noted earlier, I don't know if we really went into, but we're limited. We have a ten-year time frame to do this. So how can we do this most effectively and most cost efficient.

We have up to \$285 million. It doesn't mean we have to spend \$285 million to administer this program. But that is our limit. So we do have to operate within those constraints.

To consolidate land in the areas of tribal preference. We've been hearing a lot about this as we've gone around through the consultations on what tribes feel is their preference. Some of it's economical or economics; some of it is cultural; some of it is historical, etc.

Reduce fractionation in highly fractionated areas. Strategy one would be to prioritize those highly fractionated lands? And that would be done, you

```
1
      know, from our viewpoint, in working with the tribes.
     What are your priorities in some of those highly
 2
 3
      fractionated areas. What do you see those areas that
 4
      you would like to see brought back into tribal
 5
      ownership.
               Target individual Indian money account owners.
 6
 7
      You know, with every fractionated interest, we have
 8
      account owners. If we are able to buy up all of their
 9
      interests, we're basically able to eliminate one of
      those accounts that has to be managed. And those funds
10
11
      could be put to better use somewhere else, possibly.
12
               Strategy three, target landowners having the
13
     most number of purchasable interests,
               Strategy four, target landowners having the
14
15
     most number of tracts.
                (Microphone problem interruption)
16
17
               We'll try this so I don't squeal so much.
                                                           Ι
18
     must giving off something here.
19
               Implement a plan that is -- can everybody hear
2.0
     me okay?
21
               Implement a plan that is time and cost
2.2.
      efficient. Target lands requiring minimal prep work
23
     prior to offers being made. In some of those cases,
2.4
      that's really -- we have on hand, possibly, a lot of
```

owners out there that have already indicated they're

25

willing to sell or that they want to sell to this program. And they're just waiting for that opportunity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Target tracts which have landowner consent and target tracts with the largest interest per owner.

Consolidate land areas in the areas of tribal preference. And, there again, that's to be determined in consultation with the various tribes.

Target tracts identified by the tribes and target tracts with economic opportunity for the tribes. And, there again, there may be other factors in there that we need to consider by the tribes, and that's who we need to hear from.

The next steps would be to, basically, incorporate all of the input that we're getting from these consultations into more or less a consolidated grouping.

Like I said, we've heard a lot of common comments as we've gone around country, and I expect that we'll hear a lot of the same words here today. But every time we hear some new ones, and we hear some different ideas, some different ways that this program can be implemented.

Those will all be put into a consolidated consultation summary, and those will be available to

everybody.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Develop the Cobell Land Consolidation Program Implementation Plan based on all of these comments and on the statutory requirements.

(Microphone problem interruption)

I don't know where this is coming from.

Can you hear me okay?

COURT REPORTER: If you speak very loudly.

MR. BLACK: I'll speak really loud. That way, you won't have to listen to me squeal.

Basically, we will be -- based on what comes out of these consultations, we'll be compiling all of those results, all of those comments, all of the ideas and coming up with somewhat of a base plan.

And there will be further consultations, based on what comes out of this and what we're able to develop. And then we'll be working with the tribes again on outreach and additional consultations. And then, hopefully, we'll be able to move from that point into the implementation of the program.

MS. GILLETTE: Another thing that -- another item that we wanted to highlight is that we have extended the comment period for written comments to November 1st. It was October 15th. But we wanted to give folks time to write up whatever concerns they

might have or any comments that you might have, either as tribes or individuals. We do have that commenting period available.

We have the address, Michelle Singer,
Director, Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs, etc.
And we also wanted to let you know that any of the
background documents, anything that we're talking about
here is available on the website. It's www.doi.gov. I
don't believe we have that on their --

MS. SMITH: We do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MS. GILLETTE: Okay, it's on here, but we don't have it on our slide presentation. Back slash Cobell. So www.doi.gov/cobell, C-O-B-E-L-L.

Back to the slide.

All of the consultations that we've held to date, we have transcripts available for all of these online. So this consultation itself will be online, and we're trying to be as transparent and let people know what's being state so that you can refer to those comments that might be up there and reflect on those as you provide written comments.

We added one more section in Rapid City, South Dakota, at the request of a pretty strong voice from the Great Plains Region. We went to six of them, and we thought they might be able to attend the Billings

one, but they really felt strongly about having one in Rapid City. So we're trying to be responsive to folks.

2.2.

2.4

The November 1st deadline for comments is probably not going to be very flexible because we are running up against having to produce a plan and have a cutoff time for input on how we should look at the plan. And we intend to go out again on another round of consultations. It might be face-to-face, because of the time factor, or we might have one face-to-face. But we'll talk about that if it makes sense to have at least one face-to-face where folks can come.

But that's going to be a really short turnaround time so that we can start getting things in place. And this is all in the spirit of looking at our policy decisions with a full understanding of what folks are saying out in the field before we make that decision.

So that's where we're at right now.

I wanted to also just highlight that the reason that we have a facilitator with us today, Stacie Smith and, she's from the --

MS. SMITH: Consensus Building Institute.

MS. GILLETTE: Consensus Building Institute.

And the reason that we wanted to have her on our team is because we know that there is a hesitancy

to trust what we're saying.

2.2.

2.4

And so what her role is, is to be a mediator to make sure that the steps that we're taking throughout the consultations are reflective of what tribes are saying. So she's sort of like a third-party neutral that can say, you know, this is — she can go back and forth. And that's actually her role.

We've hired her to be neutral and not pro-government or pro-tribe, but to make sure that both sides are balanced.

And then we also wanted to have her — she has a lot of experience in working through different issues. And one of them was on the No Child Left Behind negotiated rule making on school construction. She has experience in working through some difficult tribal issues, as well as lots and lots of other things, lots and lots of other issues that were worked through.

But we really appreciate her helping us organize and put on these events.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

With that, I just want to say a few other things, and hopefully, I won't squeak too much here.

I just want to give a quick overview of the day.

You all have agendas in your packets. If you didn't grab those when you came in, they're available at the door. It has an agenda for the day.

2.2.

2.4

It also has an overview of those preliminary goals that Mike Black went through with a little bit more detail about each. So I encourage you to look at that.

There's also a page that has some facts about land consolidation and the different regions and the number of interests, a little bit more background on the Cobell Settlement.

And on the back of that page, so at the very end of the packet, it also does have the web address, if you didn't get that down, of www.doi.gov/cobell.

And it has a little bit about the Indian Land

Consolidation Act, which is the act that is governing how this land consolidation program can be done.

So going back to the agenda for a moment, just to reiterate, so the morning session is really this government-to-government consultation time.

All of the elected officials who are representing tribes or anyone else who's been asked by their tribe to speak on behalf of the tribe, it would be great to have at least one person from each tribe come and join us at the table. If you have other

elected officials or others who are empowered to speak on behalf of the tribe or represent the views of the tribe, feel free to just defer to them outside the table, so that they're welcome to speak during this morning session, as well. Just call on them.

2.2.

2.4

And it might be helpful to just turn your placards on their sides when you want to indicate that you want to speak, So you don't have to, you know, raise your hand. And that way, we'll know and we'll be able to make sure you get your chance to speak.

The afternoon session will be open to hearing comments from all of the tribal members, members of the public, landowners, tribal organizations, interested others.

We are going to ask that employees of DOI be in listening mode primarily today. This is really an opportunity to hear from the stakeholders who are really affected by land consolidation. So we're going to open that up to all of you in the afternoon, possibly sooner if we run out of conversation here in the government-to-government level. But we'll move these microphones in a way that they're convenient for all of you to be able to share your thoughts with the Department, as well.

Just one more thing. About the agenda for the

afternoon, we did put a couple of key issues that we wanted to suggest people might want to speak to. This comes out of what we heard from the previous sessions. So the preliminary goals and strategies, that is those priorities that Mike went through.

2.2.

2.4

The issue of appraisals has come up a lot.

How are you going to do the appraisals for this program in a way that's responsive to the time constraints, the cost constraints that are also fair and that are responsive to the actual values and valuations of these parcels?

And then the administration of the Indian Land Consolidation Program, any experiences you might have had or heard, or any concerns you might have or thoughts that you have about how is this program going to be administered so that it's most effective.

So those are a couple of possible topics you might want to speak about. And I think they're topics that the Department is particularly interested in, in input about. As they develop their plan, they need to think through all of these things and respond to them. So your input on those topics is really helpful.

Lastly, I just want to offer you a couple of meeting guidelines to help us be as effective as we can with our time here today.

2.2.

2.4

The first is to share the floor, to try and be as concise as you can in your comments. Sometimes a story can be helpful to illustrate your experiences, and that's great. But try to remember that we have a limited amount of time. And everybody wants to be able to have a chance to speak. And, also, the more concise you can be about your points, the easier they are to hear and to record.

Being respectful to each other, we know you know this. We know there's hard feelings that go back. We know there's a very painful history, a very painful past. The Department is here really hoping for a turn of the page. That doesn't erase everything that happened in the past, but to really try and be as focused on positives moving forward.

You're welcome to express frustration or negative feelings, but not to do so attacking the people in the room.

Speaking one at a time and using the microphones despite how challenging the microphones might be here, it's really helpful, and it makes sure that our transcript writer here is able to record everything.

And, lastly, to be constructive. As much as you can, give real recommendations, what should the

Department do about these issues? They want to hear from you. They want your advice. They want your input and your feedback so that they can go and create a plan that can be as responsive as possible to what it is, Indian country needs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

2.5

You on the ground, you who experience this every day, the plan needs to be responsive to you. And the best way to do that is be as specific as you can in your input and your recommendations to the Department.

So just a couple of meeting guidelines.

With that, I would like to hand it over to you, our tribal leaders and our tribal representatives to begin to share your thoughts.

And again, if I can ask you to just introduce yourself, say your name as you're going to speak and your affiliation so that we make sure that we get that recorded.

MS. GILLETTE: How do you want to start?
We'll stay with the table here first. So if there's any order that you would like to have us follow; otherwise, we can just go around.

Do you want to start?

MR. TIPPECONNIE: The administrative costs,

I'm curious about that -- Robert Tippeconnie, Comanche
Nation.

Administrative costs, 285 million dollars, will that be -- it seems to me that there needs to be administrative costs by the Indian Nation Tribes, as well as DOI. So I'm curious, you know, how that will work out.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

But the point that comes to my head is that each tribe or even nation will have lands that we've identified. Now, we can gather the total of that through the Bureau, through our OST, gather all those individual allotees, fractionated. And maybe at someplace, we put criteria there. Like you said, 50 is greater than 50 percent persons on the tract, or whatever.

But I have curiosity about that administrative cost, because if we get into it, you know the nation has to expend monies, as well as DOI. And how will that be allocated?

Each nation will be different in the total tracts that they're interested in. So it seems to me there needs to be some consolidation or some simulation of all these tracts and the status. And then it gets us some sense of the course limit of the dollar for administrative or for purchase.

MS. GILLETTE: I think what I hear you asking, are you asking for more data so that you can give us a

recommendation on how we should think about that?

Because those are real, you know -- what I'd like to say is that we have a ceiling on what we can spend on administrative costs. And we also know that there is a feeling on what we can spend on land consolidation to purchase those interests itself.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

And then we have a set number of tribes this deals with. That's not all 565 tribes. By law, the ILCA Program only touches on those tribes that have fractionated allotments.

So you have a set number of tribes. You have a set number of dollars to spend.

And then we also know that everybody is not going to be willing to sell. So we're not going to — with this amount of money, certainly, we're not going to break even because it's voluntary. We're not going to eliminate fractionation altogether.

So those are really important questions. And we haven't made any decisions about that.

And so if you need more information, that's something that we're trying to get out in short order. We've been trying for a while. But we do want to get information out about fractionated interests by tribe.

Would that be helpful?

MR. TIPPECONNIE: Yes.

MS. GILLETTE: I think that's something that we're working on. And I was hoping to have it before this consultation, but -- you know, that is something that we are aware of as a request from the tribes from the last consultations.

2.2.

2.4

MR. GOVER: Marshall Gover with Pawnee

Nations. I go along with Robert. This administrative

cost, is this going to be -- this administrative money,

is this going to be able to be contracted by the

tribes, too? Or how is that going to be divided up?

MR. BLACK: That question has come up in almost every consultation we've had.

Under the Indian Land Consolidation Act, there are some restrictions on our ability to contract portions of the program. But that's one of the things we're looking at right now.

And there's been some instances, there's been, like, cooperative agreements done where the tribes operate portions or some of the programs.

So those are some of the things that we're working through with our solicitor's office on just what capabilities we have. And we should be able to flesh a lot of that stuff out as we go through the comments and we're starting to put different ideas to those comments.

```
1
               But that has been one of the big questions,
      and that's one of the things we're looking at really
 2
 3
      long and hard, just how can we incorporate self-
      determination into the process of implementing the
 4
 5
      Indian Land Consolidation Program.
 6
               MS. GILLETTE: And it has to be the concept
 7
      self-determination, because we can't do contracts by
      law under the Indian Land Consolidation Program.
 8
 9
               MR. GOVER: Just two more questions. I don't
      want to occupy all the time. What about other
10
11
      landowners? What if they want to buy up -- keep the
12
      land in their family for historical purposes, you
13
      know? Do the families get a chance to buy other family
     members' land in this?
14
15
               MR. BLACK: It wouldn't necessarily be part of
      this program, but they would have that ability to do
16
17
      that.
18
               If somebody didn't want to sell to the Indian
19
      Land Consolidation Program and they'd rather sell to a
20
      family member, that option is there. You can do that
21
      right now.
2.2.
               MR. GOVER: One last question. What are these
23
      appeals about?
2.4
               MR. BLACK:
                           I'll turn that over to James.
25
               MR. FERGUSON: The appeals process, the way it
```

works is you have a window in which to file what is called a Notice of Appeal. And the Notice is not necessarily substantial. It's something that says we plan to appeal.

2.2.

2.4

And then, once you file that Notice, after that, the actual appeal is filed.

So at this point, we couldn't tell you what all the appeals contain. So the Notices of Appeal have been filed. And the substantive appeals themselves will follow shortly.

MR. ALLEN: Rupert Allen with the Shawnee Arapaho Tribes.

As somebody that's worked on one of these land acquisition deals for the tribe, how much — there needs to be a lot of training done, not only for tribal officials that are working on this consolidation agreement, but also for the Bureau.

The land purchase that I worked on, it took well over a year to complete. And a lot of it was spent in feeling our way around in the dark. And I worked with a really good realty officer with the Bureau. But it was something that hadn't been done in so long that there was no real procedure set down.

So I'd like to make sure that there's some sort of BI handbook, or whatever, and that there's

```
1
      adequate training for both the Bureau personnel and
2
     tribal personnel that's going to be involved in these.
3
               MS. GILLETTE: When did you work on that?
4
               MR. ALLEN: Two years ago.
5
               MS. GILLETTE: Two years ago. And beyond that
6
     handbook, like, what kind of training would be helpful,
7
     do you think?
8
               MR. ALLEN: Some sort of seminar, you know,
9
     where the actual realty officers can sit down with the
     tribal personnel who is going to be responsible.
10
11
               MS. GILLETTE: Thank you.
12
               MR. KODASEET: Mike Kodaseet with the Cheyenne
13
     Arapaho Tribe.
14
               I know you mentioned -- I don't know, the
15
      study, or whatever you got. How long before you
      identify the tribes with the fractional land issues?
16
17
     Do you see that? Do you have a time line to decide?
               MS. GILLETTE: Actually, we -- are you talking
18
19
     about in terms of the goals?
2.0
               MR. KODASEET: No, you had stated earlier that
21
     you were having a study to determine -- you said not
2.2
     all tribes --
               MS. GILLETTE: Oh, yes. We actually -- I
23
2.4
     mean, there's a rough figure that I can give, and I
25
     don't know if I should give it, but I'll say that it's
```

1 less than 200 tribes to be sure that are affected by 2 this. 3 And, you know, this is -- these are all items 4 that are really important to how we think about this. 5 But if your tribe does have fractionated interests, 6 then you're probably in that category. 7 It's a matter of the degree of fractionation. 8 And those are all questions that we haven't settled on 9 yet. 10 MS. SMITH: I just want to remind people again 11 to try and speak into the mics as much as you can for 12 our transcript. I know the mics are not as ideally 13 sensitive as we would hope.

MR. KODASEET: And how soon will we be sending notification out to the tribes?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MS. GILLETTE: When we've finished -- when we're able to release that information, I believe we would either -- if we can't get it out before we do a preliminary plan, we'd send it out ahead of time, and probably send it out with a letter or submitting like that, and give that to you as part of this.

