1	CONTRACTING PREFERENCES FOR ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS
2	
3	THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2009
4	United States Senate,
5	Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
6	Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight,
7	Washington, D.C.
8	The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:30 p.m.,
9	in Room SD-342, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Claire
10	McCaskill, Chairman of the Subcommittee, presiding.
11	Present: Senators McCaskill, Tester, Akaka, and
12	Collins.
13	Also Present: Senators Begich and Murkowski.
14	OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR McCASKILL
15	Senator McCaskill. The hearing will come to order.
16	Today's hearing will examine the contracting preferences for
17	Alaska Native Corporations. Federal contracting laws create
18	a limited privilege for economically and socially
19	disadvantaged small businesses. Under the Small Business
20	Administration's 8(a) program, these businesses can receive
21	no-bid contracts for up to 3.5 million for services and
22	5.5 million for manufacturing or goods.
23	In the 1980s and the 1990s, Congress created special
24	preferences for the Alaska Native Corporations that allow
25	them to participate in the 8(a) program in a way that is not

identical to other small businesses. But Congress has said that Native corporations do not have to prove that they are socially or economically disadvantaged. They do not have to be small business, and they can receive no-bid contracts worth billions of dollars.

No one begrudges giving small, disadvantaged businesses a chance to win federal contracts. We have programs like 8 (a), HUBZone and the service disabled veteran-owned businesses because we want these small businesses to be able to get their foot in the door. But the Alaska Native Corporations have used their special preferences to bust the door down.

To get to the real facts at issue in this hearing, I requested detailed information from 19 Alaska regional and village corporations. The committee staff has prepared an analysis of this information and a separate analysis of publicly available contracting information. And without objection, I will enter both analyses into the hearing record.

20 [The information of Senator McCaskill follows:]
21 / COMMITTEE INSERT

1 Senator McCaskill. The Subcommittee staff analysis 2 shows that Alaska Native contract awards have skyrocketed 3 since 2000. Alaska Native Corporations are now among the 4 largest federal contractors with hundreds of millions in 5 annual revenues and hundreds of subsidiaries and joint 6 ventures. According to the information submitted by the 19 ANCs, none of them would be classified as small businesses 7 8 under SBA regs. The Alaska Native Corporations may also be 9 passing work through to their subcontractors. They employ 10 relatively few of their shareholders and rely heavily on 11 non-Native managers.

12 We will hear today from representatives of the Alaskan 13 Native people and the Alaskan Native contractors who will 14 tell us that sole source contracting is needed to provide 15 important benefits to impoverished people. But we must take 16 a hard look at the numbers. Only about \$615 a year in 17 money, scholarships and other benefits goes back to each 18 member of the Alaskan Native community from this particular 19 federal contracting effort.

The American people are looking to Congress to cut back wasteful spending and make sure that every single federal dollar is spent wisely. And there must be a strong bias in favor of competitive contracts that only compelling rationale should ever overcome, and then in very limited circumstances.

As we hold hearings in the Subcommittee on waste, fraud 1 2 and abuse in government contracts, we cannot give anyone a 3 free pass. The Alaska Native Corporations have had, and I have seen firsthand over the last few weeks, a very vocal 4 5 group of advocates. But our responsibility is to look out 6 for the taxpayers, not these corporations and their profit margins or any other federal contractor or any other special 7 8 interest. From the taxpayer perspective, it is hard to see 9 why the Alaska Native Corporations should be able to receive 10 enormous contracts with no competition.

11 When this Subcommittee was formed, we made a commitment 12 to the taxpayer. Our priority would be promoting 13 efficiency, transparency and accountability. Our goal is to 14 make sure that every taxpayer dollar is spent wisely in the 15 contracting arena. By taking a hard look at contracting 16 loopholes like those for the Alaska Native Corporations, we 17 can take the first step towards ensuring that our 18 contracting system provides the best possible value for the 19 taxpayer.

Eliminating waste, fraud and abuse in government contracting is not a partisan issue. And on this Subcommittee, I am particularly grateful to have Susan Collins as a ranking member. Susan Collins has a long record of working in the contracting and procuring arena. She shares my commitment to promoting competition in

1 contracting and ensuring the best value for the taxpayer. 2 I yield to Senator Collins for her statement. 3 OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR COLLINS Senator Collins. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. 4 5 I very much appreciate your kind comments and your hard work 6 and leadership as the chairman of this Subcommittee. 7 Today, as the chairman has indicated, the Subcommittee examines the benefits afforded Alaska Native Corporations, 8 9 or ANCs, in the small Business contracting program for 10 socially and economically disadvantaged small Businesses, 11 known as the 8(a) program.

12 The recent report of the SBA's inspector general has 13 raised several troubling issues concerning the ANC program, 14 including whether other minority-owned small businesses are 15 being treated fairly given the special benefits afforded 16 ANCs. As we examine the ANC program, it is important that 17 we recognize our commitment to the growth and prosperity of 18 small businesses and to the well-being of our Native 19 Americans, including Alaska Natives. In particular, we 20 should consider how the 8(a) program has helped to support 21 our Nation's minority-owned small businesses by giving them 22 the opportunity to participate in federal contracts.

In 1978, Congress first established the current 8(a)
program. Beginning with protections for black Americans,
Hispanic Americans, Native Americans and other minorities,

Congress has revised and expanded the program over time,
 including in 1986 when Indian tribes and ANCs were added.
 Over the half century, the last half century, whether
 by executive order or by legislative action, the government
 has acknowledged the value in encouraging the growth and
 expansion of small companies and in promoting minority-owned
 small business participating in government contracting.

8 In passing the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in 9 1971, Congress recognized Alaska Natives' aboriginal land 10 claims to large portions of Alaska, and in return, permitted 11 Alaska Natives to establish unique corporate structures, the 12 ANCs, to manage their affairs. The ANCs were established to 13 be stewards of the land and to help Native Alaskans.

The ANCs, whether they are large regional entities or the smaller village corporations, help to provide leadership for developing the land's natural resources, provide scholarships and offer employment opportunities to the members of the Alaskan tribes and villages. ANCs are a way for many Natives to continue to live in Alaska.

Today, however, the SBA's IG has produced some disturbing statistics that raise difficult questions regarding the scope of the protections afforded ANCs. These issues the chairman has outlined in her opening statement, but let me just touch on some of them.

25 First, the IG noted that the total value of 8(a) ANC

awards soared from \$265 million in Fiscal Year 2000 to \$3.9 1 2 billion in Fiscal Year 2008. Of additional concern, the IG 3 found that 82 percent of these ANC contracts were awarded via sole source procurements; that is, without competition. 4 5 Second, the IG's report shows that the dollar value of 6 the ANC's share of all 8(a) program dollars grew from 13 percent in 2004 to 26 percent in 2008. Yet ANCs account 7 for only 2 percent of the 9,500 businesses that participate 8 9 in the 8(a) program. Third, the report reveals that 11 of 10 the 20 largest ANCs receive approximately 50 percent of all 11 the 8(a) funds that are awarded to all ANCs.

12 These statistics show a growing domination by ANCs, 13 particularly of a few large ANCs, of the 8(a) program market 14 share at the potential expense and exclusion of other 15 minority-owned contractors and perhaps to the detriment of 16 taxpayers given the lack of a cap on the dollar amount of 17 the noncompetitive contracts.

18 While I do not question the fundamental proposition 19 that ANCs provide critical services for an economically and 20 socially disadvantaged group of Americans, we simply must 21 consider whether the structure of the 8(a) program provides 22 disproportionate benefits to one group.

23 Congress must carefully consider the following key 24 questions. First, do the statutory advantages of the ANC 25 program need to be reexamined within the context of a more

competitive, fair and transparent overall 8(a) program?
Second, should the ANCs continue to receive an exemption
from the cap on awards of sole source contracts to program
participants? Third, should ANCs continue to be exempt from
the limitation on subsidiaries applicable to other 8(a)
participants, which permits their indefinite participation
in the program?

8 I recall when I was the regional head of the Small 9 Business Administration in New England that we would have 10 graduation ceremonies for our 8(a) participants. If you can 11 have an infinite number of subsidiaries, ad infinitum, that 12 raises a real question about the purpose of the program.

I look forward to hearing the testimony of the witnesses today. And as the chairman said, the final question we need to look at is what the impact on the value received by the American taxpayer is for the services provided under this program.

18 Thank you, Madam Chairman.

19 Senator McCaskill. Thank you.

I do not want anyone to think that I am skipping over our senators from Alaska, but I am going to--just for the record, we have done something a little unusual today in that we have invited the two senators from Alaska to attend the hearing to make opening remarks and even have gone so far as to allow them to ask questions of the witnesses, even

1 though they are not members of this committee.

2 We are trying to bend over backwards to make sure that 3 Alaska's representatives in the Senate have an ample opportunity to ask questions about this important topic to 4 5 their state, and I am cognizant of their need to do that. 6 So that is why they are here, and that is why they are on the dais. And we welcome both of them to the committee. 7 8 However, Senator Tester is a member of the committee, 9 and so he will be recognized for any opening comments he 10 would like to make as a member of the committee. 11 OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR TESTER 12 Senator Tester. Thank you, Chairman McCaskill. I 13 appreciate that. Sorry I missed your opening remarks. I am 14 going to be very, very brief because I want to hear the 15 testimony and get an opportunity to ask some questions. 16 I think that we all want to get the maximum bang for 17 the buck when it comes to taxpayer dollars and when it comes 18 to contracting. I do not think there is any doubt about 19 that. I think we also want to give benefit to people who are in severe economic conditions when possible. And I 20 21 think that is what this discussion will be interesting about 22 for me.