And then we'd also post it on the website for reference material.

MR. MAYNAHONAH: Louis Maynahonah from the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma.

```
1
               I attended that consultation meeting at
 2
      (unintelligible). And when I was in there, you know,
 3
      they had that 1.9 million dollars budgeted for
     buy-back. It was mentioned up there that 500 million
 4
 5
      dollars of that was going to go to administrative fees.
 6
     And $1.4 billion is to buy-back the land.
 7
               And it was suggested by some of the tribes up
      there that they can go three ways, either by contract,
 8
 9
      or the BIA, or the tribes themselves administer the
      ILCA plan.
10
11
               It was mentioned a while ago that you-all had
12
      a 285 million dollar ceiling. Where did -- I mean,
     where did that 500 million dollars come from up there?
13
               MS. GILLETTE: Did the tribe say that?
14
15
               MR. MAYNAHONAH: Pardon?
               MS. GILLETTE: Did the tribe say that?
16
17
               MR. MAYNAHONAH: Well, it was mentioned during
18
      the meeting by -- they took a poll with some little
19
      gadget that the tribes -- one of the questions from the
2.0
21
               MS. GILLETTE: So was this at the --
2.2.
               MR. MAYNAHONAH: From the facilitator up
23
     there.
2.4
               MS. GILLETTE: So was this the one this
25
      summer, this past summer?
```

```
MR. MAYNAHONAH: September 26, I think.
1
2
              MS. GILLETTE: Okay, the one in Minneapolis?
3
              MR. MAYNAHONAH:
                                In Hinckley, yes.
              MS. GILLETTE: I don't believe that we said
4
5
     that it was going to be 500 million dollars.
6
     positive of that, because I was there at that
7
     consultation.
8
              MR. MAYNAHONAH: Were you there?
9
              MS. GILLETTE: Yes, both of us were there.
              MR. MAYNAHONAH: Well, did you hear that 500
10
11
     million dollars for administrative purposes?
12
              MS. GILLETTE: Well, if a tribe says it, then
13
     that is something that we can't control. But the
14
     settlement itself has a 15 percent cap on it, and we
     can't change that. That's firm. And so this isn't
15
     moving around. This has been 285 at that consultation
16
17
     it was. I had the PowerPoint here, as well from that.
18
              MR. MAYNAHONAH: And then, again, I've got
19
     another question about -- the comment period is to be
20
     by November the 1st. And Mr. Ferguson said there are
21
                                 Then why -- I kind of get
     appeals in the works now.
2.2.
     the impression that we're being pressured to give you
23
     our comments by November the 1st. But those appeals
2.4
     are going to be a little bit longer time to be
25
     considered by the judges, right?
```

MS. GILLETTE: Right.

2.2

2.4

MR. MAYNAHONAH: And Indians have a long history of taking their time in deciding something. And it's come down from those treaties. And they take a long time. But then Government sets in and they pressure you to do something. Say, hey, we've got this deadline, and I want you to do that.

But since this money, I think, is a judgment won for the Indians, right? And I think that they should have — they should send a message over to the BIA, saying let us decide this ourselves, but stay within the guidelines of the judge.

You know, being pressured for such a short time to make a decision, I think the original suits were for 50-some-odd billion dollars, right? And then it got whittled down to this 1.4 billion dollars to pay out to the individual mineral owners.

And over 50 percent of that is going to go back to purchase that land.

And 15 percent of that is going to be administered by whomever is given the authority to administer it.

That was my questions.

MR. BLACK: Just to respond real quick to your comment. I mean, largely, you know, this is all we --

we need to be prepared when that order does come down from the Court after it goes through the appeals process. We're hoping to be able to hit the ground running. And that money is to implement this program and get on the ground and be able to start purchasing these interests.

2.2.

2.4

This won't be your only opportunity to comment. We're trying to be able to get all the comments back from these consultations to begin with the development of an implementation plan. And, as I stated in the one of the slides up there, we'll be doing additional consultations and soliciting additional input based on all this.

So this won't be your only opportunity to provide input and comments.

MS. GILLETTE: I'd also like to add there was one slide we didn't go over. It is about the ten-year time period. So by law, actually, by the terms of the settlement, this 1.9 billion dollars is only available for 10 years. That ten-year clock starts ticking when the judge or when the Court resolves all appeals.

So 10 years from that time, from when the judge says all appeals are settled and resolved, to ten years out. Anything that's left over goes back in the Treasury.

So you can see -- you mentioned the tribes take a while to get together. Well, sometimes, you know, it takes a long time, and the Government takes a long time to get moving on certain things.

2.2

2.4

And so these time frames for comments are meant to move us faster, as well, so we can get a plan out for you to get back to you to comment on. And it is — I feel like we have a pretty tight time frame knowing that we had asked for an expedited process with the judge and he granted it. And knowing that sometimes in settlement cases like this, it takes years to settle the appeals, but we're working for an expedited process so we can get this program moving as quickly as possible.

But the goal of the administration is to make sure that we have a plan in place that will make full use of the opportunity to purchase 1.9, you know, use the 1.9 dollars for land consolidation.

And we know that 10 years can go by pretty quickly. And so we're trying our best to get, like Mike said, hit the ground running as soon as the judge says yes.

We don't have to worry about appropriations. The funding is already there waiting for us to spend when the judge issues that final nod for resolving

```
1
      those appeals.
 2
               MS. DEERE: I just have a few comments.
 3
               First of all, my name is Kathy Deere. I'm
 4
      with the Absentee Shawnee Tribes and am the tribal
 5
      treasurer.
 6
               I'm part owner on 12 tracts of land, and there
 7
      could be 20 or more of us on these lands. So I'm
     probably one of these 200 tribes that have fractionated
 8
 9
      lands. And there's 11 regions.
               My question is: On these 11 regions, is there
10
11
      at least 200 tribes, are they all from these regions,
12
      these 11 regions?
13
               MS. GILLETTE: I think we set out a -- I don't
      know if Tony has it. Yes, he does. It's on this page
14
15
      where it shows -- you guys have, on your handout, by
      region, which regions have more fractionated
16
17
      individually-owned interests.
18
               And you can see that some of them, some
19
      regions have more than others. And for Souther Plains,
2.0
      it's up there.
21
               There are 12 regions. ILCA doesn't address
2.2.
      fractionated interested in Alaska.
23
               MS. DEERE: You know, in Oklahoma, there's 39
2.4
      of us. So probably 39 of us are part of that 200,
25
      right, that's fractionated lands?
```

To me, it would seem like, as a region, that we should be responsible for our own fractionated land, because it pertains more to us. We know what's being fractionated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Like our Tribe, we have a realty office, and we have good people that work in there. And these people know each land, who has what, who's on what, you know, everything.

And, to me, being on a region, I think, in that region, the tribes in that region should be responsible for their own fractionated land consolidation part.

And that's my feelings on that.

And then, as far as the agreement on administrative cost and stuff like that, I think that should be up to the regions to administer those administrative costs.

Each region that's involved in this has their own administrative costs that they can take care of.

And on the appraisals, you know, we had bought some land from a tribal member, and it took us a year to get one appraisal. It's two parts of land. And it's taken us two years -- excuse me, a year to get this land, to buy it back for the Tribe. And the most part of it is the appraisal part, you know.

2.2.

As a tribe, we should be able to provide our own appraisals, you know. We can have BIA train us, or whatever, and, you know, be able to do our own appraisals. Because, you know, people out there in the White man's world, you know, you say you want this land and, boy, you can get an appraisal done in, what, a month, maybe more, you know.

So I would think it would be good for, you know, each region to have a group of appraisers that can go out and do these types of things.

And as far as, I guess, the timeline for saying who's going to get what on each of these lands, you know, start with people that have — there's, like, 100 owners on one. Start with the highest. To me, that would be the most feasible, is to get the ones that have — there's 100 people on this one tract of land. You know, start with them, because that would be the most people. Because most of those people probably want to sell because they probably own a 16th of it, or whatever, you know. If we can talk to them and maybe one person out of that whole tract would want to buy that, one tribal person might want to buy that. To me, that would be the easiest to start at, is get the people that are the most owners on these tracts, you know, to get them going.

```
1
               And say, okay, we'll buy this from you, you
2
     know. Most people -- times are hard, and a lot of
3
     Natives are ready to sell. They don't want to sell it
     to the White man, you know. They want to sell it back
4
5
     to the tribe or someone in the family, you know. But
     give them an opportunity.
6
7
               And that's what I'd like to see on that part.
8
               As far as time and cost efficiency, you know,
9
      like I said, that was along those lines, too. That
     would be -- start with the highest number of people on
10
11
     these tracts and then go down to the 20 or more people
12
     or less, or whatever.
13
               And I've probably got more stuff, but right
14
     now, I can't think.
15
               MS. GILLETTE: Sure, that's fine.
               MS. DEERE: Oh, one more thing. The appeals.
16
17
     On these six appeals, you said there were six appeals?
18
               MS. GILLETTE: Yes.
19
               MS. DEERE: Okay. Were they all timely
20
     appeals?
21
               MR. FERGUSON: Yes, ma'am. There was a 60-day
2.2.
     window in which the appeals had to be filed. And,
23
     again, the Notice of Appeals. I know it sounds like
```

we're splitting hairs here. But the Notice of Appeal

had to be filed. And the cutoff date was October 4th.

24

25

```
1
      So what's today? The 6th. So that just passed.
 2
               So, yes, they were all on time.
 3
               MS. DEERE: And can you say why most of these
 4
     were appealed?
 5
               MR. FERGUSON: Again, as we said earlier,
 6
      there was a Notice of Appeal. And so they'd have to
 7
      file something substantive shortly, based on the
      Court's timeline.
 8
 9
               But to the extent that you have an interest in
      what was in the appeal, most Courts did document
10
11
      online. And so, for the most part, you will be able to
12
      look that up.
13
               MS. DEERE: Okay. And that will be on the
14
     Cobell?
               MR. FERGUSON: They're not on the Government's
15
     website.
16
17
               MS. DEERE: Oh, okay. So where do you have to
18
      look?
19
               MR. FERGUSON: We're getting a bit far afield
20
            I'll tell you what, when we take a break, I'll
21
     be glad to talk to you.
2.2.
               MS. DEERE: Okay.
23
               MR. FERGUSON: Okay, thank you.
24
               And to the extent that anyone has those type
25
      of questions, not exactly on fractionation or land
```

```
1
      consolidation, please feel free to talk to me on the
 2
      break. I'll be here.
 3
               MS. DEERE: All right. That's all for now.
                                                             Ι
 4
      may have some more.
 5
               MR. HORSE: I've got one.
 6
               My name is Ricky Horse. I'm with the Kiowa
 7
      Tribe.
 8
               COURT REPORTER: Hold on just a second.
 9
      can't hear you at all.
10
               MR. HORSE: My name is Ricky Horse, and I'm
      with the Kiowa Tribe.
11
12
               This lady asked a question here about the
13
      appraisals, but, also, with that appraisals comes
      surveys. I'm going to speak for myself, because, like
14
      her, I have several areas, land I've come into, almost
15
      1,000 acres. And we own some land in Lawton,
16
17
      Oklahoma.
18
               We went to the Bureau to get us a survey on
19
      our land, because it's so divided. And it's one place
2.0
      is over here and another one is over here.
21
               So as they came and surveyed this land, they
2.2.
      gave us surveys that were all messed up. One land was
23
      over here. Another tract was over here. And I know,
24
      myself, where my land is.
```

And then we go back to the Bureau and say,

25

hey, this is messed up here. And they know they messed up.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

So they go back and survey it again. Well, when they surveyed it, some of it was correct and some of it wasn't correct. As a matter of fact, as we found some land we didn't even know we owned, didn't even know we had.

So when this thing takes place, how are we going to know that those lands are going to be put in the correct spots, because we have a problem with our housing program that went on when they came in and surveyed these tracts of lands for an acre and a quarter. And when they come and put these houses on, some of these houses weren't even on the lot. They were in different spots, because the surveys were done wrong.

So how is this going to help us in that area right there?

MR. BLACK: I don't have an exact answer there for you there. We have heard issues with surveys, as we've gone around, you know, during these consultations. And that's something else that will have to be addressed.

As to your specific questions, I'll try to get some answers for you on that.

2.2.

2.4

What we're largely dealing with here is within a parcel are numbers of fractionated interests. And we, generally, know where those parcels are. We may have some survey issues out there. But those fractionated interests will be purchased and incorporated into the whole parcel of Indian ownership of the tribe. So they won't move.

And I'm not saying -- I think the survey issues are going to relate more for us right now, as you said, it's going to tie directly to the appraisals.

But I'll take this question back and see what kind of answers I can get back. And if you can give me

I don't have a solid answer for you right now. I'm sorry.

any more specifics on your situation, I'll be happy to

-- and if anybody else has anything like that.

MR. HORSE: Will the Bureau be a part of that, then, when that time comes if the tribes decide to buy some land? And I know we will. But will the Bureau come in there and survey those tracts of land, or is that going to be up to the tribes to go and get those surveys done?

MR. BLACK: Are you talking fee interests?

MR. HORSE: Yes, on any land, any land that is fractionated. And there's a lot of those lands where I

am in southwest Oklahoma, that there's 40 acres over here. There may even be 12 acres. And I even come in on a spot with there's only an acre and a quarter, and there's probably 20 heirs that come in on an acre and a quarter, you know.

MR. BLACK: Well, an acre and a quarter, I think we might be talking two different things here. And that's trust lands and fee lands.

MR. HORSE: Yes.

2.2.

2.4

MR. BLACK: Now, in fee lands, we're dealing with the fee to trust process, which is outside of the Indian Land Consolidation Program. And that's where the surveys and stuff will come in. And, basically, those surveys are provided to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and BLM Indian Land Survey Office will review those surveys and validate the accuracy. I don't know the exact steps involved in all that.

But that's something we would work with you on. I don't know that we would go out and do the surveys on the fee land. In the process of bringing them into trusts, then we would be reviewing those surveys, etc.

MR. HORSE: Thank you.

MR. TIPPECONNIE: Robert Tippeconnie, Comanche Nation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Getting back to the appraisals and administrative costs, you know, the administrative costs were laid out here. There's different opinions as to how that could be expended in a selfdetermination manner. You know, it could be the Nation, the Indian Nation can do that if they have the resources and the skills to effect all of that acquisition. But when it comes to all that administrative costs, you know, will the appraisals be out of the amount that's in the purchase dollar, or is it an administrative dollar? The appraisals are always a headache, you And I don't want to go to the fee to trust. That's especially a headache there. But I hope we can expedite, as I know now we can take a different mode of acquiring that, a

But I hope we can expedite, as I know now we can take a different mode of acquiring that, a different tactic in acquiring the appraisal. Rather than a full quote "appraisal," we can go to the realtor, and we can do different things under the present fee to trust.

So I'd like to think that we're going to have that capability.

But my question again is: In the administrative costs, will the appraisal be in the land

purchase area when you have the money for the land purchase, or will it be in the administrative side?

Because I can see it's limited in administrative maybe.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

And then I'll ask one other question. When I look at this graph here, I can see, you know, that the land bases that are fractionated are pretty heavy in a couple of areas of the country, in Indian Country, you know, if you look at the Rocky Mountain and the Great Plains.

So my question earlier was, you know, given the fact that we have some data, and this is part of the data, that gives us an appreciation of where the fractionated lands lie, will there be, are you thinking of appropriating or apportionating, whatever, you know, these dollars based upon this type of data?

Now, I know there's the other criteria which is imposed, as you suggest, if there's 100 -- you know, if there's only two, it's fractionated and there's only two owners, that's a great -- I mean, the priority should be given where it's truly fractionated, where you have multiple, multiple owners.

So it may look like this is a high percentage of fractionated lands, but I don't know how many owners.

1 So I think our criteria is pretty critical to 2 all of us. 3 But, also, my question -- I'm talking too 4 My question, again, based upon the fact that 5 data is here, would they be getting, initially, a 6 greater distribution of this 1.5 million dollars? 7 MR. BLACK: Let me address your first question 8 on appraisals. Appraisals is administrative cost of 9 implementing the program. So, yes, it would come out of that. That has been one of the top topics in our 10 11 consultations, is how to deal with appraisals. 12 Realizing the difficulty that everybody has had and in 13 timeliness of getting appraisals, the accuracy of 14 appraisals, etc. 15 And we've had some excellent recommendations, as we've gone around, dealing with the state's zone 16 17 type appraisals, mass market appraisals, market 18 studies, etc., in different ways. 19 And, there again, anybody that's got some 20 experiences or has some ideas on this, we're really 21 looking forward to that input. 2.2. We do realize that that could be a hindrance 23 to the implementation of the program if we don't come 2.4 up with more streamlined, efficient, effective ways.