I mean, I cannot speak to what goes on in Alaska as far as the unemployment rates. I can speak to the unemployment rate in Indian country in my state and the value of the 8(a)

1 program itself in my state. When you have unemployment 2 rates that rise well above 50 percent, in some cases 80 percent, as one person said, it would be nice to give 3 4 those folks fishing poles so they can do a little fishing. 5 And I think that that is what program is meant to do. 6 Hopefully, that is the same way as it is in Alaska, and 7 hopefully, we can get some of those questions answered as we move forth. 8

9 I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you, Madam Chair. 10 Senator McCaskill. Thank you. And I would 11 recognize--I believe Senator Begich was here first. We come 12 in order of appearance here. So if you would take a couple 13 of minutes, if you would like, to make a few comments and 14 then we will recognize Senator Murkowski.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR BEGICH
Senator Begich. Thank you very much, Chairwoman
McCaskill.

18 Thank you, Ranking Member Collins for allowing Senator 19 Murkowski and I to be here today to participate in the 20 hearing.

The issues we explore today are vitally important for my constituents and especially for the Native people of Alaska who comprise 20 percent of our state's population. For me, the well-being of Alaskan Native people is personal for two reasons. First, my father's greatest legacy in his

1 short tenure here in Alaska as a lone congressman was to 2 write the Alaska Native Land Claims bill. This landmark 3 act, which has dramatically improved the status of Alaskan Natives passed Congress in 1971, just a year before he died. 4 5 The second reason, it is personal is because I have 6 personally witnessed the struggle against formidable odds 7 and the enormous success of the Alaska Native people. I was 8 born in Anchorage barely three years after Alaska became a 9 state. At that time, Alaska Natives had developed a rich 10 culture in some of the harshest conditions on the globe. By 11 Western measures, their status was bleak.

12 Census date for the post-statehood era is incomplete. 13 But the data that is available tells a story of great need. 14 In 1970, only 18 percent of Alaska Natives had a high school 15 diploma and less than 1 percent had a college degree. Half 16 lived below the poverty line. Fifty percent of Alaska 17 Natives lived without indoor plumbing, collecting their 18 waste in what we call the "honey bucket." And nearly 19 two-thirds lacked what we define today as a job. Most 20 hunted, fished and lived off the land and water.

Today, thanks to the Settlement Act and congressional action to permit Alaska Native Corporations to participate in the SBA's 8(a) program, the story of Alaskan Native people is one of unprecedented success. The numbers tell part of the story. Educational attainment has soared with

about half of Alaskan Natives earning high school diplomas and nearly a third with at least some college. Less than 25 percent now live below the poverty line. Three-quarters live in homes with basic clean water and sewer facilities we all take for granted.

6 For those of US who believe in the free market system, 7 as I do, the transition to the private sector is especially 8 admirable. In 1970, about half of Alaskan Natives worked 9 for the government. Today, that number is just 29 percent 10 as more Natives work for their corporations and other Alaska 11 companies.

12 What is more impressive to me is the success of Alaska 13 Native Corporations. After struggling in their early years, 14 all twelve of Alaska's in-state regional for-profit 15 corporations are profitable, generating about 4 billion in 16 revenues for the Native shareholders.

17 ANCSA corporations are among the state's top employers, 18 providing jobs for more than 30,000 people. And I submit 19 that these companies are among the most socially conscious 20 Their chief mission is to provide benefits to in the world. 21 the Native people they were created to serve. They work 22 hard and contribute enormously for education scholarship, 23 cultural preservation, elder services, community 24 development, and support the subsistence lifestyle that is 25 such a vital part of the culture.

1 The participation of the ANCs through the 8(a) program 2 is another great success story. These amendments to the 3 Claims Act were five years in the making, thoroughly 4 discussed within both the Native community and Congress 5 before adoption. The SBA IG report that there are now about 6 203 ANCs that participate in the program.

7 Through their work across the Nation, they are 8 generating billions of dollars in benefit to the ANC 9 shareholders. This continues to raise the standard of 10 living for thousands of Alaskan Native people who live in 11 200 villages and communities across my state. There are 12 scores of compelling stories we could document if time 13 permitted.

14 Madam Chair, contrary to the spin generated off the 15 various government reports, I believe Alaska Native 16 participation in the 8(a) program overall has been one of 17 the most successful programs this government has done. 18 Certainly, there may be a few bruised apples that require 19 attention. I agree with many of the IG recommendations that 20 the SBA needs to clarify its procedures and fully staff its 21 oversight mission.

Let us continue to be mindful of the continued needs among Alaskan Native people in my state and how ANCs working in part through their 8(a) subsidiaries are meeting those needs so that American taxpayers do not have to.

1 Again, I look forward to working with the Subcommittee, 2 hearing the testimony and being able to ask questions 3 regarding the reports given. 4 Thank you, Madam Chair. 5 Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Senator Begich. 6 Senator Murkowski? 7 OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURKOWSKI Senator Murkowski. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and 8 9 thank you for the courtesy that you have extended Senator Begich and I to participate. And to Ranking Member Collins, 10 I truly do appreciate this. 11 12 Today the Subcommittee takes testimony on the question 13 of whether a law intended to provide Indian tribes, Native 14 Hawaiians and Alaska Native Corporations with the 15 opportunity to establish viable business enterprises selling 16 goods and services to the Federal Government, whether or not 17 this has been a flawed concept. My views on this subject 18 are informed certainly by the six years that I have served 19 as a member of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, 20 including a short stretch when I was vice chair of that

21 committee.

I believe that the Indian 8(a) preferences are achieving important economic development objectives and are well worth preserving as a matter of federal Indian policy. Our Nation has a special relationship with its first

1 peoples, which has been recognized since the founding of 2 this country, and that special relationship is expressed in 3 our Constitution. It is also well established that our great Nation has a long history of imposing ill conceived 4 5 policies on Indian tribes and Native peoples, and the Senate 6 acknowledged as much when it attached Senator Brownback's 7 apology resolution to the Indian Health Care Bill back in 2008. 8

9 As Senator Begich has noted, our Native people live in some of the poorest, most geographically and most 10 11 economically isolated places in the country, some in 12 conditions that resemble Third World countries. Our Native 13 people struggle to maintain their traditional cultures in an 14 era in which subsistence hunting, fishing and gathering 15 simply do not generate sufficient resources to keep one's 16 house warm in the winter.

As we begin this inquiry, we must keep firmly in our mind that the preferences that we are discussing today are an exercise of federal Indian policy to mitigate the impact of past ill conceived policies and to help our Native people maintain their unique cultures and identities and survive in the modern world.

Although today's hearing is labeled an inquiry into Alaska Native Corporation contracting, let me make clear that there is no such thing as an Alaska Native Corporation

1 preference in government contracting. There is a preference 2 for Indian tribes, which includes Alaska Native corporations 3 as well as Native Hawaiian organizations. The opportunity 4 was structured in a way that would be meaningful to the 5 challenges of economic development in Indian country and 6 provide financial benefits that could be shared among large 7 numbers of tribal members. All of that is at risk today. 8 While the hearing is labeled Alaska Native Corporations, 9 nobody in Indian country believes that the consequences will 10 not fall equally on all beneficiaries of the Indian 8(a) 11 preferences.

Now, there are some who say that this program really is not important to anyone other than Alaskan Natives. But we will hear much today about how some Alaska Native Corporations have done well, perhaps too well in pursuing these opportunities. But that does not mean that they are less important to other Native corporations or to Indian country as a whole.

19 The history of economic development in Indian country 20 suggests that Native leaders frequently look at which kinds 21 of businesses are working in Indian country and adopt the 22 successful business models of others, all in their own time. 23 This has certainly been the case with Indian gaming, and all 24 indications are that interest in government contracting 25 among the tribes is rising.

1 The sad truth is that there are very few business 2 models that have provided any modicum for success in tribes 3 and ANCs. From my conversation with Indian leaders, there seems to be unanimity that the 8(a) business opportunity 4 5 holds great promise for Indian economic development and it 6 is an opportunity worth saving. I expect that you will hear the same from the Native leaders that are testifying today. 7 But this senator does not believe that these 8 9 contracting preferences undermine the integrity of all 10 federal contracting. While the dollar value of some 11 individual contracts may be substantial, taken together, all 12 of the contracting under this preference accounts something 13 on the order of 1 percent of the total federal contract pie. 14 And I am deeply concerned by the suggestion that a victory 15 for the Indians is a defeat for businesses enjoying 16 preferences through other socioeconomic classifications. 17 Surely, there must be a way to win for all.

Let me be clear about the stakes here. Congress 18 19 enacted a law giving Indian-owned and controlled entities an 20 opportunity to build federal contracting businesses. Many 21 rose to the challenges and have fully committed their tribes 22 and their business enterprises to these opportunities. Some 23 of these businesses are maturing, and others are just 24 starting. Our Native leaders have entered into contracts, 25 they have hired people, they have created systems and

1 focused all of their energies on learning the business. And 2 now that same federal government threatens to pull the rug 3 out from under them.

I fear that we are moving down the road to breaking yet another promise to the Indians. If we are not careful, policy changes prompted by this Subcommittee's inquiry will go down in history as another of the ill conceived policies that we in the Congress are later forced to apologize for.