And that's the response to your first

25

question.

2.2.

2.4

And then your second question on the distribution of the funds, that isn't anything we've decided yet. That's really information that we put out there. And you're right. Just because one region may be highly fractionated — generally, that does correlate to a lot of owners out there.

But, you know, there again, we are looking at some of the options we've posted up there earlier. And that is, really, what is the tribal preference, what is most economically viable, you know, what has the biggest bang for the buck and the best return for the tribes? Some of these lands may be highly fractionated, but they may not be very productive lands. Even though they would hold the line of cultural value to the tribe, they might not be economically viable.

And that's where we've got to -- we've got to look at all of these factors.

So, no, no decision has been made as far as we're going to distribute based on that chart or anything like that.

MR. FIELDS: Good morning. My name is Jim Fields with the Pawnee Nations.

I just have a couple of questions and some

comments.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

But I think that, as I understand the consultation process, you're here to listen to us. And as I hear the comments from the tribal leaders here at this table that we have more questions.

To me, the questions we have are good. But, as I understand the consultation process, is it should be based upon what our comments are. Not what our questions are, but what our comments are.

Historically, if you look at the relation between the Federal Government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the tribes, it's one of kind of a paternalistic attitude where you would always tell us what to do. And here we are again. We're in a situation where we're asking you how you're going to treat us and so forth.

So I think this comment period or comments should be based on how we think it needs to be handled, not questions on how you're going to handle this, but we should comment on how we think it should be done. Because if you listen to these tribal leaders, they say how and what if and so forth. But I think the comments should be this is how we think it should be done from this region, based upon whatever our backgrounds are and so forth.

So let me first start -- when you talk about prioritizing purchases, and I heard some of the leaders ask, how are you going to do this? Will it be by region? So much allocated by a region.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

I heard you comment that this would be those most highly fractionated interests to be purchased first.

You also, as you go around the country, you probably come across regions with different law, different probate laws that affect Indian tribes differently.

Let me tell you, for example, in Eastern Oklahoma, the Five Civilized Tribes have their own probate laws that they go through. And whether you know it or not, it goes through the State Court.

Megan, my Cherokee sister over here, will elaborate on that.

But if you look at the probate law for the Five Tribes going through State Court, it also has to be the cost -- the cost of it goes to the heirs. If you look at Eastern Oklahoma by itself and the Five Tribes, you see that they deal primarily with what you would call presumed heirs.

What that means, it means that the estate has not been probated in State Court. And, in fact, we

probably deal with two or three generations of presumed heirs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

And so, when you go through this purchase process with the Five Tribes, does that mean all these estates have to be probated first before you look at purchasing them?

Secondly, when you look at the probate laws of the Five Tribes, then when the land is distributed by probate, any lands where the heir is less than one-half degree Indian, then that land automatically becomes unrestricted. It becomes fee land automatically.

And so I think that, in a way, that's -- the fact that it hasn't been probated is good for the tribes because these lands have stayed in fee status -- I mean, under fee status, because they haven't been probated yet.

And if you notice with Eastern Oklahoma, there's quite a high percentage of those tribal members that are less than one-half degree Indian or tribal member.

So if they probate it, it all went to a fee status, you have to consider that when you look at purchase of land.

Second, here in Oklahoma, the lands, you can have surface ownership and you have subsurface

ownership. And so, for example, I have lands that I have an interest in subsurface or minerals, but not the surface.

Then I have other lands where I may have surface but no mineral interest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

And so how do you rectify that? I mean, how do you deal with those kinds of situations? Do you only purchase surface, or do you purchase surface or minerals, or both? Or does the land have to be the requirement of both ownership?

So that's a comment I have is, how do you deal with that, because these are good questions for here in Oklahoma?

The second thing I want to talk about is when you talk about, during the presentation, you gave the comments of economically feasible. Economically feasible. I'd like for you to define what you mean by that. Does that mean feasible for the tribe, or is it economically feasible for the Federal Government, or does that mean both, you have to have both approvals?

It also said in your slide presentation that there will be, for every land sale, there will be money set aside for scholarship for that land sale.

Well, when that land sale is set aside, will the benefit, the scholarship benefit of that land sale

go to the tribe on which the land is situated, or will it go to some kind of scholarship board?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

The question is who's going to administer this scholarship? Will it be up to the tribes?

And my comment is it should be left up to the tribes, and not to a scholarship board or not to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but that the tribes self-determine where that scholarship money is to go. The tribe should be benefiting by those land sales that are set aside for scholarships.

Your comment here is how do you establish a purchase priority.

And I think another question, and I'm asking questions instead of giving comments. But the question I have is: When you purchase, use the benefit to purchase fractionated lands, what if all the owners — this is a voluntary program — does not agree to sell their purchase, their interests? Will the program buy those owners who want to sell their fractionated interests, even though there may be a great number of owners not wanting to sell on a tract of land?

So is it all or nothing, or will it be you purchase what the tribe facility finds?

My comment on that is that the tribe should self-determine, again, what lands they want to

purchase. It should not be a governmental decision.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

You're talking about the administrative costs, and we hear talk that there should be some set aside for the cost of the tribes in going through this program.

My comment is that this should be included in the administrative costs. What should not be included is the cost of the Government in administering this program.

For example, your cost in these consultation processes issued by the Federal Government and not by the administrative costs.

My comment is that the administrative costs should be the cost of the tribes in administering the costs of acquiring these lands.

Another question that I heard from the table here was, you know, how do you prioritize who gets what first?

I can tell you right now that the 1.6 billion will not be enough for all those owners who want to sell their land. I don't know if you have an estimate as to what if every owner sold their land, what would that cost be? Of course, in order for you to determine that, you have to determine the value of the land. And that goes to the appraisal.

2.2

2.4

And I think there should also be, you know, tribes are, tribal members are funny, because if you're not an Indian, you don't understand the concept of land to us. Land to us is valuable historically. You know, land, owning land was much like owning the air, historically. And we're not -- we believe we're good stewards of the land.

And then when you determine the value of the land, there's also what you would call cultural value. The value to us culturally and historically, that has to somehow be factored into the appraisal process.

If you look at the appraisal process as being done by a State Certified Appraiser, and I've seen the appraisal handbook and the factors they use in determining the appraisal value, and there's no consideration for historic or cultural value to the tribes. It's all based upon comparables and what the land is worth and other areas. So that's how they arrive at the value.

I think that, when you determine this, there has to be some consideration for the cultural and historical values that we place on land.

What I'd like to hear from you-all and from the table here is how we'd like to see it done. I don't like, you know, saying, how can this happen or

```
1
     what happens here or in this situation? I think in the
2
     consultation that you listen to us, and I would
3
     encourage the other type of leaders to, rather than ask
     a question, we should tell you how we think it should
4
5
     be done. And then let you share with us.
6
               Your mentioned, also, Jodi, that there's a
7
     ten-year limit on the program and you used the word "by
      law". And I don't think this is by law. The law is
8
9
      established by Congress. Did Congress set this law or
      is this part of the settlement by the Courts?
10
11
              MS. GILLETTE: I misspoke. Yes, you're right.
12
      It's by the settlement.
13
               MR. HORSE:
                           That's right. It's not by law.
14
          (Inaudible)
15
              MS. GILLETTE: The settlement?
              MR. FIELDS: But it's not a law in Congress.
16
17
              MR. FERGUSON: Actually, it --
18
              MR. FIELDS: It has the effect of law.
19
              MR. FERGUSON: It has to be passed as a law.
2.0
              MR. FIELDS: I'm not through talking yet.
21
              MR. FERGUSON: Okay. I apologize. I was
2.2.
     trying to respond to your question.
23
               MR. FIELDS: I've got a lot that I hope you
2.4
     can comment to all of them when I get through here.
25
              MR. FERGUSON: Okay. I apologize.
```

MR. FIELDS: Or if you want me to restate this, then you can comment on every comment. That's fine with me. But you all laid out this, not me.

2.2.

That's all I have for now. Thank you.

MR. TIPPECONNIE: I want to make a comment after my brother here, because it did raise some questions.

Robert Tippeconnie, Comanche Nations.

What I want to say is, you know, the Comanche Nations knows what we want to acquire. So we will present that. You know, we will present the area. We will present the tracts, and we will give you that.

So, then, what we want to have is the ability to get the appraisals. So we want the money, which I — when I raised the questions, I wanted to get it clear where it was. So you've answered that for me. So it's in administrative.

So the Nations would like to say that, you know, let's expedite the way we make acquisitions or purchases. And the way we've done -- and I hate to relate to the fee to trust, because it's nothing but a headache to us, the Comanche Nations, relative to that type of acquisition. We've just struggled on that for years, it seems like, and years.

And then because of the reformed handbook or

changed handbook, it changes time frames. And then it's all sent back to us, all the cases. So we're just very frustrated by that process.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

So I hope -- what we want to say, in this process, allow us to expedite our actions, the appraisals and the purchases, and don't go through all these nightmares that occur on acquisitions.

We know the lands. We've been telling you what they are. And we would like you to say here's this money to go ahead and proceed with this.

And then, again, it may be a shared administrative matter between the Federal Agency relative to us and our nation. But we would like to be able to do a lot of that ourselves, go out and get our appraisals, how we feel they should be done. And, you know, there's framework now, what's acceptable in the area of realty and appraisals.

So I think we can have options ourselves. We can take those options and bring up that value on the land. That's the way we'd like to look at. We will lay out what we want. We have it. We know it, more or less, and then present it.

Now, we would have -- because we do know now, because we're acquiring lands, we have some sense of values across our reservation areas. So we would have

some sense, tentatively, saying this is an amount that we need for these acquisitions.

MR. BLACK: Thank you.

2.2.

2.4

Mr. Fields, I'll try to respond to some of your questions.

First off, I can't agree more with your initial comments. That really is why we're here. It's not for us to tell everybody here how we're going to implement the program. We're here to solicit input on what the tribes feel and how you think we should implement the program.

And we are trying to respond to the questions, largely, for clarification purposes in hoping to help everybody formulate their responses and their comments.

To talk about a couple of the things, first off, the surface and subsurface interests, everything is on the table. We're looking at all the interests that an owner has. They don't have to be in the same parcel, in the same tract. They could have a surface interest here and a mineral interest here. And we're interested in buying it under the program.

On economically feasible, that was probably the wrong term to use. That was really discussing, you know, when it comes to tribal priorities, you know, what may have the most economic impact or economical

viability for the tribe in generating their priorities.

2.2.

2.4

I guess -- Jodi, correct me, but it's in the ILCA, depending on how much money we have. But there, again, I think it's still -- I'm, you know, as we've been going around the country, we've been hearing more from the tribes as to what would have the most economic impact for them.

Then the scholarship fund, I'd have to turn to Tony or somebody on that. I don't know all the specifics on that. I'll turn that over to Tony in just a minute.

Administrative costs, consultations should not be included. They are not. As it stands right now, we don't have any authority to spend any of the money under the settlement. We don't have that until we've gone through the appeals process and everything has been finalized. We will not have the ability to spend any of these funds.

How do we prioritize? Well, right now, we're not prioritizing this. There, again, we hope to get that from you.

And I do realize that the land is valued differently by the tribal members of the tribes than it is, probably, by your standard use of appraisals. How we incorporate that, I don't know. There, again, that

is something we can solicit for input.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Then to the very last question, I can probably turn that over to James. But this was -- the settlement is a law passed by Congress. The Claims Settlement Act of 2010, or whatever the name, the whole entire term. But, yes, it is a law that was passed by Congress. So that's what we're operating under.

Did I miss anything?

MR. FERGUSON: And, again, Mr. Fields, I apologize for cutting you off.

But what Mike said is absolutely correct. It is a law. The Settlement Agreement was adopted in the legislation that Congress passed. So it is actually a law passed by Congress.

MS. GILLETTE: And I just wanted to respond —
I do just want to comment on something that Councilman
Tippeconnie said at the end of his remarks. He was
talking about allowing the tribes to look at their own
processes and giving consideration to how you would do
it. And I think that would be extremely helpful. I
mean, you have it on record here. I think the words
that Mr. Fields said about the evaluation of lands.
Those are all things that are just extremely helpful to
how we're looking at this.

And what I would appreciate, and I don't know

that we've received very much of this, is, you know, if you do want to submit written comments, set up a scenario that, you know, this is our vision for what we see happening, and this is how we would deal with -- we have this barrier when we do things in the existing process. This is how we would address that barrier.

And those would be just, you know, for us, as we look at all of the different places that we need to move quickly to improve would be extremely valuable.

So on that note, I think we're due for a short 15-minute break. And then we'll come back, and we'll hear some more from tribal leaders. And we'll all be available up here if you have any other individual questions.

MS. SMITH: So we're going to take a 15-minute break. It's 10:25. We'll come back at 10:40, and we'll continue on.

Thanks, everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

(Break)

MS. SMITH: I'm going to hand it over to Tony to respond to that, and then we'll open it back up for comments from the Tribal Governments.

MR. WALTERS: Just quickly to talk about the scholarship portion of the settlement and how it ties to the land consolidation.

I don't know if Jim is actually in here yet with his questions about this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

(Inaudible) -- land sale, a particular specified amount will be transferred into a scholarship fund. And that fund will actually be administered by a nonprofit organization.

And the way that was selected was, under the terms of the settlement, the plaintiffs were to provide a list of the number of nonprofit organizations to administer that scholarship program. And they did that.

The two that they submitted were the American Indian Graduate Center out of Albuquerque and the American Indian College fund out of Denver.

And then it's up to the secretary's office to select one of those two organizations to administer this fund.

There's no timeline for that determination yet. The office is still gathering the information from these two organizations to help best determine which one would best administer this program.

But it won't be solely up to just the organization. There will be a board that will consist of five individuals, two selected by the secretary and two by the plaintiffs, and one selected by the selected

organization. And that board will determine how that fund will get administered. And it will be up to that organization to carry that out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

2.5

So there is time, still, for tribal input into that. I don't know off the top of my head what that consultation outreach will be for the secretary's determination of which organization. But I know that timeline to select that isn't coming up quickly. There is time to discuss that.

Feel free, when you submit comments to this land consolidation program, be sure to include any comments you have on the scholarship fund.

MR. FIELDS: Jim Fields, Pawnee Nation.

I'd like for you to comment on what this gentleman here just commented on. Of course, he's Cherokee, so I should know better.

You tell us, then, this will be administered by a board, a five-member board. Then they will do this and will determine how the fund will be utilized.

I thought that was what this consultation process is about, is for you to listen to us as to how we want it to be administered, not for you to again tell us how it's going to be administered.

I don't know if that was a Court decision to have this board administer or was it input from the

tribal leaders? I think you heard the tribal leaders discuss at this table that they're going to want the scholarship to be done by the tribes themselves and not by a board of your choosing. Because that flies in the face of consultation and self-determination.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

MR. WALTERS: Well, just to follow up quickly. This consultation is certainly for tribal input on the land consolidation portion of the Cobell settlement.

Unfortunately, the terms for the administration of that scholarship fund are in the Settlement Agreement itself. So that's not something that the Department can control or change. That's something that the parties agreed to. And that's where the language comes from and the provisions come from that dictate that we're to use one of these organizations that the plaintiffs offer, and the secretary will choose which one of those, and that group, along with the Board of Trustees, will determine how that fund is administered.

MR. FIELDS: You've already said it's a five-member board. So somebody has already self-determined that.

MR. WALTERS: The board -- the provisions regarding the board are also in the Settlement Agreement itself. And it doesn't dictate who the

2.0

2.2.

2.4

individuals are. It just dictates who will select those five members. And that's why I say there's still time to get comments in on that to the secretary through written comments. I'm sure there will be some sort of follow-up on that decision, as well. But there's still time to figure out what individuals are on that board. But the composition of the board itself is in the Settlement Agreement.

MR. FIELDS: So I think it would be for the Tribes to self-determine how they want the board to administer, whether they want a ten-member board or a 12-member with one member from each region, or something. There has to be some way of knowing -- but somebody has already made the decision for us.

What I alluded to a while ago was, in your presentation, you said for each land sale, there is a set-aside for scholarship.

My comment here was that that set aside, with each land sale, should go to that Tribe where the land is going to, not some national board.

One of other question that I had was on the appeals process.

My question is why -- you know, you say that there will not be a final scheduling order until all the appeals are heard and settled. Why couldn't there

2.0

2.2.

2.4

have been a set aside to expedite this? I'd like for you to recommend this, that these appeals, they have an amount of money attached to each appeal. Why can't there be a set aside for these appeals and then distribute the rest of the money, because the appeals only go to a certain amount of money? And so why should that hold up the distribution of all the rest of the money? It makes logical sense to me that, since the six appeals do not affect the whole 1.6 billion dollars, that you could set this money aside and distribute the rest of it.

MR. FERGUSON: Sir, the way the Settlement Agreement is drafted, the agreement between the parties is that the settlement is not final as to what's adopted by Congress is, by definition, the settlement is not final until all the appeals are heard.

So there is no permission for the Department to make any unilateral decisions. This is simply what the law states.

MR. FIELDS: Mr. Field again.

That's true. I can understand that. But if this is to be determined or settled by tribal input, then I think the Tribes should recommend back to the Court, whoever it is that you're answering to, that this be done in a set aside, because this is a

2.2.

2.4

settlement issue, and it could be then considered again, because my experience is that it will be years from now. I know you've -- I've heard you use the term "expedited," you've used, and "expedited process". But to us, that expedited means as long as you want it to be. It can be years after I'm gone and we're still fighting over this thing.

So I think the fair way to do it would be to set aside this money. And that would be a recommendation that you make back to the Court, is to come up with this set aside amount. Because that way, this purchase program can begin a lot sooner than that.

One additional thing I'd like to bring up here in Oklahoma, is that, when you deal with different tribes and different land laws and probate laws, you recognize that a hundred years ago -- most have been 130 years ago now, under what we call the General Allotment Act of 1888, Congress passed that law to allot these -- and break up the reservations. I think it was -- the goal of the Congress at that time was to break up the reservations.

And, unfortunately, and it's really unfortunate, that here in Oklahoma most of the tribes are under, what we call, the General Allotment Act. So when we refer to the Pawnees and most at this table,

we're all General Allotment Tribes. In fact, we all are, even the Five Tribes who resisted it up until 1906 when they passed it, was called the Dawes Act where it was forced allotment on the Five Tribes.

2.2.

2.4

On these allotments were -- I mean, all the reservations were broken up and given them, even on that percentage of acre bases or a value of land that the purchase, that they could allot land to. But they were effectively broken up.

What happened after that was there was a mammoth plan, larger than the land here in Oklahoma. Even if you're not from Oklahoma, you know what April 22nd was. April 22nd is where they had the land runs where the so-called surplus lands and reservation were opened up to White settlement.

So here, in Oklahoma, in Western Oklahoma and the northeast part of Oklahoma, these lands were opened to White settlement, that there's no compensation given to the Tribes for those lands taken.

You may say, well, you had the, what we call, the judgment funds, back in the beginnings of the 50s and the 60s, where they were compensated for lands taken. But that was for lands taken from our original homelands.

For example, the Pawnees, we come from

Nebraska. So the Land Settlement Act was for the lands that were ceded unfairly from our original homelands.

2.2.

And, as you know, here in Oklahoma, depending on what tribes you talk to, all tribes that are here have been relocated here by force during the 1880s, beginning with the Five Tribes in the 1830s, going through the 1870s with the Plains Tribes.

And so a lot of times we're in a situation here where the (unintelligible) and the lands alluded to that are fractionated, are lands that were derived from the General Allotment Act.

I think that, when you do these values of land and so forth, these things need to be factored in somehow.

But I think that, and I don't know how much history you have done on these Tribes here in Oklahoma, but there were other tribes. If you look at your pie chart there, you see that, by far, the larger percentage of fractionated land is what you call your land-based tribes, which are primarily your northern tribes. They did not go through the Allotment Act.

We, in Oklahoma, back in the 1880s, we fought that. But we were, unfortunately, you know, we're conquered people.

And I think that we've had to rely upon the

Federal Government to protect our trust interests. And I can tell you right now that, you know, when you use the word "trust," you have a trust responsibility. Well, what does that mean? Is "trust" defined by law? Or is trust defined by we're trusting you to do the right thing?

2.2.

And I can tell you right now, the trust policy of the Federal Government is that we trust you to treat us fairly. We trust you to protect the interests. And too many times, historically, the Federal Government has failed in its trust responsibility.

If you're tribal members, either from Oklahoma or other areas, you should be on our side. You know, I see a Cherokee sitting over there at the end of the table. You know, historically, the tribes here were warrior societies.

But today, in the wars fought, you look at the, generally, the Cherokee, the Talahi, the Chalahi (ph) that he's in a suit. And that's our warriors of today.

So we would hope that you would be looking at this from our viewpoint and not from the viewpoint of the Federal Government. You know, tomorrow times, historically, you know, it wasn't really until the Indian Preference Program or Indian Purpose Laws, held

by Congress to the mid-70s, that we had Indians serving in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in positions. Back in the 1960s and 50s and so forth, they were clerks, but they weren't in leadership.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

So I would just encourage the Indians up there at this table to look at it from our viewpoint. And, when you go back to Washington and you formulate the policies of this program, that you remember first that you're an Indian, a Native American. And think back about your heritage.

I never thought I would get to be an elder. But I'm an elder now. And I like to think that whatever I say and do here, I'm looking to the eyes of my parents and grandparents and great grandparents, because, for me, and I think for Marshall, too, it was our grandparents who were relocated from Nebraska in the 1870s.

And we're in the process now of acquiring land back in our homeland, and we're going through that process now.

And it's real emotional for me to go up to Nebraska and look over those. As we traveled up there -- we did this over a year and a half ago where we got the land and the town of Kearney, Nebraska, had a sign when we went up there that says, "Welcome home

```
Pawnees, " because that was our homeland. You know, it
1
2
     was a very emotional point for me to go through that.
3
     We had a ceremony of walking across a bridge to our
     homeland.
4
5
               And so I would encourage you all to think
6
      about how this, how this affected you.
                                              The Cherokees
7
      in the 1830s removed. And the Pawnees, for us, it's
8
      our grandparents that had to go through that.
9
               So when you look at this and try to come up
      with some issues on how to resolve this issue, I would
10
11
     encourage you to look at it from our standpoint.
12
      at it through our eyes. And then make the best
13
      decision you can make with the input from this table
14
      and these other tables you sat around in this
15
      consultation process.
               As Forest Gump says, that's all I've got to
16
17
      say about that.
18
               MS. GILLETTE:
                              Thank you.
19
               MR. BLACK: Do we have anybody else at the
2.0
     table who would like to offer some comments on either
21
      some of the priorities we've discussed or any specific
2.2.
      areas, such as appraisals, etc.?
```

Again, you know, this whole process, I'm glad

MR. ALLEN: Rupert Allen, Cheyenne Arapaho

23

2.4

25

Tribes.

you're having these meetings, because 10 years is not a very long time when you're talking about land issues.

When we talk about water issues, you're talking hundreds of years. Ten years is not very long. And I'd certainly hate to see any of this money go back to the Treasury. I'd like to see it all utilized.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

I think there should be trigger points at some point in time. If there's not, the majority of the funds aren't being utilized by certain tribes, those funds should be reapportioned to tribes that are utilizing the funds.

The issue of percentage of heirs in allotment required to do a land purchase needs to be addressed.

Right now, I believe by C.F.R., it's like, if there's less than five, then 100 percent, 5 to 10, 70 percent. If over 20, 50 percent.

Now, in other occasions where tribal members and tribal leaders have been told that, irregardless, it's 100 percent, which is not necessarily true. But these need to be clearly defined in your procedural manual that, ultimately, you come out with.

Let's streamline it as quickly as possible, because, as I said, 10 years is a very short period of time when you talk about land issues.

Thank you.

MR. BLACK: Thank you very much.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

I just want to -- if you don't mind, just clarify one thing real quick on the consent issue.

When we're talking about the Indian Land Consolidation Program purchasing interests, we're talking a one-over-one interest. So the consent issue is the one person that wants to sell their one interest or their five or six interests. So it's not a matter of having to go out and get 50 percent consent to purchase that one interest.

MS. GILLETTE: So I think something that is also important to think about is, you know, what is a good way for us to think about -- some tribes already do have land consolidation programs. For instance, a tribe told us at the last consultation that their tribe uses the lease income from their tribal land to purchase fractionated interests from tribal members to preserve it from going out of trust.

So if individuals want to sell their land, the tribes can use that funding to purchase those. And there's a number of those kinds of programs around the country that we're not aware of because they operate independent of the Government, other than the appraisal and the LTRO and the titling function that the BIA has.

So if there's anything like that that you're

aware of or that you already do, and I think, you know, likening it to anything that, you know, like you were talking about, the fee to trust process. If there are things like that that you're doing, that would be extremely helpful for us to hear about.

2.2.

2.4

And I just wanted to also say that we don't have a set way of how we're going to do this. So, you know, the idea that we would do apportionments or that we would do, you know, sort of a formula or anything like that, that's not been decided. And, you know, the more that we hear about what you think would work for your individual tribes, the better equipped we are to make those kinds of decisions.

MR. GOVER: Marshall Gover with the Pawnee Nation.

I wonder how this is all going to work, because we have such fractionated land. The other day across my desk came one that was reverted back to the Pawnee Nation. This man passed away, and his interest reverted back to the Pawnee Nation. He owned 1/256th. That's how fractionated we are.

So how is this all going to work out? What formula does this break down to? You say there's just a couple hundred tribes, but how is this going to break down to this formula?

And then 60 million dollars for scholarships, but then, I hear there's a portion of each sale goes to scholarships?

2.0

2.2.

2.4

MR. WALTERS: To clarify that, it's up to 60 million. So a portion of every land sale will contribute to that 60 million dollar fund. So it starts at zero fund, but it will be up to 60 million dollars based on the amount of sales that occur.

MR. MARSHALL: Then how does a portion of each sale contribute to that 60 million?

MR. WALTERS: Yes. So, based on a particular land sale, say it's — there's a formula in the Settlement Agreement. So it's based on the amount of the sale here. So say it's \$500, I think that's maybe \$25 or five percent. I'd have to go back. But on top of that, that will be transferred over to the fund.

So it doesn't come out of the sale price. It will go to the individual interest owner. The individual interest owner will get the full value of their interest. And then to incentivise that, it's supposed to transfer a small portion of money from the fund to this larger fund, up to 60 million dollars.

MR. GOVER: Then, you know, I have a comment about the education fund, much like my brother, Jim, here.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

It seems like we were left out of that process, you know. We have a tribal college, the Pawnee Nation College. And if we are buying back fractionated interests, why doesn't that go to our Tribal College? Why doesn't it go to our scholarship fund? You know, we have — the Pawnee Nation College, you know, it seems like it should stay at home, to us. That's our viewpoint.

We realize that Courts do this, they told us. Once again, we're being told. But, still, we're supposed to be government to government.

A judge should have enough sense to look around, because we're not the only nation that has a college. Look at all of the nations. How many around that has a college? My brother here, the Comanches, they have a college. Brothers over here, they have colleges. Creek Nation, all of them around, they've got colleges.

All of them in Oklahoma here are fractionated. Why can't we keep that money in our own nations?

Sometimes, back in D.C., when we go back there, it seems like, when I go back there doing business for my people, I've got to have a book to see where am I at today. What's their definition of trust

```
responsibility?
```

2.2.

2.4

Then I go across the street, I've got to flip that page. What's that definition? Where am I at today? Oh, yeah, it's over here, that's their definition.

You know, the point I'm getting to is the formula we're going to use, because we've got some highly fractionated land there in Pawnee. I don't know if we've got more fractionated than other Tribes.

I know what that one was that come arose my desk the other day. I know I've got a Pawnee Nation College that I'd sure like to see the scholarship funds at from my own sale. The lands that people want to sell their land back to the tribe, and not be told, well, it's going to go to this fund, but we don't know where that money is going to go.

That's just the way the Pawnees feel.

MS. GILLETTE: Thank you.

MR. KODASEET: Michael Kodaseet, Cheyenne Arapaho Tribes.

I think I'd have to agree with Mr. Gover's assessment on that scholarship fund. We have a Cheyenne Arapaho College, too. And earlier, you said that the settlement will most likely just affect 200 tribes. But then you're talking about the scholarship

being administered by the Albuquerque Indian Scholarship Fund. That, basically, makes it sound like that would open the door to all the other 300 tribes that aren't going to be involved in this fractionalized settlement. I think that would be a concern of all the tribes that are identified in that 200.

2.2.

2.4

I believe that it would be in the best interest of the tribal nations for that scholarship fund to be administered by our tribal colleges or to our tribal governments.

And I think, you know, it comes back to trust responsibility. You know, that's a high moral and ethical task that's placed on your shoulders.

Some of the issues of our tribes that we're facing now, we feel that some of that responsibility isn't being addressed properly. But, you know, that's a book I don't want to open right now, because that would take the rest of this meeting.

But anyway, that would be our concern. I think the tribal nations that have colleges should administer the scholarship fund.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to comment a little bit more on Mr. Bonstein's (ph) question.

You've already stated there's, like, 200 tribes that are participating in this --

```
1
               MS. GILLETTE: I said it's under 200 tribes.
 2
               UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Under 200, okay.
 3
               MS. GILLETTE: Yes, it's not --
               UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have to be able to
 4
 5
     participate in this buy-back program to be eligible for
 6
      scholarships.
 7
               MR. BLACK: Just to reiterate, the
 8
      administration of this scholarship fund has not been
 9
      determined in any shape or form. It hasn't even been
      identified which organization will operate it under the
10
      terms of the settlement.
11
12
               So that's for that organization and the board
13
      that will be in place, once it is in place. And I'm
      sure there will be some sort of consultation before
14
15
      that. I'm not sure, again, what the scope of that
      outreach will be.
16
17
               But any administration of that fund, I mean,
18
      the eligibility requirements or any criteria will be
19
      developed in the future. And certainly it has not been
2.0
      established.
21
               MS. GILLETTE: I just want to sort of just
2.2.
      further remind people that this is, you know, the real
23
      focus of the consultation is on the 1.9 billion dollars
2.4
      that's for land consolidation. And so there's a lot of
```

unknowns, and we're happy to take your input on the

25

```
scholarship. But the land consolidation piece is what the purpose of this consultation is. It's not -- you can certainly bring up your concerns related to the scholarship, because it's part of that funding.
```

But we're interested in rolling out the land consolidation, because if we don't -- if we're not able to start that -- that scholarship fund is at zero right now. And unless we start purchasing interests, it's going to be at zero until we start rolling out the programs. So we really need to get the land consolidation implementation on the road right away. Without it, the other thing doesn't exist.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would it be up to this Board on how they want to allocate these funds to tribes or colleges or private colleges with Indian students?

MR. WALTERS: Yes, I believe that's correct. That's why the board will be put in place, along with the organization that will administer the fund, will determine all of those, criteria, edibility, etc.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So in other words, that might be able to help each tribe's education program, right?

MR. WHITAKER: Theoretically, yes.

Really, the scholarship fund, there's no

2.0

2.2.

2.4

on administration of funds. And it's really preliminary to even be discussing how that's going to be working, because it's really not the focus of this discussion. And it's something that's not established yet. So it will be up to that board.

2.2.

2.4

MS. SMITH: Maybe it will be helpful to say that these comments about the scholarship fund, and we've heard them at many of the other consultations, as well, will all be collected. And we'll make sure that those comments get put in front of the people who either are on the board or selecting the board so that we're sure that those comments go to the people who actually can act on them.

And your written comments, as well. Any written comments you want to submit about the scholarship fund, your views on the scholarship fund, we can make sure that those get forwarded to the people who are going to be working on those issues.

2ND UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would just like to make one more comment. On the scholarship, you know, you're saying that there's no money in there right now. But I think what you're asking the tribes to try to expedite this whole issue here, I think would be motivation for the tribes to get the message to our

tribal members who are interested in doing this buy-back.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

And that would be something, again, that I would reiterate that, you know, you're saying it doesn't mean a lot. But it would mean a lot to our people. A lot to some people that have this fractional land that they own, this might be the selling point to them is that, okay, I want to do this, but I want to make sure that that money, that this scholarship fund goes to my people.

You know, our tribal nations have always wanted to look out for our people and for those that are yet to come. It's always been the way we were brought up. And I think this would be something that would speak a great deal to trying to address what you're asking us to do.

MS. GILLETTE: I think that you're absolutely right. I don't mean that I don't think that it's important. I didn't -- I hope that that wasn't -- that's not what I meant. Even if it was taken that way, that's okay.