9 I do thank the Chair for inviting me to participate. I 10 look forward to the witnesses. And I ask, Madam Chair, our 11 congressman, Don Young, Alaska's only House member, had 12 requested an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee. 13 And I understand that his request could not be accommodated. 14 He has submitted written testimony in hope that it would be 15 included within the record.

16 Of course, since I am not a member of your 17 Subcommittee, it is inappropriate for me to offer a 18 unanimous consent request. But I would like to submit the 19 congressman's testimony and would hope that this request 20 could be accommodated, and would also ask that the committee 21 or the Subcommittee hold the record open to accommodate a 22 statement from the governor of Alaska as well as any Alaska 23 Native Corporations that may wish to submit their views, if 24 that is appropriate.

25 Senator McCaskill. We certainly will take all of those

statements, and as it relates to the congressman, certainly, and the governor, we will be happy to make a unanimous consent motion that their statements be included in the record. [The information of Senator Murkowski follows:]

6 / SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT

1 Senator McCaskill. We have had so many requests for 2 statements to be included. For all other statements, we 3 will receive them in the committee and review them, and then 4 be happy to get back with the people who submit the 5 statements as to whether or not they will be made part of 6 the record.

7 Senator Murkowski. But we can encourage them to 8 submit--

9 Senator McCaskill. Absolutely.

10 Senator Murkowski. --to the committee?

Senator McCaskill. We will take all the information. We have gotten so many requests in the last five days, we want to make sure that we are not overwhelmed if somebody wanted to submit 600 pages. We have a very small staff.

15 Senator Murkowski. I think everyone is anxious to tell 16 their story.

Senator McCaskill. I understand. I understand,Senator. Thank you very much.

19 It is the custom of this Subcommittee that witnesses 20 must be sworn in. Therefore, I would ask the first panel to 21 rise, please.

Do you swear that your testimony that you are about to give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

24 Ms. Britt. I do.

25 Mr. Jordan. I do.

1 Mr. Assad. I do.

2 Senator McCaskill. Thank you very much.

3 Senator Akaka has joined us.

4 Senator, as a member of the committee, would you like5 to make any opening comments?

6 OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR AKAKA

Senator Akaka. Madam Chairman, I thank you so much for
your work on contracting, which is something that we really
need to work on in this new period. And if you do not mind,
Madam Chairman, I would like to make just my statement.

11 Senator McCaskill. Certainly.

Senator Akaka. Chairwoman McCaskill, thank you for
 conducting the hearing. I appreciate the opportunity.

14 As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of 15 Government Management, I recognize the need and importance 16 of ensuring appropriate oversight measures are in place for federal contracts. Failure to have skilled contract 17 18 officers in place at federal agencies can negatively impact 19 the process and risk the loss of billions of taxpayer 20 dollars due to inefficiencies and, in some cases, fraud. 21 That is why I am pleased by your efforts to review federal 22 contracting practices.

23 Today we are here to examine just one aspect of federal 24 contracting, federal contracts with Alaska Native 25 Corporations. In our review, it is appropriate that we

acknowledge the federal trust relationship the United States
has with Native Americans, including Alaska Natives. The
U.S. Constitution under the Indian Commerce Clause vests
Congress with the ability to regulate commerce within Indian
tribes. Congress has utilized its well established authority
to enact policies that address the unique circumstances and
needs of Alaska Natives.

8 For the past 19 years, I have worked with Senator 9 McCain, Senator Murkowski, Senator Dorgan and others as part 10 of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee to protect and 11 advance this unique trust relationship with our Nation's 12 first Americans. From experience, we know that successful 13 federal Indian policy enables American Indians and Alaska 14 Natives to be a full partner with the Federal Government. 15 We have seen more enduring and meaningful results when 16 Native people are allowed to maintain their culture, 17 commerce and local political systems to adapt and address 18 the impact of an America that has rapidly changed around 19 them.

As we review the experience of ANCs in the Small Business Administration 8(a) program, we must be mindful that Congress deliberately established this corporation structure to empower Alaska Natives to develop sustainable economies that benefit their communities.

25 Under the Alaska Claims Settlement Act, Alaska Natives

were required to establish corporate vehicles quite similar to tribal corporations with vital differences. To promote a more robust commerce, it provided control of a portion of their aboriginal lands at fee simple title, rather than the establishment of reservations, and required the engagement of commerce and enterprise to be separate for their tribal government.

8 Congress established the SBA 8(a) business development 9 program to connect the growth of American business 10 enterprise directly to the needs for goods and services of 11 our Federal Government. It has shown success and great 12 promise for the growth of women-owned, veteran-owned and 13 minority-owned firms and has changed the socioeconomic 14 standing of thousands of Americans.

Recognizing the success achieved with individuallyowned firms, in the 1980s, Congress established provisions within the 8(a) program to include the unique corporate vehicles of American Indian and Alaskan Native enterprises. And today, ANCs are responsible for providing more than just profits but are responsible for the welfare and long-term survival of their people and indigenous culture.

As proposals may come forward to address oversight issues relating to ANCs, I am hopeful we will proceed honorably in a manner that respects and strengthens the government-to-government relationship between the United

States and Alaska Natives. The United States and Alaska
 Natives are partners, and development of any policy should
 be a collaborative effort.

Again, thank you, Chairman McCaskill for holding this hearing. I look forward to the hearing and the witnesses who will offer their expertise on this important matter. Thank you.

8 Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Senator Akaka.

9 Our first panel has three witness. Our first witness 10 is Debra Ritt, and she is the Assistant Inspector General 11 for Auditing at the Office of Inspector General for the 12 Small Business Administration, and we welcome your 13 testimony.

14 Let me tell all the witnesses that we would like you to 15 try to limit your statements to five minutes, but, please, 16 we will put your entire statements in the record, so do not 17 worry that we will not take all of the information. But if 18 you can try to limit it to five minutes, we have five people 19 on the second panel, and I have a feeling there will be a lot of questions. So if you could limit it to five, that 20 21 would helpful. Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF DEBRA RITT, ASSISTANT INSPECTOR
 GENERAL, AUDITING, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL,
 U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

4 Ms. Ritt. Thank you.

5 Chairwoman McCaskill, Ranking Member Collins, and 6 members of the Subcommittee, we appreciate the opportunity 7 to testify on our recent audit. As requested, my statement 8 today will focus on procurement advantages enjoyed by ANCs 9 in the 8(a) program and the benefits derived from those 10 advantages, the growth of ANC 8(a) activity and SBA's 11 oversight of ANC participants.

12 ANC companies enjoy special procurement advantages 13 beyond those afforded most other 8(a) businesses. The most 14 significant is their exemption from statutory dollar limits 15 on the amount of individual awards that may be sole sourced 16 and the regulatory cap on sole source awards once \$100 17 million in total 8(a) contracts has been received. This has 18 allowed some ANC companies to receive 8(a) sole source 19 awards as large as a billion dollars and is the major reason 20 for the explosive growth in ANC 8(a) activity.

Further, unlike other 8(a) businesses, ANC companies are considered small even if they are affiliated with other large businesses. Consequently, ANC companies that are large through affiliation with their parent companies are allowed to compete for 8(a) awards against other small

disadvantaged businesses. While federal law permits these large businesses to participate in a small business program, it is an anomaly that impacts the small disadvantaged business community.

5 Although ANC contracting advantages were intended to 6 provide economic opportunities for impoverished Alaskan 7 communities, ANC companies are not required to report to SBA 8 how they use their 8(a) share of their profits. We have 9 found that ANC profits are generally used to fund 10 shareholder dividends, cultural programs, employment 11 assistance, scholarships and numerous other services for 12 their communities.

13 ANC companies have unquestionably prospered under the 14 8(a) program. In Fiscal Year 2007, the 12 regional 15 corporations had combined revenues of \$5.8 billion and 16 profits of 484 million, much of which was generated from the 17 8(a) program. Moreover, from Fiscal Years 2000 to 2008, 18 obligations to ANC-owned participants increased by 19 1,386 percent and more than tripled in recent years from 20 1.1 billion in 2004 to 3.9 billion in 2008. While some of 21 the increase was due to the growth in federal contracting as 22 a whole in 2008, ANC companies received 26 percent of total 23 8(a) obligations even though they constituted just 2 percent 24 of the companies performing 8(a) contracts.

Also, 50 percent of the 8(a) dollars obligated to ANC

companies in 2007 went to just 11 or 6 percent of the ANC
 participants. One company, which accounted for nearly
 20 percent of these obligations, had only 750 shareholders
 or less than 1 percent of total ANC shareholders.

5 Finally, sole source contracts continue to be the major 6 contracting mechanism for obligating 8(a) funds to ANC businesses. In 2007, the top 11 ANC companies received 7 82 percent of their 8(a) obligations through sole source 8 9 awards. While such awards provide an expedient means of 10 meeting federal procurement goals, reports by IGs and GAO 11 have shown that noncompetitive contracts have been misused 12 and do not always provide the government with the best 13 value.

14 Despite these concerns, SBA has not evaluated the 15 impact of ANC growth on other 8(a) participants or tailored 16 its oversight practices to account for ANC's unique status 17 and growth in the program. SBA has also not fully addressed 18 oversight weaknesses identified by prior GAO and IG audits. 19 Specifically, SBA does not monitor whether ANC subsidiaries 20 are obtaining their primary revenue from the same industry. 21 The agency is developing a system to collect information on 22 ANC companies, but this capability will not be developed 23 until a later phase.

Also, SBA has had difficulty monitoring ownershipchanges involving ANC companies to ensure that they remain

majority owned by ANCs. While SBA plans to increase the
size of its Alaska district office to address this issue,
the office currently only has three employees to oversee the
200-plus ANC companies in the program.

5 SBA does not determine whether ANC companies or their 6 affiliates have a substantial unfair competitive advantage in determining size for 8(a) awards and has not clearly 7 articulated in regulation how it will comply with existing 8 9 law. Further, SBA cannot readily identify and is not 10 monitoring partnerships between ANC companies and large 11 businesses to ensure that such businesses are not exploiting 12 ANCs for their 8(a) status.

Finally, SBA is not adequately reviewing financial information reported annually by ANC companies to identify unreported management agreements related to their 8(a) contracts.

In conclusion, while ANC participation in the 8(a) program has undeniably benefited Alaska Natives, ANC companies are receiving a disproportionate share of the 8(a) obligations. Also, the procurement advantages that they enjoy and their ability to access capital and credit through their parent companies may be working to disadvantage other 8(a) participants.

24 Consequently, Congress may wish to consider whether ANC 25 companies should continue to be exempt from statutory limits

on sole source awards and whether procurement goals should 1 2 be revised to account for the significant growth in ANC 8(a) 3 activity. It may also wish to consider further clarifying 4 SBA's role in monitoring ANC 8(a) activity and requiring 5 ANCs to report how they are using their 8(a) revenues. 6 Madam Chairwoman, this concludes my prepared statement, 7 and I would be happy to take questions at this time. 8 [The prepared statement of Ms. Ritt follows:]

- 1 Senator McCaskill. Thank you.
- 2 Our next witness is Joseph Jordan. He is the Associate
- 3 Administrator for Government Contracting and Business
- 4 Development at the SBA.
- 5 Welcome, Mr. Jordan.

1 TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH JORDAN, ASSOCIATE

ADMINISTRATOR, GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING AND BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT, U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
Mr. Jordan. Thank you very much.

5 Chairwoman McCaskill, Ranking Member Collins and 6 members of the Subcommittee, thank you for inviting the SBA 7 to testify regarding the participation of Alaska Native 8 Corporations in the 8(a) business development program. My 9 name is Joe Jordan, and I am the Associate Administrator for 10 the SBA's Office of Government Contracting and Business 11 Development.

12 The 8(a) program, authorized by Section 8(a) of the 13 Small Business Act, seeks to remedy discrimination by 14 helping eligible small businesses compete in the American economy through business development. Participation in the 15 16 8(a) program is generally restricted to businesses owned and 17 controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged 18 individuals. Individual applicants must demonstrate both 19 social and economic disadvantage.

20 Socially disadvantaged individuals have been subjected 21 to racial or ethnic prejudice or cultural bias within 22 American society. Economically disadvantaged individuals 23 are socially disadvantaged individuals whose ability to 24 compete in the free enterprise system has been impaired. 25 In addition to management and technical assistance, the

government is able to award contracts to participating 8(a)
 firms without competition below certain dollar thresholds.
 The government can also limit competition for federal
 contracts to only 8(a) certified firms.

5 Congress has enacted legislation that allows ANCs, 6 Native Hawaiian organizations, community development 7 corporations and tribally-owned firms to participate in the 8 8(a) business development program. The Alaskan Native 9 Claims Settlement Act was enacted by Congress to settle 10 claims to land and resources while also exploring an 11 alternative to the reservation system. General goals 12 included self determination and participation in a U.S. 13 capitalist society.

In 1988 and 1992, ANSCA was amended to remedy evidence that Alaska Natives were not receiving all the intended benefits. So Congress designated ANCs, where Natives hold majority ownership, to be minority businesses and economically disadvantaged.

ANCs have twofold missions of being competitive businesses accountable to many thousands of shareholders as well as providing a mechanism for self sufficiency. Generally, they support cultural, societal and community activities on behalf of their people while providing economic benefit to shareholders and their families. The 8(a) BD program's regulations anticipate that

organizational-owned firms, including ANCs, use the 8(a) 1 2 program to provide economic development to their communities 3 even though all other 8(a) participants use the program only 4 for individual business development assistance. ANC-owned 5 8(a) firms, tribally-owned companies and program 6 participants owned by Native Hawaiian organizations are not 7 subject to the same rules as other individually-owned 8 companies participating in the program.

9 First, subsidiaries can participate in the 8(a) program without being considered affiliated with one another. 10 This 11 allows several subsidiaries to participate in the program at 12 the same time and for each to be considered a small 13 business. Secondly, these firms are able to receive a 14 federal contract in any amount without competition. In 15 2003, Congress authorized Native Hawaiian organizations to 16 receive 8(a) contracts in any amount for Department of 17 Defense procurements.

18 Lastly, these companies do not have a restriction on 19 the participation by non-disadvantaged individuals. For 20 traditional 8(a) firms, the individual claiming disadvantage 21 must control the day-to-day operations of the company and 22 traditionally must be the highest compensated. As it is 23 currently operating, the 8(a) program is simultaneously 24 providing business development opportunities to 25 disadvantaged individuals and to firms owned by

1 organizations, including ANCs.

It is also important to recognize that as a business development program, sole source contract awards continue to have an important role in 8(a). However, competition also plays an important part and has been used effectively in the 8(a) program.

7 The SBA has worked diligently to ensure that oversight 8 of these programs is strong and that SBA programs are 9 operating free of waste, fraud and abuse. To this end, in 10 the past six months the administration has taken four main 11 actions.

12 First, we sent a team to review the Alaska district 13 office which handles the interface and caseload of ANCs. 14 Second, we have begun the hiring process for two additional 15 staff devoted to the 8(a) business development program in 16 the Alaska district office. Third, we have funded 17 initiatives to better track ANC participation in the 8(a) 18 program. And fourth, we have submitted a package of 19 regulatory changes to ensure more effective administration 20 of the 8(a) program for all participants. These changes 21 were driven by the SBA as well as concerns expressed in the 22 GAO report from 2006.

Thank you for allowing me to share the SBA's view with you today, and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

1

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jordan follows:]

Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Mr. Jordan.
 Our next witness is Shay Assad. He is the Acting
 Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and
 Technology at the U.S. Department of Defense.
 Mr. Assad.

TESTIMONY OF SHAY ASSAD, ACTING DEPUTY UNDER
 SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY,
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

4 Mr. Assad. Thank you, Madam Chairman McCaskill, 5 Ranking Member Collins, members of the Subcommittee and 6 senators. My name is Shay Assad. I am the director of 7 Defense Procurement. I am also presenting serving as the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and 8 9 Technology. I want to thank you for the opportunity to 10 appear in front of you today to participate in today's 11 discussion.

As you know, the Small Business Administration manages the 8(a) program. ANC firms along with the tribally-owned firms participate in the 8(a) program, but like Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, they receive unique procurement advantages not available to individually-owned 8(a) firms. You have touched on several of these advantages already.

You asked me to address the adequacy of the Department of Defense's management and oversight of contracts with ANCs. Consistent with my recently expanded responsibilities following my appointment as the Acting Deputy Under Secretary and as part of a general review of contract oversight across the Department, I am currently attempting to determine the management and adequacy of our contracting

1 oversight. I have asked my staff to work with the Defense 2 Contract Audit Agency as well as the Defense Contract 3 Management Agency to ascertain the extent to which ANCs 4 receive the same audit and oversight as other DoD contracts. 5 Further, I have directed my Deputy Director for 6 Strategic Sourcing to initiate a detailed review of all of the Department's awards to 8(a) ANC firms for Fiscal Years 7 8 2008 and 2009. Through this review, we will gain a detailed 9 understanding of what we are buying and procuring from these 10 firms, and in those instances where we are not competitively 11 procuring, the rationale for that sole source approach. Ιt 12 will also give us an opportunity to further expand 13 opportunities for ANC firms as we gain a better 14 understanding of exactly what the capabilities and skills of 15 those companies are collectively.

16 My purpose here today is not to challenge the 17 assistance provided to 8(a) participants or specifically to 18 ANC businesses. Again, I reiterate my support for the 8(a) 19 program. My concern is with competition in this particular 20 context and the benefits of that to the American taxpayer. 21 While we have authority to use sole source procedures 22 with ANC contractors, we do, in fact, compete sometime. In 23 2008, it is approximately 35 to 40 percent of the time. 24 That is well below our average for competition. We need to 25 significantly improve that. On many occasions, I have

stressed the importance of fair competition, which I believe is the cornerstone of our procurement system. It is important to obtain the best value for our warfighters and the best use of taxpayer dollars. GAO has repeatedly reported that some sole source procurements to ANCs have resulted in paying significantly more for services and products than were warranted.

I respect the need to provide economic opportunities 8 9 for 8(a) ANCs. However, based on the Department's 10 experience with the 8(a) program, I think there may be ways 11 to promote additional competition in appropriate 12 circumstances. The Department has used competition 13 successfully to achieve best value in the 8(a) program, and 14 I would welcome the opportunity to work with SBA in 15 exploring appropriate options for the application of 16 competition for ANCs.