But I think it's extremely important. But I do feel like we have to start -- and if it is important and it is relevant to how we implement and how we get people interested in the program, by all means, bring

those points up.

2.2.

But to spend a lot of time talking about things that we don't -- we really -- because I'm recused. I can't even talk about that piece of the settlement.

And then, for sure, the Bureau of Indian

Education will be involved in that decision-making, and

we can -- you know, we just can't respond very well to

the questions that are being brought up, because, one,

they're either undetermined or, two, because we're not

the right people to respond to those.

So, you know, by all means, I'm not saying let's not talk about that, but we just have a limited time here today. So however we can balance that with the implementation of the Cobell Settlement, you know, that's also helpful. But I get your point about why it is tied to that.

MR. TIPPECONNIE: The Comanche Nation -- Robert Tippeconnie.

The Comanche Nation, we laid how we would like -- and I have to say this: Before I came here a few weeks ago, tribal members came to me, saying we know about this; we know it's coming. So let's get prep'd. So we are attempting to get prep'd. And I laid it out that way. We're looking now, and we're

using resources that we have.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

Well, my question is, though, you know, it's always like on the front end of these things, we have to find resources — that's dollars — to effect this kind of, you know, inventory with our tribal members, because these are individual allotees. So we have to approach them.

So that was posed to me a few weeks ago — well, a month ago, really, to get on with this. So that's why I made that position. That's what we want to do. We're going to give that information, we're going to bring it forward. These are the tracts, these are the locations, this is the tentative value, because we have some sense across the landscape of our area, what those values are per acres, etc.

So that's what we want to do.

But my question is, you know, we're using resources on the front end of our own. Will there be resources available, because I think it can expedite -- 10 years is too short, actually, in a sense, unless you're very active right now, moving out -- tribes, I'm thinking of. Because tribes are going to be the ones that have to go out and outreach with our tribal members and see if they're willing and voluntarily wanting to sell.

```
1
               So I just want to say, you know, that some
 2
      resources will be very supportive.
 3
               We're doing it with some resources we have,
     but other tribes don't have that. You know, there's
 4
      200 and some tribes. And I'm sure that some don't have
 5
 6
     that.
 7
               So it could be a question to you, you know,
 8
      that we need something in the front end to be prep'd
 9
      like our members said in committee, get with it, you
      know, move out. Be ready, because we want to acquire
10
11
      these fractionated areas from these willing sellers.
12
               MS. OOSAHWEE: Sedelta Oosahwee with the
13
      Cherokee Nation.
               I just wanted to comment on the education
14
15
      part. Am I correct in assuming that you're trying to
      decide whether AITC is to administer that or the
16
17
      American Graduate College (inaudible)?
18
               MR. BLACK: Yes, those are the two
      organizations that are proposed, I would think.
19
2.0
               MS. OOSAHWEE: I know that you have until
21
      November 1st to have written comments. But the
2.2.
     American Indian College Fund does administer
23
      scholarships to tribal colleges and to those programs
2.4
      that will be a function of that program.
```

So maybe in the written comment, that we

25

simply can advocate for it to go to the American College Fund versus the America Graduate College. And American Graduate College provides funds for graduate and undergraduate students in both programs. And they also administer the Gates (ph) Scholarship Program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

So I just wanted to let you guys know that.

MS. SMITH: Are there other comments?

I know that we have some tribal leaders who are not sitting at the table, chose not to sit at the table. And I'm wondering if there are any tribal leaders or representatives of Tribal Governments who aren't at the table who would like to speak at this time.

MR. BUTCH: I'm Rhonda Butcher with Citizen Potawatomie Nation.

And I would like to make just a few comments.

And they're very consistent with what you've heard thus far.

Focusing on the land consolidation portion, what's really important to us, the operative word is tribal self-determination. I just can't say highly enough how important it is that each tribe determines what parcels, what offers would be made to allotees, I mean, which ones to prioritize. Because if it's prioritized from above, we don't even know how it would

fall down. It may even fall down to the regions that have the vast majority would get all of the funding, and there would be none left for Oklahoma.

2.2.

2.4

So tribal priority is the first thing that's most important, I think, (inaudible) that we have as much administrative control of that as possible, because we know our people. We, in fact, are making offers today to tribal members trying to consolidate our lands. We are actually doing that very thing that evidently you had experience with other tribes.

And the last thing we want is for us to be making offers and then some letter come down from the Federal Government that they'd like to make an offer, as well. Obviously, that type of conflict would be the last thing we'd want to see.

So tribal priority is important.

Allocation of the funding is important. It leads into an allocation of the funding, and we want to make sure that the Oklahoma Tribes have access. Even though we don't have the absolute greatest in proportion, we have a huge amount of need and huge fractionation. You've heard the descriptions here.

So we want to make sure that funding goes out to all the regions and that our region is able to share in that. We weren't able to share earlier when there

was land consolidation. We tried, and I tried to get into that ten years ago. And Oklahoma wasn't a priority, so we weren't allowed to do so.

2.2.

2.4

So I just want to make sure that we don't get bypassed in this process, that there's some allocation methodology that we can share. And the tribes need to make it a priority.

But in that regard, when I talked to tribes that did participate in your land consolidation plan, which none of us have gotten access to, thus far, one of the things that I heard them say loud and clear was, when the Bureau bought this land, they gave it to the tribes with a lien. And I want to make sure that, if the land goes to the tribes, which we are -- obviously, that is a high priority. If we get the choice, we just don't want any liens put on the land to get any kind of paybacks, which is obviously the crux of such a settlement.

But I want to make sure that doesn't happen after listening to some other tribal experiences.

That's important that the land is free and clear.

MR. BLACK: Thank you very much.

I will let you know that, on the lien issue, there, again, that's another thing that's been brought up consistently across the board. We're working

through some issues with our Solicitor's Office in dealing with the liens.

2.2.

2.4

The Act itself, basically, says we have to put liens on the properties.

MS. GILLETTE: The ILCA Act.

MR. BLACK: The ILCA Act itself, not the settlement.

It is not the intent of the settlement to have liens put on, so we're working through the process right now to see what we can do. It's not the intent of the Act or the settlement or our intent to have, you know, for Tribes to have to pay back these.

MS. GILLETTE: So the ILCA law says that we have to put a lien on the property, and then the money when that lien is being paid, then it goes to the Government until the purchase price is paid off. And that's part of the Indian Land Consolidation Act itself.

However, there are steps in the ILCA Act to address a lien waiver. And those are the legal points that our Solicitor's Office are looking at to set up a process to address that issue of what you've stated, because we have heard this over and over throughout Indian country.

And our Deputy Secretary Hayes made some

pretty strong comments in previous consultations about the fact that we are working to address that in a way that is consistent with what tribes are telling us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

I think that, you know, at some point, you know, just to respond to the Indian Land Consolidation Program, that program was set up because of the Act, and it was never adequately funded. This is an opportunity where we can use that authority to expand the program so, though we have lessons learned from that program, it is different, because it is part of a settlement. And that bears a significant amount of resources, a significantly more amount of resources going into what the Act tries to do, to reduce fractionation.

So that's something that we are looking at the expertise that's been developed in the Indian Land Consolidation Program. However, we're not mirroring exactly those processes. And we're not limiting ourselves to the priority areas that were previously established.

MS. SMITH: Are there any other comments from Tribal Leaders, Tribal Government Representatives, either at the table or in the audience?

MR. FIELDS: This is Jim Fields, Pawnee Nation.

I'd like for Jodi to explain, when you say there's a lien placed on the land, I guess the lien would be in favor of the United States of America; is that right?

MS. GILLETTE: Yes.

2.2.

2.4

MR. FIELDS: That the United States would cover the cost or had the lien removed by the tribe's use of the land, or would the United States place a burden upon the tribe as to when they use the land for a certain purpose, then the revenues from that purpose go to pay off the lien? Or how do you get the lien removed and a Release of Lien on the land?

And most of us here will go for that lien waiver, because that's the first time I've heard that term. My understanding was that when the land would be given to the Tribes, it would be, more or less, free and clear. I don't know the legal term, but free and clear for the tribes for use for their benefit.

I notice in Strategy 2 in your paper, is that you're going to target -- that 100 percent of the fractionated land would be targeted first.

In other words, your target is all of the 100 or 200 or 300, whatever the landowner number is, would have to agree to sell in order to purchase it first, since that's your highest priority or top priority,

along with targeting the land with the largest number of ownership and owners, period. That would be targeted first.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

So I think, if you were to follow that, then you'd probably find those tribes around the table here, and the Pawnees probably at the top of it, probably have the most highly fractionated lands that are broken up in undivided interests.

The other question I have is: When you start trying to determine who gets what first, then it may be a race by the tribes, competitive almost, to come up with a -- maybe come up with a land consolidation purchase program. And maybe if we just determine, once we get -- because, as I understand this process, the tribes will self-determine what lands they have an interest in. If the Pawnees have a lot, maybe there's lands that we're not interested in purchasing because we can't to anything with it.

So there has to be some kind of determination as to what use of the land that the tribes may have.

There's some -- because of this idea of a lien placed on it, it kind of flies in the face of this whole process, to me, because all you're doing is giving us this land, and we're going to buy it back. I don't think that will work.

So I would really oppose any kind of lien and encourage you try to go for a lien waiver, if that's what has to be done as far as getting title to it.

(Inaudible) that land is titled in the United States, with the Pawnee Nation.

Those are my comments thus far.

2.2.

2.4

MR. BLACK: Just to explain this briefly. The statute that the ILCA operates under has a mandatory requirement that the Government put liens on it.

Under the way the program has been operated in the past, it's been based on, you know, appropriated funds. And it's been fairly minimal. The top amount I think we've gotten in any one year was \$35 million dollars.

But the revenue generated off of those properties that were purchased under ILCA and title transferred to the tribe will put the lien on the title.

The income derived from those properties goes back to paying back the lien on the property. And then those funds that are generated from that revenue go back into what's called a recoup account to purchase additional property. So it's not money that goes back to pay back any fund or anything. It goes into the recoup fund. And those funds are there, again, reused

to purchase additional properties.

2.2.

2.4

Now, under the Act, it's not the intent to have a recoup fund continue to operate. But the statute and the ILCA law requires that liens be put on. So we're looking at the process of how can we — hopefully, it's not a point where the tribes have to come in and request waivers on it every single time we do this.

So we're looking at some of the processes and what our latitude is within the operation of the statute on the lien issue.

And we've heard the tribes loud and clear.

You know, they don't want to have liens on these
properties. They want to be able to take property in
title and be able to use it.

MR. FIELDS: Jim Fields, Pawnee Nation.

When you define a lien placed on a property, that means that, if we think of a car, or a house with a lien on it, that if certain conditions are not met, then somehow we would lose title to that land. In other words, if you say a lien is placed on it and let's say, for example, we do not convey the revenues from that land to pay this lien off, then are there steps — what are the steps for maybe the United States, or whoever, whatever entity, getting title to

the land again opposing a tribe? Because when you use the term "lien," that means that there is an encumbrance against that piece of property. And whatever revenues, as you said, generated by it goes to pay off the lien.

2.2.

2.4

Well, does that mean the great White Father and the BIA and the (inaudible) agency looks after your interests and then the tribes actually lose control of that land, because the next step would be, as a lienholder, you may step in and say, well, this is the best use for that land. It goes through the process and then you're telling us how to best use the land, rather than the tribe self-determining that, you know.

So that sort of flies in the face of this idea of self-determination, self-termination.

MR. BLACK: Well, everything you're saying is one of the large drivers in the intent not to put liens on the property, because the tribes should be able to use that land.

Under the existing ILCA Act, we didn't have that option. And those revenues, you know, that were generated through the leasing process, or whatever, automatically go into a recoup fund that's all set up.

But that's not the intent of the Act.

MS. GILLETTE: We have one other.

MR. STANDING: Leslie Standing from the Wichita Tribe.

2.2.

You know, this kind of burns me up, because I lost four parcels of land in that Land Consolidation Act back in 1983 I inherited from my mother and my father. And now, I've got buy it back. You know, that's kind of, like he said, a kick in the face from this Government, again, you know.

They stepped all over Tribal Governments, saying we've got sovereign rights, and they stepped all over those sovereign rights with this payback thing on this Land Consolidation Act.

We didn't want it in 1983, but it was shoved down our throats by the Federal Government.

You know, it did not give the Tribal

Governments back then an opportunity to take a look at what we had and how to work a solution to the problem. The Federal Government said, hey, the Land

Consolidation Act is placed upon you, took the land away from us. They didn't pay us no money. Not one dime did they contribute to that land that they took. And that's what's burning me up right now. If I would have known this was in here, I never would have participated in it today.

But it just makes -- it just kicks me right in

the face. I don't know how the rest of you feel, but it does.

2.2.

For land that they placed, made a law to take the land away from us in the first place.

Fractionation of lands right now with the Wichita Tribe, and I had my transportation officer go down to the Rolls Department, and we got our allotment, about 30,000-something acres that the Wichita Tribe owned.

Now, I know, on some of my land, I know the fractionation is there real bad. And trying to let me find a solution as to how I can work it, you know, here we go again, that 1983 Act is something else. Very detrimental to Tribal Government.

And here you come back again, today, with this issue again. And I don't appreciate it. I really don't.

But I'm going to go back to my Tribal Government and try to figure out a way to find a solution to this.

And then -- you know, it really upsets me, because that land was my mother's and dad's land in the first place. We lost 100 acres in a judge's probate that went to a non-Indian, and she took it out of the trust. It was a lifetime use situation. But the

Probate Judge gave her that 100 acres. And I don't know that it's ever been put back in trust, because I took the issue to Echo Hawk back in 2008, and I never got a reply from them.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

MR. FIELDS: Jim Fields, again, with the Pawnee Nation.

I hear this brother talking over here about this Land Consolidation Act in the 1980s. And, of course, the consequence of that, as you all know at the table, you know, that in 1988, the United States Supreme Court declared that law to be unconstitutional.

And you also know -- I got those letters -- my father passed away in '83, so it was after that that Act was passed. And I got a letter from the Government saying -- and they used that two percent rule that any heirs and there was two percent or less of the total land value, that fits into that Consolidation Act back in the '80s.

So I got a letter saying all this land, many tracts of land that was succeeded to the Pawnee Nation.

And of course, in '88, when the Supreme Court reversed that decision, then I got a letter putting it

back and giving it back to me.

2.2.

2.4

But there's one part of the 25 C.F.R. today that still bothers me, because we got resentful of several tracts of land recently under that sole heir rule of 25 C.F.R. inheritance that states that, if there's a two percent interest out there that's probated and it goes to a single individual, then that land goes to the Tribe.

And to me, how could that be done because that flies in the face of the United States Constitution that prohibits the unfair taking of land. And that's what that Supreme Court decision was based on. But, yet, we use it today.

And so, in fact, that person who lost that interest, recently, which is my cousin, actually, asked me how could that happen? And what I said is it was in that 25 C.F.R. part so and so that states that.

But, to me, that sole heir rule flies in the face of unfair taking. I mean, it follows an unfair taking of the land without the Indian owner permission. But they lost the land.

These things should be considered, I guess, when you do your homework. When you pull out 25 C.F.R., you see that there are discrepancies in the regulations that we have to follow today.

There, you have what gentleman talked about where that -- I guess it was a State Judge that ordered that land be sold to a non-Indian. Well, that's very similar to what's happening in Eastern Oklahoma, where a State Court Judge, under the current probate system, goes to the State Court.

2.2.

The Genlapa (ph) Tribes here, most of us are Genlapa Tribes, the probates are done by what they call an Administrative Law Judge, employed by the Department of Interior.

So we had these -- when my dad passed away, we went to the agency in '84, and the Superintendent then or the Administrative Law Judge from Oklahoma City just divided the land up. My dad died intestate, so the land was divided equally among his six decedents.

But these things happen.

But in Eastern Oklahoma, you have a situation where -- you have a term called "forced partition."

And what that means is it means that, if I were to ask you can a piece of land be taken from an Indian in today's times without the consent, you'd probably have to answer that, no, they can't take it.

But at least in Oklahoma, the estate court system, you can be forced partitioned, and that's under a term called the 47 Act, which determines the five

tribes, the probates. State Courts -- the State Court Judge can dispose of the land. And there are cases where an undivided interest in land, a non-Indian, lawyers and stuff that have the land deeded to them, in an undivided stake can force the petitioning of that land.

2.2.