Taxpayers would benefit. All procurement agencies 17 18 would benefit, as their prices they pay for their 19 requirements would be competitively determined. Small 20 business would benefit as well because of greater 21 opportunities. In short, the appropriate use of competition 22 could provide economic opportunities for 8(a) ANCs and 23 further help agencies to obtain best value for the 24 government and for the taxpayers.

25 Finally, I would like to emphasize the important role

that small business plays in the industrial base. Fostering 1 2 an environment that is conducive to small business is 3 critical in helping us maintain our competitive procurement 4 system. A strong and vibrant small business program which 5 includes ANCs is one that will allow its small businesses to 6 not only provide goods and services that are essential to our national security but will also enable them to develop 7 over time so that they can meet the future needs of our 8 9 Nation's warfighters in a competitive marketplace. Our 10 warfighters deserve no less, and our taxpayers demand that 11 we do so.

12 [The prepared statement of Mr. Assad follows:]

Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Mr. Assad.

1

2 Mr. Jordan, let me start the questioning. We will do 3 five-minute rounds, and we will go to the committee members 4 first and then allow our guests from Alaska to question 5 some, also.

I will be honest with you that your responses to the audit I found troubling and dismissive. I am a former auditor, and so I always go to the responses first because that is where you are going to determine if the audit is going to make a difference. And reading your responses, I was concerned that the audit was not going to make a difference.

13 Let me start by stating for the record that this is 14 confusing. The 8(a) program is confusing, and you can get 15 into the weeds because there are so many different 16 requirements and rules and thresholds and determinations. But I want to make very clear for the record one thing, and 17 that is that there is a difference between Alaska Native 18 19 Corporations and the rules for them and for any other Native 20 corporation, Hawaiian and the lower 48.

21 Would you explain that to the committee, Mr. Jordan, 22 what the difference is between the rules for an Alaska 23 Native Corporation versus a lower 48 Native corporation or a 24 Hawaiian corporation?

25 Mr. Jordan. Yes, Madam Chair, I will.

1 So ANCs and Indian tribes both have statutory exception 2 to affiliation. Native Hawaiian organizations also enjoy 3 the exception to affiliation privilege; however, that is regulatory. Indian tribes and ANCs both have sole source 4 5 authorized above the thresholds. They both have exception 6 to the \$100 million sole source cap, and they both have 7 statutory authorization to own more than one company, 8(a) 8 company, at a time as long as no two companies are in the 9 same primary NAICS code.

10 Native Hawaiian organizations also enjoy the authority 11 to own more than one company, but that is regulatory. They 12 do not have the exception to the \$100 million cap. And for 13 the sole source above the thresholds for Native Hawaiian 14 organizations, that only applies to the Department of 15 Defense.

16 The one area in which Alaska Native Corporations are 17 different from Indian tribes is the presumption of economic 18 disadvantage. ANCs are presumed economically disadvantaged 19 whereas tribes are not. However, to the best of my 20 knowledge, there has not been a case where a tribe was 21 rejected from the 8(a) program based on that.

22 Senator McCaskill. But don't you lose your status as 23 economically disadvantaged once you get to a certain 24 threshold, Mr. Jordan?

25 Mr. Jordan. You do as a--Senator McCaskill, as you

1 said, there are differences between ANC's tribes and Native 2 Hawaiian organizations and the traditional 8(a) business 3 development program participant. The way the--4 Senator McCaskill. Including the Indian tribes. 5 Mr. Jordan. Yes, but the larger difference is between 6 ANC's tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations and community 7 development corporations and the individual socially and 8 economically disadvantaged business owner. And so when you 9 are looking at the net income, net asset threshold over 10 which you become no longer presumed economically 11 disadvantaged, the process by which Indian tribes are 12 evaluated is obviously more complex than the process for 13 evaluating one individual small business owner. 14 Senator McCaskill. Well, but it is my understanding, 15 Mr. Jordan, that the law carves out a permanent economic 16 disadvantage status for ANCs. 17 Mr. Jordan. You are correct. Senator McCaskill. And it does not do that for Indian 18 19 tribes. 20 Mr. Jordan. You are correct, yes. 21 Senator McCaskill. Okay. And that is a huge 22 difference because if you get a \$100 million contract for 23 four years running, then you are no longer economically 24 disadvantaged under the rules of SBA, correct? 25 Mr. Jordan. Correct, but--

Senator McCaskill. --unless you are an ANC- Mr. Jordan. Well, that is not--

3 Senator McCaskill. --and you are permanently 4 economically disadvantaged regardless of how big the 5 contract is.

Mr. Jordan. That is not necessarily correct because it is not the size of--I will get back to you with the exact definition, but it is not the size of the contract that would necessarily--

10 Senator McCaskill. It is the revenues.

Mr. Jordan. Well, yes, it is the net income and the total assets and the revenues, yes. But it depends what flows to the individual business owner, the socially and economically disadvantaged business owner.

15 Senator McCaskill. Well, I am not talking about the 16 socially--I am not talking about the business owner. I am 17 talking about--I am talking about Indian tribes versus ANCs. 18 And I believe--

Am I correct, Ms. Ritt, with what I am saying, that there is a special status for the ANCs that provide permanent economic disadvantage regardless of how big they get, regardless of how large the corporation is, regardless of how many subsidiaries they have, and that is simply not true for Indian tribes?

25 Ms. Ritt. You are absolutely correct.

1 Senator McCaskill. Let me also talk about the audit in 2 this context. There is an exception that allows the ANCs to 3 create subsidiaries and there have been almost 250 4 subsidiaries created in the last nine years and still count 5 as a small business along truly small businesses like a 6 start-up disadvantaged business. And it says the SBA has 7 the ability to count those subsidiaries if it determines it 8 creates an unfair competitive advantage.

9 In your audit, Ms. Ritt, you pointed out that the SBA 10 had not--both you and the Inspector General--excuse me--both 11 you and the GAO said that SBA is not really making that 12 determination. They are making no effort to determine 13 whether or not there is an unfair competitive advantage.

Ms. Ritt. Right. There is a statutory requirement that they make those determinations when considering size and they are not doing that.

17 Senator McCaskill. And I want to make sure I get this 18 correct. The SBA told GAO that the statute was confusing 19 and you were not sure how to implement.

20 Is that accurate, Mr. Jordan?

21 Mr. Jordan. I would have to look at our response. I 22 was not with the agency at the time of the 2006 report.

23 Senator McCaskill. Well, do you think that language,24 "unfair competitive advantage," is confusing?

25 Mr. Jordan. I do not believe that I am in a position

1 to declare it confusing one way or not confusing right now. 2 But I do want to get back to the--so I do not have to 3 get back to you later on the tribes versus the ANCs. 4 So under the regulations, tribes have a one-time 5 determination of whether that tribe is economically 6 disadvantaged. So this happens with the first 8(a) firm 7 from that tribe. For every other 8(a) firm owned by the 8 tribe, they do not have to establish that economic 9 disadvantage.

10 Senator McCaskill. The point is not establishing it, 11 Mr. Jordan. The point is that they do not get to keep it 12 forever. That is the point. The point is that Indian 13 tribes, after they get to a certain size, no longer can 14 participate on a sole source basis. That is simply not true 15 for ANCs.

16 Mr. Jordan. Well, it would not be the tribe so much as 17 the tribally-owned company that is a 8(a) participant.

18 Senator McCaskill. Maybe I am not being clear. I 19 thought that I was being very clear. There is a difference 20 in the law as to how an Indian tribe is treated and an 21 Alaska Native Corporation is treated as the determination of 22 economic disadvantage is made. And one is permanent and one 23 is not permanent; is that correct?

24 Mr. Jordan. There is a difference in the law. That is 25 correct. In terms of how that difference plays out over

1 time, I would have to get back to you.

2 Senator McCaskill. Okay. Thank you.

3 Senator Collins?

4 Senator Collins. Thank you.

5 Mr. Jordan, to follow up on this line of questions, it 6 is my understanding that other 8(a) firms have to every 7 single year prove that they are still economically 8 disadvantaged; is that correct?

9 Mr. Jordan. Yes, that is correct.

10 Senator Collins. But with an ANC, no matter how big or 11 how successful it becomes, it is presumed to be economically 12 disadvantaged; is that accurate?

Mr. Jordan. That is accurate. Just like with the individual businesses being developed, there is no presumption of them giving a community development or shareholder benefit, per se. So, again, I view them as separate, you know, contexts operating on the--

18 Senator Collins. I am just wanting to make sure we 19 understand how the process works.

20 Mr. Jordan. Yes, ma'am.

21 Senator Collins. Ms. Ritt, current law provides a 22 5 percent bonus if you subcontract with an ANC or an Indian 23 organization or an Indian-owned economic enterprise. I was 24 surprised to learn that this bonus applies even with an ANC 25 that contracts with its own subsidiary.

1 Is that your understanding? 2 Ms. Ritt. I am sorry, Senator Collins. I cannot 3 answer that question. 4 Senator Collins. Mr. Jordan, can you answer that 5 question? Can an ANC get a 5 percent bonus for contracting 6 with its own subsidiary? Mr. Jordan. I do not know. I will have to get back 7 8 with you. 9 Senator Collins. Mr. Assad, do you know? 10 Mr. Assad. I do not believe the law distinguishes amongst that and probably allows that to happen. 11 12 Senator Collins. It is my understanding that the law 13 does allow that to happen. 14 Ms. Ritt, can you think of any rationale for giving a 15 bonus to an ANC that contracts with its--that subcontracts 16 the work to its own subsidiary? 17 Ms. Ritt. No, I cannot. And my staff just confirmed 18 that what you said was true, that they can get a 5 percent 19 bonus. 20 Senator Collins. Do you believe that that incentive is 21 needed to encourage ANCs to do business with the Federal 22 Government or to help direct more work to ANCs? 23 Ms. Ritt. No, I do not. I think the exemption from 24 the sole source caps is a huge incentive by itself. 25 Senator Collins. Mr. Assad, do you think there should

1 be an incentive where an ANC gets a 5 percent bonus if it 2 contracts with one of its own subsidiaries? 3 Mr. Assad. No, I do not. 4 Senator Collins. Mr. Assad, you said in your opening 5 comments that you were concerned about the lack of 6 competition in the award of ANC contracts. A subsequent 7 witness today is going to say that there is informal 8 competition, that a contracting officer can informally call 9 up other ANCs and see if they are interested and do an 10 informal price competition. 11 Do you view that as being equal to the requirement for 12 full and open competition under the Competition and 13 Contracting Act? 14 Mr. Assad. No, I do not, Senator. I actually have 15 some personal experience along these lines. 16 Senator Collins. Could you share that with us? 17 Mr. Assad. Yes, ma'am. When I was the director of 18 contracting for the Marine Corps, we had a procurement come 19 to me that, in fact, was determined on the basis of one of 20 these informal determinations that a specific company should 21 do the work. When that was presented to me, I just would 22 not buy it because I had actually been contacted by a couple 23 of other Alaska Native Corporations who said they could do 24 the work. You know, we went back to the SBA at that time 25 and suggested that this should not be sole sourced to a

particular company but, in fact, should be competed amongst
 the ANCs.

Well, because the determination had already been made that this particular company was going to get the work, the SBA was reluctant to do that. So in order to deal with it, we actually canceled the procurement. We then reset the procurement. It was competed amongst three Alaska Native Corporations, and the best company won. And that is kind of how I see things ought to be.

10 Senator Collins. Thank you.

11 Mr. Jordan, I mentioned in my opening comments that I 12 remember when I was the regional head for New England of SBA 13 that we would have actual graduation ceremonies when an 8(a) 14 firm had been in the program perhaps for the limit of nine 15 years or because it had been successful and become 16 prosperous, was graduating from the 8(a) program.

Is nine years the maximum limit for participation in the 8(a) program except for Native-owned corporations in Alaska, Native corporations?

20 Mr. Jordan. Yes, nine years is the limit, but I 21 believe tribal entities and Alaska Native Corporations, 22 these 8(a) certified subsidiaries that are in the 8(a) 23 program, are also held to that nine year limit. It is the 24 parent company itself that is not.

25 Senator Collins. Correct.

1 But, Ms. Ritt, isn't there a provision in the law that 2 allows the ANCs to keep adding subsidiaries so that the 3 effect is that they can remain in the 8(a) program virtually 4 forever rather than being subjected to the nine-year limit? 5 Ms. Ritt. Yes, Senator Collins, that is correct. They 6 are not restricted in the number of subsidiaries that they 7 can enter into the 8(a) program. And as we have seen, as 8 firms graduate, new ones get created. So it happens quite 9 frequently.

10 Senator Collins. Thank you.

Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Senator Collins. 11 12 We do not have any committee members here. So, 13 Mr. Begich, would you like to ask a few questions? 14 Senator Begich. Absolutely. Thank you very much. 15 Let me, Ms. Ritt, follow up on that. Do you, I am 16 assuming you do, understand the difference between an 8(a) 17 that is an individually-owned and an 8(a), an American 18 Indian, Alaska Native and Hawaiian, which represents thousands of owners? 19

20 Ms. Ritt. Yes, I do.

21 Senator Begich. Do you see any difference in the sense 22 of what they should be able to do or not do?

23 Ms. Ritt. I do understand that the Alaska Native
24 companies have multiple shareholders--

25 Senator Begich. And American Indian.

1 Ms. Ritt. And American Indians that benefit--2 Senator Begich. And Hawaiian-owned. 3 Ms. Ritt. -- from their participation whereas other 8(a) companies just have a few owners. 4 5 Senator Begich. Right. Do you see a difference there 6 in the sense of how they generate contracts and value in the sense that an 8(a), that 9,000 or so that are 7 8 individually-owned or a couple owners, are much different in 9 that their profit motivation is obviously for their own 10 personal wellbeing in the sense as individuals but the 11 Alaska Native Corporations, the Indian-owned, the American 12 Indian-owned and the Hawaiian-owned, are for the betterment 13 of their culture, their communities as well as profit to 14 their shareholders? 15 Ms. Ritt. Certainly, I do. But I also understand that the small businesses are the backbone of this economy and 16 17 part of the recovery plan. 18 Senator Begich. I do not disagree. I do not disagree. I have been in small business for 25 years. My wife owns 19

20 four small businesses, so we have been in it; we understand 21 it. But I thank you for that comment of your knowledge of 22 it.

Let me ask you, in your report, did you compare the growth of the women-owned businesses, the HUBZone firms, the veteran-owned firms and their percentage of growth over time

1 compared to?

2 Ms. Ritt. The scope of this audit was limited to ANCs3 based on concerns raised by GAO in the report.

Senator Begich. But you used the phrase "explosive
growth." Let me give you one data point from testimony that
was given on the House side in '06.

7 When I look at the women-owned business in one year 8 alone, they grew almost double. HUBZones grew over 200 and 9 some percent. If you did it over the same period, which you 10 did it over nine years, in some cases, it would be as much 11 as 1600 percent. So I guess when you say explosive, you 12 are--

13 Ms. Ritt. What I meant was--

14 Senator Begich. How are we comparing it?

Ms. Ritt. --the percentage of participation. When you have one group that is 2 percent of the group getting--of the participants getting contracts, getting 26 percent share of the 8(a) pie, to me, that is explosive. That is disproportionate.

20 Senator Begich. But if I compared the ownership of, in 21 the sense of Alaska Native Corporations, that are owned by 22 thousands--thousands--there are more owners for those for 23 sure than even the 9,000 single owned or double owned, 24 correct?

25 Ms. Ritt. There are more owners. I would agree.

Senator Begich. So there is a different
 responsibility.

3 Let me ask you another question. In your report, you 4 talked about a lot of gross revenues, and you talked about 5 the value of the dividends, and yet you kind of had some 6 question in that arena. I forgot the exact number, but I want to say it was 1 point some billion dividend return for 7 8 the 11 or so that you reviewed. And their contract total 9 was 29 billion, if I remember this right, over the period of 10 time that you did the analysis.

11 So the question is, why didn't you focus on the net 12 revenues? Because that is what matters, is what flows to 13 the owners. Because if you use the calculation that I am 14 familiar with, they almost gave away 70 percent of their 15 dividends to their shareholders. Why didn't you use that 16 number instead?

17 Ms. Ritt. Use their net revenues?

18 Senator Begich. Yes.

Ms. Ritt. Because a lot of them do not make very large profits.

21 Senator Begich. Right.

Ms. Ritt. They have very huge cost structures, as I am sure you know. Some of them have restructured after Chapter 11.

25 Senator Begich. Yes.

1 Ms. Ritt. And--

Senator Begich. And 8(a)s helped them move forward.
Ms. Ritt. But there they are getting billions of
dollars in contracts with hundreds of millions of dollars in
profits, I guess, from various sources.

6 Senator Begich. Yes, but your analysis here kind of 7 makes it sound like they have these huge contracts and they 8 are making this huge amount of money. But really, it is 9 about the net revenue just like the standard 8(a) is 10 measured by.

11 So let me ask you an additional question in regards to 12 that, and that is you had a lot of commentary in here on SBA 13 reforms necessary. Actually, I think your last report 14 highlighted that a lot, which I agree with, and I think 15 every SBA member agrees with that. Besides staffing and 16 overview and monitoring, what else does SBA need in order to do the job? 17 Because it sounds like, for example, the 18 example that I just heard from Mr. Assad, the process he 19 used stopped a contract they did not feel was adequate. So 20 what more?

Ms. Ritt. Well, I do think that they need to collect data on ANC activity, and they need to be more engaged in overseeing joint ventures, mentor protege relationships, where there are opportunities for abuses.

25 Senator Begich. Okay. If I can just ask you, I just

1 thought of another quick question. My time is pretty much 2 up here. But in your report, you talked about the GAO in 3 regards to sole source and the potential of costs to the 4 taxpayers. 5 How come you did not specify any specific issues where 6 an 8(a) corporation has cost the taxpayers more than it 7 should? 8 Ms. Ritt. Well, I think that there has been a lot of 9 cases documented with other IG reports--10 Senator Begich. Of 8(a)s? Ms. Ritt. Yes, of 8(a)s. 11 12 Senator Begich. But why didn't you restate that, then, 13 if that was such, as I saw, an important piece of the 14 equation? Because that is part of the debate of sole 15 source, of what is the value. Because, you know, like 16 today, for example, I receive a nice newsletter from the Air 17 Force talking about \$25 million they saved working with an 18 8(a). 19 Ms. Ritt. Right.

20 Senator Begich. So why didn't you use those examples? 21 Ms. Ritt. Well, we felt that there was enough body of 22 work that other IGs had done that clearly demonstrated that 23 sole source awards to ANCs had been abused.