2.4

And, you know, land is very hard to divide. You cannot divide land equally. Each has different values. So you can't say five owners in a 40-acre tract, they each own eight acres. Well, that's what it is.

But when you try to divide that between the owners, you can't do it. You just cannot do it fairly.

So what the State Court Judge will do is he'll force a sale of the whole piece of property, because whereas land is hard to divide, money is not hard to divide. So the State Court Judge will order it sold.

And then, to take it one step further, the first crack at buying land are the landowners. And the other landowners have interest, being Native Americans, we don't have money available.

But who has the money is a non-Indian who has an interest in that five percent interest. But he can force a partition. And then a State Court Judge orders

the land be appraised. So the Bureau of Indian Affairs comes in and appraises the land. And then the State Court Judge can turn around and sell it to the non-Indian, or an owner maybe, at 80 percent or 90 percent of its value.

2.2.

2.4

I can't remember (inaudibile). I used to know those numbers.

Say, it's 80 percent. So you would have, then, an Indian landowner losing his land by this probate law, and the Indian ownership goes out of restricted status or trust status.

So these are things that you need to consider, when you look at this, is what laws do we have on the books now that are adversely affecting this process.

One other comment on the scholarship program, you've heard most of the statements here saying it should be administered by the tribes. And I concur -- I mean, I wholeheartedly agree with that.

But I hope that the scholarship program would mean any kind of post-high school training programs. Not only four years or graduate programs, but also the vocational schools or trade schools, you know. A lot of our Indian people may not be college equipped or college minded, and they may want to go to maybe trade schools or vocational schools. And I think the money

through this program should be made available for that kind of training, not only four-year or a graduate program, but these two-year vocational type programs, or less.

Thank you.

2.2.

2.4

MS. GILLETTE: I just wanted to thank everybody for the comments.

We're going to break for lunch now. It's almost noon, and I don't like to stand in the way of hungry folks and their food. So we're going to take a break now.

But I do want to just let you know that the comments that we're hearing here today, and we have heard some of them; others, there's -- some of the ones that were regarding the self-government tribes, you know, they're all really valuable. And the more that we have that kind of interaction and dialogue, the better decisions we can make.

I also wanted to say that, when I introduced myself, I didn't give you a background of where I'm from. I'm from the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, but I haven't ever worked for the Federal Government before. I have never been an employee there. I worked as an advocate for my tribe, both as an employee, and I worked for a nonprofit for a number of years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

```
And the only reason that I came to Washington,
D.C., is because I saw an opportunity for this
administration to really make meaningful change in
Indian country. And I don't think that I'm
disappointed because I know there's been a long
history. I never thought I would be in the Federal
Government. I never thought I would be in the
Department of Interior. But I have very good
relationships established there that give me hope.
I can say that I wouldn't be there if I didn't think
that we could do something different than what we've
done in the past.
         And I just applaud you for all of your work as
tribal leaders. I know that that is a difficult
undertaking in and of itself. And the many, many
issues that you work on day in and day out are just,
you know, right there on the ground. And you really do
have a lot on your plates every day.
         So I want to thank you for your service as
leaders of your people.
```

(Lunch Break at 12:02)

MS. SMITH: Hi, everyone. Welcome back.

So at this time, I want to open the floor.

The microphones are not ideally placed. But you're welcome to come and use either microphone. And tribal

leaders, tribal government representatives are also welcome to make additional comments.

2.2.

2.4

Please remember to introduce yourself, your name and any affiliation you'd like to share so that we can get that on the record.

And just come on up to one of these mics and feel free to share your comments.

MR. TIPPECONNIE: My name is Bob Tippeconnie with the Comanche Nation. I'm a want to be Comanche.

You know, this is a purchase of those fractionalized interests. And, as you know, we are constantly going through this future trust acquisition process. And I notice that, if you read 25 C.F.R., one of the determinations, when you do this future trust for an individual, there has to be a decision made by the decision-maker that this person has to be in need of assistance as a condition of putting it back in trust.

And I think that's unfair. Because I'm sure that, when it was taken out of trust and say the individual asked for removal, the trust did some supervision, that nobody made the determination then that this person is capable of managing their own affairs.

But it is a condition under 25 C.F.R. that

must be made before you put it back in trust. And I think that's very unfair to have that requirement, because I know that a lot of times the decision-maker, even though they may want to put it back in trust, they cannot satisfy that definition requirement of "in need of assistance."

That's all I have for now.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

MR. JACOBS: My name is Danny Jacobs. I'm Chairman of the Oklahoma Indian Honors Association and a founder of the Oilman Association of Independent (unintelligible)

The reason I'm here today is to address some of our individual Indians. This consultation should include our individual Indians. It's their land that's going to be sold, land or minerals to be sold. That's what this land consolidation is all about.

I just wondered how many of our people here have read the Claims Resolution Act of 2010. It seems like a lot of our people may not be familiar with that, since, in essence, this is the Cobell Settlement, which was passed by Congress. So our Indian tribal leaders seem to not know that this is the law that was passed. And it was forced down the individual Indian's throat, as well as the tribes that are here, without any comments or anything from the plaintiffs. The

plaintiffs' attorney said they talked to all the class members. But that is not so.

2.2.

2.4

I tried to contact the class action plaintiff attorney several times by letter and never received a reply on any of those cases.

We went to Washington, D.C., for the so-called fairness hearing. We were allotted ten minutes to have our comments. Ten minutes is not ample time to cover the situation that has been ongoing for over a 100 years now.

The trust that was established came out of the General Allotment Act and the other allotment acts that followed that. For the Five Tribes, it was 1906, was our date for the allotments to be issued.

The lack of information to our members seems to be a major problem. I don't know if you can have a fairness hearing and give a person ten minutes to address issues that's over a hundred years. I don't call that a fairness hearing, because we made our ten-minute presentation, and that very same afternoon, about 6:00 that evening, the Judge gave a decision.

He had no time to consider those comments that were presented that day, even documentation that was presented that day. He had no time to absorb all that in that short period of time. But, yet, he gave his

decision, and that's the reason this case is being appealed right now, because Congress passed an act and imposed it on the judicial system. And land consolidation was never a part of the Cobell class action until this Settlement Agreement came about. And it created a whole other set of class members.

2.2.

2.4

I'm astounded that this can happen in our society today that we don't have true separation of powers with our Federal Government. And that's part of the reason that this case is being appealed, because not all class members' situations were the same.

You know, there's a recent decision on the Wal-Mart decision where Wal-Mart won a class action lawsuit because of that very fact, that the class members' situations were not so similarly situated. And I feel like this should be the same way.

But we're fighting an uphill battle, because Congress has already mandated this Settlement Agreement, and President Obama has signed off on it.

So the Courts are going to just rubber stamp this regardless of what we do.

And we're going to live with it, the Indian people. The Indian people have always been the losers anytime there's a settlement agreement that's been made. We always lose.

```
The 1.9 billion that is set aside that we were
 1
 2
      talking about the land consolidation, the 1.6 billion
 3
      there, this should have been money that went to the
      individual Indians.
 4
 5
               There's still strings attached to this 1.9
 6
     billion dollars. The Government has control over those
 7
      strings. When you put a limit on how long you have to
 8
      resolve the issue, ten years, but it takes 10 years to
 9
      get off high center for the Government to do anything.
               So a lot of this money may go back to the U.S.
10
11
      Treasury. And who ends up being the loser? But the
12
      only way you can participate in this land consolidation
13
      for an individual, like myself, is to sell your land or
                 So you're giving up something in return for
14
     minerals.
15
      a settlement agreement back.
               I plan on writing up written comments to
16
17
      submit, but I just wanted to address that concern
18
      today.
19
               Thank you.
20
               MR. BLACK:
                           Thank you.
21
               Is there anybody else?
2.2.
               MS. DeROSIER: My name is Brenda DeRosier.
23
      I'm from the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma.
2.4
               Some tribal members believe that this land
```

consolidation -- they believe they can sell their land

25

and still live on it. Is that true? Or is that a misconception? Especially, if the land goes back to the Tribe.

2.2.

2.4

MR. BLACK: I guess I don't have a firm answer for you on that, other than it'd be kind on a case-by-case basis. It would take working with the tribe on that to do so. You're probably talking about a home site lease or some other arrangement at that point, because the ownership of the land would be reverted over to the Tribe at that point.

MS. DeROSIER: On that, the ownership of the land being reverted back to the tribe, I thought the reason allotments were made was to assimilate the Tribes. And here you are trying to put it back in. Is it because that action was such a failure?

MR. BLACK: The fractionation that happened was a direct result of the Allotment Act, and then the probate and further addition fractionation of the land through continuous probate, it's at a point where a lot of these lands, we may have a 40-acre parcel of land with over a thousand owners on it. No one person really has ownership of that land. Everybody owns a small piece.

So through this process, you know, and being able to buy up fractionated interests and get it into a

position where the Tribe actually has majority interest in a piece of land, hopefully, or a hundred percent interest, they're able to actually use that land. And that land can be used for economic development or home site leases or other purpose.

2.2.

2.4

But as it stands right now, so much of what we're talking about when we say "highly fractionated," it's just that. No one person really has any ownership or control of that land.

MS. DeROSIER: I'm a one-eighth Sac and Fox. And I have an interest, 1/6 interest in 160 acres. And there were probably 10 to 12 people. And nothing can be done with that. To me, that's not highly rational. But we can't do anything with the land except lease it and then get a portion of the lease.

MR. BLACK: There, again, it takes a majority consent or, depending on where you are and what the threshold is for consent in order to be able to do certain things with that land.

MS. DeROSIER: Well, it was leased, and I was never -- no one ever came to me asking whether or not I agreed to that lease.

MR. BLACK: It may be a case of they had a majority interest or majority consent from the other owners. So, at that point, they had enough consents to

```
1
     be able to go forward with the lease. I don't know the
2
     exact circumstances of that lease.
3
               MR. TIPPECONNIE: Bob Tippeconnie, Comanche
4
     Nation.
5
               I still have a question on the administrative
6
     there. You know, if the Nation, the Indian Nation
7
     takes it on, as I stated we would like to do, which we
8
     are attempting to do as a nation, the administrative
9
     costs, we need that. So that administrative cost needs
     to be part of the actions that we're going to undertake
10
11
     at the Nations.
12
               Now, I just have a question:
                                             Is the
13
     administrative costs going to be in the hands of the
     DOI and case by case, or if we bring forward all these
14
15
     tracts that we would like to acquire and you advise,
     well, here's this amount of administrative for that?
16
17
               So what I'm saying, I'm not going to ask a
18
     question. I just want to say that we're doing it, we
19
     want the appropriate administrative costs.
```

MR. BLACK: Is there anyone else in the audience that has any comments or anyone at the table, for that matter?

20

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MR. CASIAS: Yes. I'd like to say a little bit about serving.

I'm Bob Casias, Chief of BLM for this region

and for New Mexico, Texas, and Kansas, as well.

2.2.

2.4

I guess, Mr. Black, I would just like to say that the administrative trust model was, I think, very successful in the way of addressing boundaries for Indian Country. And the BLM is the only Federal Agency that's authorized to do, on Federal lands, to identify them, has played a pretty major role in that reform. And I think it's been pretty successful. We have also BLM Indian land surveyors in each of the BIA Regional Offices. And I think that has been successful.

And as someone here at the table said earlier, before you get an appraisal done, you actually have to have a survey, as well. And if the survey is going to be expected to be a land survey, then I would hope that the Department would give some consideration to what BLM's capacities and abilities are in this regard. Because with the shortfall last year in the program, offices, like mine, had to decrease in personnel.

And so there may not be enough of us around to do this work for the department. But I would hope that, you know, consideration is given for not only the appraisals, but also for the work that's going to have to happen on the survey site when it comes to BLM.

MS. SMITH: Thanks.

If I could just also remind you, the goal here

```
1
      is to hear as much from the public and the stakeholders
2
     as possible. I'm going to ask for department employees
3
     to -- there's other mechanisms for input. So we're
4
     going to try to be in a listening mode here today.
5
               Are there any other comments, questions,
6
      input?
7
               MR. TIPPECONNIE: Tippeconnie again, Comanche
8
     Nation.
9
               I have one question on this one. I can see
     the Nation identifying with what you're attempting to
10
     do, get all this under our areas of influence and
11
12
      jurisdiction.
13
               But is there something forthcoming as further
      advisory to the individual landowners?
14
                           In regards to?
15
               MR. BLACK:
               MR. TIPPECONNIE: In regards to this action.
16
17
               MS. GILLETTE: The land consolidation?
18
               MR. TIPPECONNIE: Yes. We will do that, of
19
     course. But it seems to me that these questions on the
20
     whole of the Cobell matter that, at some point, there
21
     needs to be some conveyance, some assurance that this
2.2.
      is, you know, proceeding. And it seems to me it has to
23
     come from the level, you know --
               MR. BLACK: And James can, possibly,
2.4
25
     elaborate. But as it stands right now, we still have
```

the no contact orders with the class plaintiffs. And we're very, very limited in our scope in what we're able to communicate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Unfortunately, there is a lot of information that needs to get out that we just can't really share or discuss at this point.

MR. FERGUSON: Mike summed it up exactly.

Again, we had to get permission for Mike and Jodi to

come out and have this conversation. And so the points

you made are very, very valid and it will be very, very

helpful.

But until the Court grants that permission, we cannot do that.

MS. NIGHTWALKER: My name is Jane Nightwalker. I'm with the Cheyenne Arapaho Tribes.

Sir, you keep talking about administrative costs. I thought administrative costs were going to be coming out of the 1.9 million. Are we wrong, or is that going to be achieved by when we buy these lands back from (inaudible).

Also, another question I have, when I first read the Cobell suit, I was under the understanding that Cobell was going to provide the scholarship money as part of the settlement. I did not, in any way, know that we, as Tribes, were going to have to create our

own scholarship funds through this program of acquiring these lands back.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

That kind of seems like another way of the Government getting out of its responsibility to provide these services through our past treaties.

Also, I wanted to ask, we were talking about the minerals. Are we also talking about water rights? Are we also talking about all the rights that these individuals have to these lands? Are these going to be — is the tribe going to be able to retain all of those?

And, also, I had another question -- with that in mind, it kind of sounds -- I don't know. It sounds like really bad faith that we're dealing with, with the possibility of putting a lien on land that they gave us through a settlement to acquire our land back on behalf of Tribes.

My dad used to say that's another way of getting in the back door again, you know. And we're all the losers. It seems like we're always the loser.

You have to excuse me. I've just been in a government position, a Tribal Government position the last two years. Before this, I was a Comanche member. So this is all new to me.

So I'm really looking at it from a prospective

we have fractionated lands, because there's so many of us on there. And I'm kind of concerned, just like when are you going to take the individual allotee's land? What if they choose not to, what if my tribe says, no, we don't want to? Then, you know, how are you going to deal with that? Because that might not happen.

Some of us don't feel like it's a good deal.

It's always, like, I hate to say this, we're always getting left out. We just invited you out to visit and we didn't see us being conquered and divided, you know. We asked you to come and share with us. And we're always getting left out again.

But those are just some of the questions I have.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MR. BLACK: Thank you very much.

First off, let me say you're analysis of the lien issue is one of the best ones I think I've heard in the way you described that, framed that. I think that's exactly right. And that's why I say it's not the intent of the Act, the way we see it, either, that we put liens on this property. This is a settlement.

And a couple of these real quick. The admin costs, yes, they do come out of the 1.9 billion

dollars. It's not anything that the tribes have to come up with to cover the admin costs on this program.

2.2.

2.4

The scholarship fund, there, again, that also comes out of the 1.9 billion. It does come out of the settlement. It does not come out of anybody's payments, but it is — it comes out of that 1.9 billion, a percentage equivalent to the payment somehow based on some sliding scales. And different things that are in the settlement will contribute to the scholarship fund.

So I hope that answers those questions.

And, oh. The other thing is this is purely voluntary. If someone does not want to sell their fractional interest, they do not have to. This is a willing seller program.

MR. JACOBS: Jay Jacobs again.

I'm very appreciative of the BLM gentleman making his comments about the surveys that will have to be done. Because in the past, I've requested surveys, and I know it takes a lengthy time to get a survey. So if they don't have the staff to do these surveys, how are we going to get our appraisals on these small tracts of land that are going to be sold? If you have a thousand requests to sell property in one region, or more, then how — is the staff going to be able to

cover these? And then is that going to be part of the administrative costs that we're talking about, as well, goes to them?

2.2.

2.4

MR. BLACK: Basically, anything associated with the implementation of the Indian Land Consolidation Program, including appraisals, surveys, those aspects of it, will come out of the administrative costs.

MR. TIPPECONNIE: Bob Tippeconnie, Comanche Nation.

Going back to that point made there, the administrative costs. So if a nation decided that they would, with certified appraisers, certified surveyors, do the whole package, they could do it that way. That's what I would suggest. I think that's a very strong option to some Indian Nations to contract that if they don't have the capability in-house. But I think it makes it easier for the matter to be expedited.

MS. GILLETTE: Also, I just wanted to address the issue that my husband brought up couple of times with the surveys. We do have regular communications with BLM, Marshal Burke and Bob Abbey. And we know that there's concern there from the BLM on the side. But there's an appropriate time and place to discuss

that, and this is for the public and tribal leaders to have this discussion.

2.2.

2.4

MS. NIGHTWALKER: Jane Nightwalker again.

I have -- on your gold screen, Strategy 9, it says tribal consolidation (inaudible) identified and target those facts that would be considered as having economic development potential for the tribes.

You know, tribal people, we necessarily don't always look at economic development. We've always held that only land is one of the greatest things you can own. It's the only think that no one can ever take away from you, until now.

But because of that, as a tribe, will we be able to determine, through sovereignty, the best route that we see if it's not economic development? If it's just land acquired just to have a bigger land base for the future, is that something that we will have a say on as a tribe?

MS. GILLETTE: I think, for the land consolidation piece, the first and foremost the Indian Land Consolidation Act requires the Department to consult with the tribes on is the prioritization of the tracts, you know, even without the Cobell Settlement. So that's one of that places we are by law required. Mr. Tippeconnie and myself work on different parts of

the consolidation. There's only some pieces that are required by law that we have to consult on.

2.2.

2.4

And it is absolutely the prioritization of which tracts should be consolidated. And then how that gets translated into the bigger plan, you know. I see that part myself as being woven throughout all of the different things that we're doing. So it's not going to be a "yes" or "no" question of whether or not tribes are going to be consulted on that piece.

And the other thing is that I know that we did a lot of shortening of our language to make the goals really simplistic and very straightforward. But I know that, when we — and we've always discussed this goal of ordered prioritization by tribes. It doesn't necessarily just mean only economic development, because it says up there "economic development."

What you're saying about the inherent value of the land because of, like Mike said, historic or cultural reasons, those are things that the tribes can put forward. They can put forward. Like some tribes talk about camp areas. Some people talk about ancient dwellings or some sacred part that is some sacred lands they value very highly and would prioritize at the top of the list to keep consolidated or to consolidate and put into tribal control.

So those are all things that, you know, by you bringing them up, it is a really good reminder that we, you know, in our haste to make things really concise, we do need to put back those principles that originally we started out with. And we need to be explicit about that.

2.2.

it won't.

MR. HORSE: Ricky Horse with the Kiowa Tribe.

We've been talking about this land

consolidation. But, also, there was some talk about a

lien on these lands. What kind of guarantee is there

that there won't be any liens put on this. You say so,

But, as we know, the Government can do whatever they want to do. And that's to take away our lands. And that's all we've got. You know, I think that's why these lands are so fractionated, is because that's all we have. Like this man said, here, that ties us back to our families, from generation to generation.

I talked with Mr. Tippeconnie. We lost some lands that's valuable over there, sold them for nothing. How do we get them back?

And are we going to lose our lands because of a lien that was put on? And how are they going to do that when this is trust property? You go through a

bank and try to get a home, buy a car and you mention land, is it trust property? Well, they're going to back up and say, well, I'm sorry, we can't help you. And, yet, we're talking about liens put on our lands.

2.2.

2.4

Is there a guarantee that that won't happen after all this is said and done, because a lot of our Tribes ain't got the money to pay back that loan. Our Tribe has got a million dollars. How are we going to pay that debt? Do we lose or lands?

MR. BLACK: That message, like I said before, has come across loud and clear from all of the tribes. And, as I stated, it's not the intent of the Act or our intent to be placing liens.

And as far as the payback, you know, we have current processes in the Indian Land Consolidation.

And the payback is purely based from the property. And that's one of the issues with the current Indian Land Consolidation Program is that some of the parcels, quite honestly, don't generate any income. So those liens, basically, are just going to sit there for — it could be 100 years. And it's still tribe land. We're not going to take it back because it's got a lien on it.

So that's another issue for, really, maybe another argument for not having a lien put on some of

these properties. If it's a religious or a cultural property, that's of great value to the tribe, yet it probably doesn't generate any income. So what's the point of having a lien on it? It's not going to pay itself off.

2.2.

2.4

MR. HORSE: I think there has to be some kind of guarantee. I mean, we can say this. We can say it now, but what's to say tomorrow, when it goes back to somebody else? You know, I believe this: Not everything is free. You have to earn it some way or another, whether you work for it, or whatever. But nothing is free.

So I'd still like to go back to this: What kind of guarantee is it that's going to say that this land is not going to be held up, that there's going to be a lien put on it? Because if that's so, then I don't want no part of it because we might lose it.

MR. BLACK: I wish I was, but I'm not in a position to give you that guarantee today. I can promise you we do have our Solicitor's Office and the people that really need to be involved in this looking at what our options are. And as soon as those options are developed, we'll be bringing those out (inaudible) consultation as a part of the implementation plan of the Indian Land Consolidation Program.

1 MR. HORSE: Will that type of information go 2 out to all our tribes on what's going to take place? 3 And that's not something that's going to happen tomorrow, and then they expect it the next day? 4 5 MR. BLACK: This will all go out, it will all 6 be generated as part of the implementation plan. 7 MS. GILLETTE: And I think that -- but you do 8 make a really important point that we want to have your 9 continued involvement and feedback. This is the first stage. We want to give you a plan, and then we'd like 10 11 to have your feedback on that plan. 12 And knowing that we're up against a ten-year 13 time frame, somebody said it takes a long time for the Government to move. Well, it does. And that's why we 14 15 are trying our best to move quickly. But we are also respectfully requesting that 16 17 the tribes also move quickly with us so that it's not 18 eating into the ten-year time frame when the judge 19 issues that as final. 20 I'm hopeful that he will resolve the appeals 21 in a short period of time. 2.2. And so we're on a time frame where we think 23 this is going to happen next year, you know, like, 2.4 early in the year. So we need to have a really good

communication with you all so that, when we do put this

25

plan out there, you can look for the issue about the liens, and you can comment on it as soon as you see it and, you know, give us feedback as quickly and as fast as possible so that we can make modifications before we go into the implementation, the actual implementation phase.

MR. PASEKO (ph): A.J. Paseko.

2.2.

2.4

I have one more comment. Mr. Black said it would be strictly on a one-to-one basis on who wanted to sell their land on a voluntary basis. And now I hear you talk about economic development and all that.

So this individual wants to sell their land. So the Government is going to buy something like what's the old saying, "I buy an opinion of both." You don't know what you're buying until the appraisal is done and all that.

If someone wants to sell their lands to the tribes that want it, are they still going to be able to sell their land in this part of it?

MR. BLACK: I think that's something probably that still has to be decided through consultation with the tribes and the priorities. The tribes may still look at that as options and alternatives for individual members to be able to sell that if that's what their desire is. But, there again, we have a lot of those

```
1
     kinds of questions that still have to be answered,
2
      including the consultation and implementation process.
3
               MR. PASEKO: So, in essence, just because you
4
     want to sell your land, you may not be able to sell it?
5
               MR. BLACK:
                           It's possible. I can't say that
6
     that's the case. Until we get further into the
7
     program, I can't really answer that one.
8
               MS. GILLETTE: Right. And I think that it's
9
      fair to say that there's a limit on how much funding we
     have. So are we able to buy all the fractionated
10
      interest in the United States of 1.6 billion dollars?
11
12
     Probably not.
13
               So is there a chance that we are going to be
      able to buy some land and we're going to have to not be
14
15
     able to buy some land? It could possibly be the case.
               MR. PASAKO: Well, our Indian people aren't
16
17
      dumb. They're not going to sell that land if it's
18
     available.
19
               MS. GILLETTE: Right. And they don't have to.
20
      There has to be a willing seller.
21
               And that's something that we know. We know
2.2.
     that we have a -- I always say that these are our
23
     constraints that we're working under. We have a finite
2.4
      set of money. We have a finite set of landholders.
```

have a finite set of willing sellers. We don't know

25

what that is. We've never done anything like this, so we don't know who would be willing to sell and who wouldn't be willing to sell.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

So it's very difficult to say that we would be able to take all of the willing sellers and be able to buy land. But it's also very difficult, say -- with those kinds of variables that we don't really know yet, it's hard to say, you know, how all of that will play out.

And that's why we're coming to you guys to try to get the best strategies that will make the most sense for tribes and for the communities. Because at the end of day, the individual landowners are part of the community.

And I think this came up in the last consultation that the -- I think it was in Phoenix.

One of the tribal leaders had stated, you know, I go back to my voters. That's who I answer to. So I need more information to better inform the individual landowners. If we can't communicate with them directly as the Federal Government, the tribes certainly can.

MS. SMITH: Any other comments?
Yes, sir.

MR. MAYNAHONAH: You mentioned at the end of the day, there's going to be a lot of disappointment

```
among a lot of individual landowners who will not be able to sell their land when you reach that capital of 1.4 million dollars.

So now this purported board is going to work around that. I know it's not up to you people. It's going to be up to the board, right?

MS. GILLETTE: No.
```

2.2.

2.4

MR. MAYNAHONAH: It's going to be up to the Government?

MS. GILLETTE: We're the Government. We represent the Government.

MR. MAYNAHONAH: Well, they're the ones that got the money.

MR. BLACK: I'm not 100 sure how to answer that. What we're talking about is the 1.4 billion for fractionation. And I think Jodi probably said it best, is we really don't know what our universe is out there of willing sellers. I mean, there, again, on the same hand, there's a lot of people out there that would probably like to sell their fractionated interests. And I think we can all have personal stories of people that have some very small interests, but they're not about to sell, because it is their one tie back to that land. And they're not about to let go of it.

I mean, I, personally, have some family

```
1
     members that are in that position. And they're not
2
     going to sell.
3
               So it's really hard to judge just what our
4
      environment is.
5
               1.4 billion is a lot of money. If we were to
6
     go out and buy every fractionated interest out there,
7
     that's not going to be enough. And every day, lands
8
      still get fractionated through probate (inaudible).
9
               This is, hopefully, a step in the right
     direction. But it's not going the eliminate fractions.
10
               Ma'am?
11
12
               MS. DeROSIER: My name is Brenda DeRosier.
                                                            Ι
13
      am the sole owner of 40 acres of Kickapoo land. And I
     do have a Will. Okay, will my heirs inherit my land as
14
15
      I have proposed in my Will, or will that go through
     probate as if I didn't have a Will and return it to the
16
17
     trust?
18
               MR. FERGUSON: Unfortunately, ma'am, we cannot
19
     answer that question. We really have constraints put
20
     on us by the communication ban that says they we are
21
     only allowed to speak about fractionation and land
```

MS. DeROSIER: Okay. Well, it wasn't until I looked at this fractionation when all this was brought

consolidation related to the Cobell settlement. So,

unfortunately, I have to ask him not to answer that.

2.2.

23

2.4

25

up that I started to realize what could happen with a sole owner's property once they're deceased, whether they have a Will or not.

2.2.

2.4

And then the other thing is as Kickapoo, currently, the BIA handles our realty. And my tribe is looking at taking over that realty. Currently, within the tribe, they don't have the capability to do that. Handling land is very complex. And there is no way they can do that.

And I don't know if this is the proper forum to make that statement or not.

MR. BLACK: Honestly, it probably isn't. But we do have the Regional Director here from the Southern Plains. If you'd like to raise that issue with him after we get done today, I'm sure he'll be able to visit with you a little bit about the process of that.

And you're talking about the 638 in the program, self-government.

MS. SMITH: Anyone else?

MS. GILLETTE: I just want to say this is really, by far, on of the most engaging consultations that we've had, and, you know, just the questions and the thoughtfulness and the comments that have been put forward today have been really helpful for me in trying to think through what our next steps should be. Some

```
1
      new ideas, we've heard today, and new things that I
 2
     haven't thought about before has just been really been
      great.
               I know that we have other people in the
 4
 5
      audience. We want to give everyone a full opportunity
 6
      to talk if they'd like to. And if they feel like it's
 7
      appropriate, we can keep going as long as you all want.
 8
               We're here, it's says, until 4:00. And, you
 9
      know, we do request that we stay on tract with what the
      topic of the classification is.
10
11
               MS. DEERE: I just have some more comments.
12
               Kathy Deere with the Absentee Shawnee Tribe.
13
      I'm the Treasurer there.
               Listening to all of this, different ones
14
15
      speaking, if all of these consultations that you've
      had, and you've had, what, six, five, so far?
16
17
               MS. GILLETTE: This is the sixth.
18
               MS. DEERE: This is the sixth.
19
               After all of these, have you gotten an idea?
20
      Is that where this goals and stuff has come about, is
21
     by listening to these prior consultations?
2.2.
               MS. GILLETTE:
                              No.
               MR. BLACK: These were some things that we
23
2.4
      developed during internal discussions to, hopefully,
25
      invoke some of the comments and some of the issues, you
```

know, to at least bring some things out that gave the tribes opportunities to think about and provide comments back.

2.2.

2.4

MS. DEERE: In my situation, our tribe's situation, we're real close to the Potawatomie Tribe. The Federal Government gave us the same land, basically, you know. And it's -- we've had Court cases against each other on this type of thing. And it's just real burdensome, you know, to know that the Federal Government can do this to tribes, you know, give the same lands, just about, you know. In order to get any lands in trust, we have to go and ask another Tribe, you know. Anyway.

But a lot of our lands that we have in our Tribe, these are sacred lands to us. We do perform our traditional dances. We bury a lot of our loved ones on our lands. And so it's a real cultural preservation thing for us.

Being a small tribe, we have a little over 3,400 tribal members now. We lowered our bloodlines. But, you know, being a small tribe, we want to economically grow. But it's kind of difficult at times when we can't get the land that we need, because it's so fractionated.

And a lot of it is fee land, you know, and

it's really difficult for us to -- we want to be able to survive on our own because we're self-governed, we're self-determined, you know. We want to be self-sufficient, eventually. We don't what to depend on the Federal Government for everything, you know. We want to be able to take care of our own tribal members.

2.2.

And this is what my goal is from my tribal members, is to try to bring in economic development. But then, again, be sure and keep our culture alive, too.

Our Governor, he's real dedicated in the cultural preservation part. He's one of our affluent speakers. He teaches our language to the other Shawnee Tribes and to our absentee members, too. So I know he's really concerned about, you know, this fractionated land, you know. Like some people may not want to sell, but some people want to because they just have, like, a 1/16th of a piece of land, you know. It's really not worth anything.

But I'm sure the money that will come down to all these tribes is not going to be enough. You've already said it's not going to be enough for all of us to be able to get, to pay everybody who wants to sell, you know.

I was reading some of the transcripts, and I'm

one of those people that gets like six cents from that, for my IM account, you know. And, I guess, if there's other people on that same tract, they're getting the same amount as me, you know. So maybe we can just sell it back to the tribe. And that way, the tribe can take care of it.

2.2.

2.4

But then, again, it comes back to the cultural thing, because most of the land that I'm part owner of is culturally preserved. We do our traditional dances there. We hunt there. A lot of our burial, our elders are buried there.

And I just want to make sure that the Federal Government understands that it's really up to the tribes, especially, if we're self-governed and self-determined, you know, that we have the most say about what happens to our lands, you know, what's going to be done with it, you know. We want to make sure that we have our voices in that and not be left out because, you know, just like one person said, you know, we didn't intend for all these foreigners to come over here and stay. You know, we were just being friendly, helpful. We didn't want them to die because we're that type of people.

And it's just so hard to, you know, say, okay, we'll sell this land. It really needs to come to our

tribal members that deserve it, you know. Because a lot of our tribal members have passed on, and it's all trickled down to me.

2.2.

2.4

I remember one time my elders said, that
BIA -- this is a pun for BIA. They're just called Boss
Indians Around, you know. And it just seems it's
always been that way.

It's just like we don't have the opportunity to take care of our own business. And, you know, the reason why my tribe is self-governed is because we want to try to take care of ourselves. We want to take care of our tribal members and our future children and our grandchildren. And that's why I really believe that a lot of this land consolidation needs to come back to these tribes that are self-governing.