24 Senator Begich. More recently?

25 Ms. Ritt. Yes.

Senator Begich. Okay. I will tell you--1 2 Ms. Ritt. There was a DoD IG report in 2007 regarding 3 a contract for leased space, a \$100 million, 10-year 4 contract, sole source to an ANC who was not small, did not qualify under the size standards, they did not go through 5 6 GSA, and GSA appraisers determined that it cost \$2.7 million more a year for the life of that contract. 7 8 Senator Begich. And from that, what happened 9 with--well, I will stop because I want to ask you about the 10 process of that. 11 Senator McCaskill. Senator Murkowski? 12 Senator Murkowski. Ms. Ritt, let's continue with you, 13 if we may. Both in your oral statement and in your written 14 testimony, you have suggested that the audit has 15 confirmed--so this is not a suggestion. The audit has 16 confirmed the differences in the rules governing ANC 17 participation has allowed ANCs who have access to the 18 capital and credit of its parent to compete against truly 19 small disadvantaged companies. So your suggestion in this 20 language is very clear to me that somehow or other, the ANCs

21 have broad access to credit and certainly to the capital 22 markets. And I am just not clear how you support your

23 conclusion.

You realize, of course, that ANC stock is not traded.It is not on the stock exchange. Its subsidiaries are not

public companies. So I guess I am not sure what capital markets you are suggesting. And in terms of, you know, the capital markets that might be available to the ANCs themselves, the suggestion that they might have to pledge their land is wholly inappropriate.

6 So the question to you is, where do you believe that 7 this comes from?

Ms. Ritt. It is a very good question. We met with the 8 9 parent companies of the 11 ANC 8(a) participants that were 10 getting most of the money under the program who confirmed to 11 us that they are heavily involved in managing those 12 companies, that they have extended capital and credit to 13 them and other services, management expertise, legal advice. 14 They have a central treasury, many of them, where they sweep 15 in all of the 8(a) contract revenue on a daily basis. Thev 16 make the decisions on how that money is going to be spent. 17 And that is where they are getting their access to capital 18 and credit of the parent corporation and the bonding 19 capability of the parent corporation.

20 Senator Murkowski. Well, your suggestion, though, is 21 somehow or other that they could go out to the capital 22 markets and again--

23 Ms. Ritt. Yeah, that was not our suggestion at all. 24 It was that they are truly large companies through 25 affiliation with their parent corporations who have access

1 to capital and credit.

2 Senator Murkowski. You have looked at just 11 of the 3 ANCs here in this request in response to the chairman of the 4 Subcommittee here. Some of these that you have reviewed 5 were early entrants into the 8(a) program. Others are 6 relatively recent participants into the program, very 7 different status, most clearly, very different status.

8 Is it reasonable to suggest that we would basically 9 pull up the ladder at this point and deny entry to--either 10 deny entry to futures or to cut off those that are 11 relatively new entrants into the programs and exclude them 12 from future opportunity?

Ms. Ritt. No, our office is not advocating in any way that ANCs should not be allowed to participate in the 8(a) program. We are concerned as an IG with the unlimited sole source awards that do not provide the government the best value. There is opportunity in the 8(a) program to get large competed contracts, and ANCs can compete for those.

Senator Murkowski. Let me ask you, Mr. Jordan, because it has been suggested here, through the report and Ms. Ritt has stated again, that somehow or other we are not getting good value out of the 8(a) ANCs.

23 Can you speak to that?

24 Mr. Jordan. I can. First of all, it is also a bit of 25 a misnomer to say there is no competition when it comes to

1 8(a) ANCs. There was over--in 2008, of the figures stated 2 in terms of 8(a) contracts, over \$650 million was through 3 8(a) competition. In terms of sole source authority not providing the best value, I do somewhat reject that on its 4 5 premise. I believe that competition is good. I believe 6 that promoting competition is good. I believe that general 7 principle. The President has talked about competition, 8 transparency, accountability.

9 However, in every contract, and this also applies to 10 all sole source contracts, the contracting officer must 11 certify that the government got fair and reasonable value 12 and it must monitor performance of that contract and can 13 terminate it if the contracting officer sees fit. So to say 14 that the government did not get the best value because it 15 was sole sourced is, or should be, inaccurate.

Senator Murkowski. Well, I appreciate the clarification on that.

18 My time has expired, but I do have another series of 19 questions if we are going to do a second round.

20 Senator McCaskill. I do not think that we are. I do 21 not think that the Ranking Member and I have additional 22 questions for this panel, so we are going to move on to the 23 second panel.

24 Thank you all very much.

25 Mr. Jordan. Thank you.

61 1 [Pause.] 2 Senator McCaskill. We will move on to our second 3 panel, and our first witness on our second panel is Sarah 4 Lukin. 5 Am I saying your name correctly? 6 Ms. Lukin. Lukin. Senator McCaskill. Lukin. She is the executive 7 director of the Native--oh, excuse me. I forgot to swear 8 9 you in. I need you-all to stand, please. 10 Do you state that the testimony you are about to give 11 is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? 12 Ms. Lukin. I do. Ms. Pata. I do. 13 Ms. Kitka. I do. 14 15 Mr. Lumer. I do. 16 Ms. Schneider. I do. Senator McCaskill. Thank you very much. 17 Ms. Lukin is the executive director of the Native 18 19 American Contractors Association. Prior to joining the 20 Native American Contractors Association, Ms. Lukin served as 21 vice president of External Relations for Afognak and their 22 wholly-owned government contracting subsidiary, Alutiiq. 23 Thank you, Ms. Lukin, and we welcome your testimony.

1TESTIMONY OF SARAH L. LUKIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,2NATIVE AMERICAN CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION

Ms. Lukin. Quyanaa. Thank you. I am Alutiiq from the Native village of Port Lions on Kodiak Island, a remote community of 250 people in the Gulf of Alaska. I just started as the executive director for the Native American Contractors Association or NACA.

8 I firmly believe the 8(a) program is critical to the 9 future of our disadvantaged Native communities. It has made 10 a dramatic difference in my quality of life, my family's and 11 my community. And I am here today to ensure other 12 disadvantaged Native Americans and Alaska Natives have the 13 same opportunities to improve their lives.

14 So when I see, as I did recently, an official press 15 release describing tribal Alaska Native and Hawaiian 16 participation in the 8(a) program as a loophole, it disturbs 17 and disheartens me. That term ignores the reality of our 18 severe socioeconomic disadvantages. The fact that Native 19 enterprises are owned by Native communities that are 20 destitute and geographically isolated, decimated by 21 centuries of failed federal policies, yet are still 22 responsible for the health and welfare of thousands of their 23 people, their descendants and dependents, that is real. 24 When poverty in our Native communities exceeds all 25 other race categories and is twice the national average,

1 that is real. The fact that members of Congress have tried 2 to keep the promises made by their predecessors in the 3 Constitution, countless treaties and land settlements when 4 taking hundreds of millions of acres of Native lands, that 5 is real. And it is real, too, that Native women have earned 6 an education because of Native 8(a) benefits and that our 7 Native children can now speak their traditional language 8 that was lost for generations, and that Native elders now 9 receive benefits to offset their very limited income.

Here is a federal program that the government actually got right for Native people. The program is making a difference and we can tell you that one Alaska Native story by one Alaska Native story.

14 Like so many of our Native children, I was a statistic. 15 I come from a broken family that faced substance abuse and 16 poverty. I remember how ashamed I would feel when I had to 17 buy groceries with food stamps and wear secondhand clothes. 18 No one in my family had ever earned a college degree, but 19 scholarships from my Native corporations enabled me to earn 20 a bachelor's and a master's degree, empowering me to 21 overcome enormous odds and experience my own American dream. 22 And I am one of many Alaska Natives that 8(a) has helped. 23 The Native 8(a) benefits protect our land, our 24 language, our culture, our elders, our children and our

future. They help American keep its word. They build

25

business capacity and work ethic, educating teachers, accountants and IT specialists, hope and opportunity. The hand up is replacing the handout. We need more benefits for our people and more Native employment, more work in our Native communities and more Native executives. To cut the program that got us this far is absolutely wrong.

Native American peoples represent 4 percent of America, but Native enterprises still represent less than 1.3 percent of the federal contracting pie. Native 8(a)s strive to increase business opportunities for all other small businesses and 8(a)s, and we offer real competition to the large contractors and real value to the taxpayer.

There have been difficulties. The SBA is understaffed 13 14 and underfunded. Its enforcement, assistance, guidance and 15 training have suffered. There are some very real problems. 16 We strongly believe everyone must play by the rules, and 17 those who do not should be held accountable. Fortunately, 18 those rules and enforcement mechanisms already exist. 19 Unfortunately, the SBA lacks the resources it needs for 20 these important oversight tasks.

The problems with government contracting are universal. The search for solutions should be comprehensive and not disproportionately focused on Native American 8(a)s. America needs the federal procurement system to work, so do Native Americans. That is why the National Congress of

1 American Indians, the National Center for American Indian 2 Enterprise Development and NACA have been very active for 3 over three years in pushing, pulling and prodding for the 4 GAO recommendations, regulatory reforms and more resources 5 for the SBA.

6 We have worked so hard on these issues because Native 7 8(a) represents success, hope and self determination for our 8 Native communities. Now is not the time for Congress to go 9 back on its commitment to Native people.

Quaynaasinaq. Thank you very much for allowing me to discuss a very important program in my life, my children's lives and the lives of my people.