And it's something that, you know, only we know what is good for our tribal people, because they let us know, you know. We're the elected officials. They tell us what's wrong, you know, what they want. And, in order to explain, like someone said, explain to our tribal members, we've got to put it in easy terms, draw pictures, you know, that they will understand.

And I just want to be able to go back to my tribal members and tell them, okay, this is what is going to come about. But, hopefully, I would like to

tell them that, since we're self-governed, that we can decide what to do with our land ourselves, you know.

You can provide us the guidelines, give us your thoughts and bring it to us, but, you know, let us take care of what we know, because the Federal Government doesn't know every situation that happens within our tribe and our tribal members and the land situations.

So I just wanted to say that comment.

Thank you.

2.2.

2.4

MR. BLACK: Thank you.

MS. GILLETTE: That's really helpful in the context of understanding what lands mean to people and the value, not just the economic or the monetary value of things, but all of the things that are tied to the land as Indian people.

And I just want to say that I've had the fortune to work with the head of the boss of the boss, and it just reminds me that, you know, working with Mike and the people that are (inaudible), because I'm new to the Federal Government, it really is — we hired people, we put people in place to make sure that we are attuned to the fact that tribes really want to be in charge and control of their resources and in control of the decisions for the future. And I can't think of

anybody better to work with than Mike in this respect.

And it reminded me of a joke that Joe Medicine Crow said at the last Tribal Nations Conference. He said it's no longer bossing the Indians around. It's bring Indians around.

MS. SMITH: Anyone else?

2.2.

2.4

MR. FIELDS: Jim Fields, Pawnee.

I know we're probably nearing the end of this. But I'm just wondering how do you view the next step in this process? Are you talking about trying to design or come up with a schedule? And then you said further consultation with the tribes in hope that — you know, historically, when the Government consults with the tribes, it was through the Federal Register. That wasn't very accurate or with any appropriate responses.

So I'm hoping that it's something more than that, because -- and that's probably why you don't see a lot of tribal leaders here. I've been to meetings -- I think I went to one in Nashville of couple of months ago on Indian Health Service. And I think there were three tribes represented out of 273.

And I think the reason for that is, historically, you have these meetings. And we come and give you comments, heartfelt comments, statements that we really believe in. And then you go back to

Washington and the decision is made, and it's like you never even paid at any attention to us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

So a lot of the tribal leaders' position here is that, so what? You're going to do what you want to do anyway.

And then the response has always been, you know, it's in the Federal Register.

So I know that President Obama, to his credit, when he came on, he redefined the consultation process. In fact, he gave an executive order and ordered all executive departments to consult with Indian Tribes.

I know for those around the table here, we were getting invitation to consultations that we hadn't even heard before, the Defense Department, others that have never sought to consult with us. But now they're consulting with us, because of that executive order.

So I hope that what comes out of these meetings is something more than just, you know, given this voice support, that it really means something to the leaders. What we say here really means something.

And when you, you know, historically, I think the Federal Government has always taken a divide and conquer concept. I heard that initial speaker that said something like this is not, you know -- this is not -- we're not here to argue with each other.

Because you know, I've always said this in all my presentations, that, you know, historically, you know, we fought with each other. The Sioux and you and I are traditional enemies. So I'm not going to talk to you no more.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

But I also understand that there's a need for that, is that, you know -- and I've always said this. I said, you came in, the Government, you know, and Pawnees, as you know, we sided with the soldiers. We were scouts along with the Crows and others that we were aligned to. Because we, at that time, we thought our enemies were the Sioux or the Cheyenne. So we fought to defeat the Sioux and defeat Cheyenne. So we'd just work with them against our enemies.

But you know what? Our real enemy was the soldiers and the White people. We conquered ourselves.

After the Indian wars were over and these tribes started to begin to be relocated, guess what? We were out in front again in Nebraska.

So I think that's one reason we don't give all that tribal skepticism on the part of tribal leaders.

And they're just meaning (inaudible).

So I know it's still yet to be seen. And so I hope that Jodi and these others when it comes out, that

you won't penalize us Pawnees because we were your enemies and we defeated you.

But, you know, when Indians can tease each other, as you know, that means they like you. We don't tease people we don't like, like these Comanches over here.

When I meet with Bob, I have to talk slow, you know, because he's Comanche. If I talk too fast, let me know. If I need to draw a picture, let me know. But that's teasing each other. We're really united in what we're saying here.

I think you heard us all express a common voice and common concerns. And I hope that you take this message back with you when you develop your procedures, or whatever you do to get this thing off the ground, and that you'll keep us in the loop, so to speak.

Thank you.

2.2.

2.4

MS. GILLETTE: Thank you.

And I do want to clarify that I am Lakota, but I married an Arikara so my kids are half Lakota and half Arikara. I did manage to capture one of your greatest basketball players.

MR. FIELDS: Well, did you good. I guess you know the Arikara, they speak Pawnee.

```
1
               MS. GILLETTE: Yes, I understand that.
                                                       That's
2
     why I wanted to relate to you that in that way.
3
               MR. FIELDS: You raised up about two points.
4
               MS. GILLETTE: Because he was captured.
5
               Anything else? Are there any closing comments
6
     that tribal leaders want to make before we wrap up?
7
               MR. TIPPECONNIE: Bob Tippeconnie, Comanche
8
     Nation.
9
               I want to say one thing: I hear my brother
      speaking, you know, that sometimes we don't participate
10
     as tribes and tribal leaders because we've had some
11
12
     question whether that's going to be followed through
13
      for us.
               But the thing that I've learned in the past
14
15
      few years, you know, it's a grand opportunity for
      Indian Nations to participate and to speak up and be
16
17
     present. And, you know, Jodi, the last time we were
18
     together in D.C., we had an issue, the Comanche Nation
19
     did. We had access to the Solicitor. And that was
20
     terrific, you know.
21
               So I think that times are grand right now.
2.2.
     And we need to spread that among our tribal leaders
23
     that, you know, it's our time to make a difference,
2.4
     because we're being heard as tribal leaders, as
25
     governments.
```

So I want to extend my appreciation to you all, because I know we have this tendency to say that the BIA, whatever. But to me, I throw those out of my mind anymore, because it's in our hands more. And if it doesn't happen, it's because we're not participating and we're not asserting ourselves, because it is a grand opportunity right now.

And I just wanted to say that from the Comanche Nation. And I'm sure some of the other tribal leaders may have something to say.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MS. GILLETTE: Thank you.

MS. DEERE: Kathy Deere, Absentee Shawnee.

I just want to thank you all for giving us this opportunity to express our thoughts and ideas and comments, because before, you know, we seem like we never had that chance. And now, it's different. We've got the chance now, and I appreciate that very much.

And I thank you for what you can tell us. We know there's a lot of things that we want to know, but you can't tell us right now. And I just hope that, once you get your strategy, your goals, whatever you're going to do, that it happens quick, and that, you know, we can start working quick on it, too. Because, you know, this concerns a lot of us, you know.

```
So we want this done, you know, pretty quickly
1
2
      on this appeal thing. So you know, this Notice of
3
     Appeal, you said, it has passed. October 4th was the
      last deadline, right? So they can't appeal no more
4
5
     after that, or can they?
6
               MS. GILLETTE: No.
7
               MS. DEERE: So they probably -- the judge may
8
     hear it. Hopefully, you said, early 2012 we may be
9
      able to start working toward this goal?
10
               MS. GILLETTE: Yes.
11
               MS. DEERE:
                           That would be great.
12
               MS. GILLETTE: If we're lucky.
13
               MS. DEERE: If we're lucky. I know it always
14
     depends on that.
15
               Again, I thank all of you for coming, and I
     appreciate you letting us talk.
16
17
               MR. GOVER: Marshall Gover, Pawnee Nation.
18
               You know, I participate in a lot of
19
     consultations of different things. Sometimes we do get
2.0
      frustrated because it seems like so many times we're
21
     told what the consultation is going to consist of. And
2.2.
      it bothers us sometimes because the consultation is
23
      supposed to be with the tribal leaders and what the
2.4
     tribes want. And sometimes it doesn't always work out
```

25

that way.

But I do want to thank you for coming.

And in my lifetime, I have seen a switch in the BIA from the way it used to be to the way it is now and the ways of the mother-in-law Bureau. We've been dictated to, now being helpful and trying to help us be self-determined when it comes to discussing shares, this is your share and not trying to hold back things and trying to justify helping us.

But I do want to go on the record for sure about that education. I do believe that that should be administered by the tribes that comes down to the ones that are fractionated, that should be administered by us. Because a lot of us have tribal colleges, a lot of us may have trade schools.

I want to go on the record that that should be for us to decide.

Thank you.

2.2.

2.4

MS. GILLETTE: Thank you.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible), again.

I appreciate you coming and letting the public have a voice in this. And our individual Indians had stood along in this Cobell deal with the plaintiffs' attorneys with little support from our tribal leaders in the past. Now the tribal leaders are getting a gift from the Federal Government at the expense of the

individual Indians.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

Thank you.

MS. NIGHTWALKER: Jane Nightwalker from the Cheyenne Arapaho Tribes.

I know we have a lot of pros and cons. But one of our traditions is to own our own land. And we, the Cheyenne Arapaho Tribe had started out with a program, and we're hoping to acquire our lands.

I know that we lost over 50,000 acres of land in the northwest part of Oklahoma. And even though some people may say that I don't know what I'm talking about, I look at this as one way of having control to acquire our lands from those individuals that may someday sell to a nontribal member. And this land will be taken from us.

So I'm the kind of person that tries to take the good with the bad and always look on how our people, especially our younger generation, in the end, because when we're gone, they'll still have the land base.

And provided through the settlement, it may not be the best, but at least we're going to have the ability to acquire these lands where tribes don't have money to acquire lands.

I totally didn't agree with the Cobell case,

but it is here. And as my father used to say, you have to make the best of it. And now that we are here to serve our tribal members, I don't agree with a lot of these things.

I didn't sign with Cobell, because I didn't agree with it. But, as a tribal leader, we have to look out for the benefit of our people. And that's building our land base, always having that land base so that our children who may not have a home one day we can provide those homes as a tribe because of the land base. Because I see our tribe lose thousands of acres out of trust that's gone out of trust and will never be gotten back.

And I may be wrong, but I think this is good and bad. I can stand here and say I don't like this. I stand here and say we can acquire our land back. It's one way we are assured of getting land back from our people on behalf of them so that they can utilize it again, through benefits, through programs that, you know, we may derive from these things.

So I'll probably catch it when I get home, but that's just an opinion I wanted to express.

Thank you.

2.0

2.2.

2.4

MS. SMITH: Do we have any other closing from tribal leaders?

Do we have any closing from the members?

MR. FIELDS: Yes, I too, want to thank you all for coming. And I think that there's another term,

"the proof is in the pudding." So we did see that pudding.

2.2.

I know that you all are doing your best. I congratulate you. I know your task is not easy. It's a hard task. We know that we can't satisfy everybody because every tribe has its own priorities. We've probably got 500-and-some-odd priorities that you have to deal with. So it's -- I don't envy the task that you have before you.

I would just encourage you all to be fair to all the tribes and to know that -- I really, sincerely, say this, that you're first an American Indian and, second, you're a United State citizen. But put your tribe first, because if you grew up in the White man's world, you know -- my dad was always telling me, he was Pawnee and Chairman of the Tribe, and he was always telling me, I'm not going to teach you Pawnee, because we live in a White man's world. And I think I found that a whole generation down here, our parents didn't teach us, because they saw that he was one of those who (inaudible) -- spoke the English language. So, myself, growing up, that's what he always said to me was to

learn to live in the White man's world.

2.2.

2.4

So I would just encourage you all to keep this in the forefront when you start formulating your ideas in this program. I know you've got a lot of decisions to make. You have different ways of doing the same thing.

And so I think if we just encourage you to look at it through our eyes and do what's best.

So, really, without even saying, you know, you should have these tribal comments lead the way. And I know as Federal employees, you're not always, you don't have that privilege sometimes.

I heard your Assistant Secretary say, yes,
he's Pawnee. But I heard him say at the BCI conference
that he went to deposition with a lot of good ideas.
But he found out that he can't implement those good
ideas because you have congressional mandates,
presidential mandates. So his parameter is somewhat
restricted in what he can do.

And so you all -- and I heard that word "parameters." I don't know which one stated it. But you have those parameters that you have to also work with.

And I think it's very difficult to do that. Because maybe sometimes your heart is in another

direction. But because you're Federal employees, you have to follow the wishes of the Government.

But I do appreciate this effort. I know sometimes I'm real voiceful in criticizing the Government, because, actually, I spent almost 39 years in the Federal Government. And I know where -- there's an old expression, you know where the skeletons are. And I know where the skeletons are.

So I told one person here I got tired of sitting out here in the audience (inaudible) because I can't say anything, and I couldn't say anything either. So now I'm in a position where I can express those feelings.

I do encourage you all to keep us in the loop as you go through this process.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MR. BLACK: Let me just say I appreciate everybody taking time out of your schedules to come visit with us and share your thoughts and comments today.

We do take this serious, and it's really us that should be thanking you. You came here to visit with us today and you took that risk. I've heard it a number of times today, the trust and past experiences with consultations. You came here, taking that risk

that maybe we'll actually listen to you this time. And I can honestly say for myself and Jodi — I think I can say it for Jodi — that we are serious about listening and taking these comments and formulating and implementing this plan in accordance within, you know, within the parameters that we have to operate in, but also in consultation with the tribes.

So, again, thank you very much. I really appreciate it. It's been a good day for all of us, I hope. And we've had some great comments and things that give us a lot to think about.

So thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

MS. GILLETTE: I just want to thank you again for the thoughts and the comments.

I think there was a key word that folks kept coming back to time and time again, and, for me, it's a partnership. It's not necessarily that we're, you know, working to tell you what you should do, but really to listen to what you have to say and partner with you in getting things done.

Anyway, I want to commend Mr. Tippeconnie for the work that he's done with the Department on the consultation policies and with a tremendous amount from people like him and others that participate in that process, we really tried to incorporate, even though that consultation isn't final, we tried to incorporate as much of that as we can into the places where we are actively working on consultation, like Cobell.

2.2.

And I also just wanted to say that we take seriously the nations, government—to—government responsibility in a way that is beyond what it was before. And the best way that I feel that I can really make that a reality is to make every interaction a meaningful one. And I think that's what keeps coming up time and time again. We don't want to just come here and talk to the government officials, so that you can say that you talked to us. We want to have some meaningful input into the policies and the decision—making that's occurring on our behalves.

So, you know, that's something that -- it's something that I'm privy to. I know President Obama is committed to it, Secretary Salazar, you know, everybody that I work with take that very seriously. And I know that it's going to take a while to get the proof that we are here in a good way.

So the only thing that you can take away from this is we'll see what happens now. So we hope that the issues about fairness, the issues about however we can address the things that you brought up in terms of better communication with individual landowners, you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2.

23

2.4

25

```
know, how to maximize tribal control, all of those
things are very important to me as I go forward in
participating in the implementation of the Land
Consolidation Program.
         I do want to say that, at the end of the day,
I think the people that are -- we're all here for our
grandchildren and the future. I believe that we, as
both a tribal member, but also as somebody who is
trying to make a better day for my kids and my
grandkids. I don't have any grandkids yet, but I will
have grandkids.
         All we can do is have that positive outlook.
I can only have that positive outlook and to think
that, if I try my best now, things are going to be
better for them. We all have that shared
understanding.
         So that's what I leave you with. If there's
somebody that wants to say a closing prayer -- I don't
```

know if Robert, if you'd like to close it up for us, we'd like you to.

Would you like to?

(Unidentified speaker) Marshall.

MS. GILLETTE: Marshall? Okay. I really appreciate that. Thanks.

(Closing prayer)

```
1
                      CERTIFICATE
 2
      STATE OF OKLAHOMA
 3
                                 SS.
                              )
     COUNTY OF OKLAHOMA
 4
 5
               I, Judy Thompson, a Certified Shorthand
 6
     Reporter for the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify
 7
     that the meeting was taken by me in stenotype and
      thereafter transcribed and is a true and correct
 8
 9
      transcript of the meeting; that the meeting was held on
     October 6, 2011, in Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma;
10
      that I am not an attorney for or a relative of either
11
     party, or otherwise interested in this action.
12
1.3
               WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 20TH DAY OF
14
      OCTOBER, 2011.
15
16
                       Judy Thompson
                       Oklahoma Certified Shorthand Reporter
17
                       Certificate No. 01674
                       Exp. Date: December 31, 2011
18
19
20
21
2.2.
23
24
2.5
```