13 [The prepared statement of Ms. Lukin follows:]

1 Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Ms. Lukin.

2 Our next witness is Jacqueline Johnson Pata.

3 Ms. Pata. Pata.

Senator McCaskill. Pata. She is the executive
director of the National Congress of American Indians. Mrs.
Pata is also a member of the board of directors of Sealaska
Corporation, one of the ANCs. Welcome.

1 TESTIMONY OF JACQUELINE JOHNSON PATA, EXECUTIVE 2 DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS 3 Ms. Pata. Thank you. Gunalcheesh. Good afternoon. 4 My name is Jacqueline Johnson Pata, and I am the executive 5 director of the National Congress of American Indians, the 6 largest and oldest Native organization representing American 7 Indians and Alaska Native tribal governments.

8 The U.S. Constitution and many statutes establish the 9 unique American Indian and Alaska Native trust relationship 10 with the Federal Government. Native peoples ceded over 11 500 million acres of land, and the United States entered 12 into a trust relationship with the American Indians and the 13 Alaska Natives. Congress was very specific when 14 articulating the Federal Government's relationship with the 15 Alaska Natives in the Alaska Natives Claims Settlement Act, 16 and this law required federal compensation to settle Native 17 land claims. And Congress mandated that Native-controlled 18 corporations be created. Furthermore, the Settlement 19 Act--in the Settlement Act, Congress confirmed that Alaska 20 Native Corporations are eligible for federal procurement 21 programs.

The Federal Government has enacted numerous policies aimed at reducing poverty and creating economic opportunity for tribes. Specifically, the 8(a) help tribal communities to overcome economic and social barriers and create new

business opportunities for Native and surrounding rural
 communities that are far removed from major markets.

3 Intergenerational poverty remains a serious challenge. 4 American Indians and Alaska Natives are amongst the most 5 economically distressed populations in the United States 6 with a poverty rate of 25.7 percent. This far exceeds the poverty rate for any other group as more than double the 7 8 national average. Per capita income of Indians living on 9 reservations is still less than half the national average, 10 and unemployment is twice that of the national average.

11 Many tribal governments lack the ability to provide the 12 basic infrastructure that most U.S. citizens take for 13 granted such as water, sewage, roads, affordable housing, 14 plumbing, electricity and telephone service. These 15 substandard economic and quality of life indicators have a 16 social toll. Health disparities are prevalent and suicide 17 rates, a symptom of lack of opportunity, are high. Over 60 percent more American Indians and Alaska Natives experience 18 19 suicide than the national average. Alcoholism and diseases 20 like tuberculosis are over 500 percent higher in American Indians and Alaska Natives. 21

Despite these great needs, tribal governments have fewer resources than state and local governments to fulfill their governmental responsibilities to their citizens, making economic development even more important. The

1 longstanding federal policy of self determination is hollow 2 with adequate resources or economic development to carry it 3 out.

4 The 8(a) program is an effective vehicle to realize 5 Native self determination. Business, educational and 6 leadership skills are being developed, and the results are impacting the economic and social conditions in Native and 7 8 rural communities. For example, thousands of scholarships 9 have been awarded to Native people. Hundreds of internships 10 have given valuable work experience to our future workforce. 11 Employment and, more importantly, career opportunities are 12 available where none existed earlier.

Business skills learned through government contracting, like strategic planning and management, are taking root in our communities, and leaderships skills are being developed in councils and on boards. Leaders are now being empowered to make choices about how best to sustain their economic enterprise, their culture and their future generations.

19 NCAI has taken seriously the recommendations from the 20 GAO report and the prior SBA Inspector General reports. 21 Since these reports were issued, we formed a joint working 22 group with NACA, with Native American--National Center for 23 American Indian Enterprise Development. And in 2007, we 24 hosted a series of government-to-government consultations 25 with the SBA administrator to discuss the GAO and the SBA IG

report recommendations and to identify solutions to address
 these concerns.

3 Through this process, we developed comprehensive 4 recommendations to improve the program oversight. 5 Consistent with the 2006 GAO report, these recommendations 6 we proposed were administrative rather than legislative. 7 Our recommendations included developing effective data collection mechanisms, enhancing oversight through Web-based 8 9 reporting, setting milestones for mentor protege and joint 10 ventures, and increased transparency of ownership 11 agreements. Additionally, we have urged that Congress 12 increase funding to the SBA and charge the agency with 13 reengineering the Native 8(a) program.

14 We feel it is important for this committee and for 15 Congress to know that tools, such as 8(a) business 16 development created to promote economic self sufficiency, 17 are working in our Native communities. The criticism about 18 the success of tribal and ANCs' contracting is misplaced. 19 More importantly, pitting a disadvantaged group against 20 another only distracts from the many issues all small and 21 disadvantaged contractors have in common.

The federal procurement market is enormous and growing. There is plenty of room for tribal, ANC and other minority businesses to participate. We have proposed increasing SBA contracting goals and size standards, as well as increasing

the thresholds for individually-owned 8(a) companies. 1 2 Limiting access to the federal marketplace will have 3 devastating effects on our Native and rural communities. 4 With conditions in Native communities comparable to those of 5 developing nations, we should all be working together to 6 improve programs like 8(a) business development programs and 7 create the opportunity that is needed in Indian country. Thank you. 8

[The prepared statement of Ms. Pata follows:]

1 Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Ms. Pata. 2 Ms. Julie Kitka is here. She is the president of the 3 Alaska Federation of Natives. She is also a member of the 4 board of directors of Chugach Alaska Native Corporation. 5 And I do want to say for the record that you owe thanks 6 to your senators for your testimony here today. Your request to testify came in after we had done the witness 7 list, but because Senator Begich and Senator Murkowski came 8 9 to the Subcommittee and made a specific request for you to 10 testify, we made an exception to the normal rule that we do 11 not allow more witnesses after the witness list has been 12 testified. So I do not know if you want to like say no 13 thanks to them when this is over or thanks to them, but you are here at their behest and we welcome you and look forward 14 15 to your testimony.

TESTIMONY OF JULIE KITKA, PRESIDENT, ALASKA
 FEDERATION OF NATIVES

3 Ms. Kitka. Well, thank you, Madam Chair, Ranking 4 Member, members of our delegation and other members of the 5 committee and staff. I truly appreciate the opportunity to 6 present testimony on behalf of the Alaska Federation of Natives regarding our Native corporations, their contracting 7 opportunities, and their status under the Small Business 8 9 Administration 8(a) program, and request that my written 10 testimony be included into the record.

Before I actually get into some of the oral comments that I wanted to do, I wanted to place a couple things into the record to give you a background of when, for example, we are talking about scholarships that are going to our young people or this or that, it is not like scholarships like everybody just imagines that you just give out to kids.

I want to put one thing formally into the record and 17 18 would like to provide the backup for that, is we are still 19 not on a level playing field as far as education in Alaska. 20 There is a class action lawsuit pending in the courts right 21 now in Alaska asserting that there is a \$200 million a year 22 shortfall deficit spending on the rural village schools, and this has been going on for decades. We have just had a 23 24 class action lawsuit on law enforcement and the deficit 25 spending and the lack of law enforcement opportunities to

1 deal with alcohol and other things.

2 We are not yet at a level playing field. And so for 3 example, the scholarships that come in from this 8(a) 4 contracting to our young people are essential because we are trying to catch up generations of young people. And our 5 6 corporations that are providing these scholarships, they are 7 for all ages. It is for adults. It is for young people. It is for their descendants on that. But we are never going 8 9 to catch up and get parity with everybody else in education 10 if we lose these opportunities for these contracts.

11 So I just wanted to say for the record, the value of 12 these scholarships means so much more to us because we have 13 got these hurdles to overcome still and we are not getting 14 the funding for our basic first grade through, you know, 15 high school education that other people across the United 16 States take for granted, or their state government works 17 really closely with them and accomplishes.

18 We are still in the state under the Voting Rights 19 Protection Act, the only other state along with Mississippi, 20 that people have to look out to make sure our voting rights 21 are protected. We were the last Americans to get the right 22 to vote in 1924. 1971, the year our land claims was formed, 23 they had to amend the state constitution to take out the 24 requirement that you had to write and speak English in order 25 for our elders, our Native people, could even vote in our

1 state. We have still got a lot of catching up to do, and 2 the circumstances we are dealing with as a people have to be 3 understood by this Congress when you are making policies.

4 As I put in my written comments, we are honored to 5 submit this testimony. I have worked with an incredible 6 number of Native leaders in public policy, public officials 7 for many years, trying to create these opportunities. And 8 we have had great success. We have had many 9

accomplishments.

10 I cite in my testimony a 30-year trend analysis that we commissioned from the University of Alaska in 2004 in which 11 12 we looked at all the social, health and economic indicators 13 of our whole populations over three decades. And the 14 thumbnail sketch of that analysis is tremendous difference 15 that this Congress and the state of Alaska and the Native 16 people have made in people's lives. People are living 17 longer. Infant mortality is being decreased, health 18 indicators.

19 Lots of progress is being made. So we do not have a hopeless situation, but we still have a thread of disparity 20 21 in every single indicator, including poverty, including infant mortality on that that needs targeted attention on 22 23 that. And we still are not at a parity with other Alaskans, 24 let alone with other Americans. And I really commend that 25 report to you as you are taking a look at when we are

1 talking about socially disadvantaged people on that, that 2 report over 30 years will see the progress of work has been 3 done, but it will point to you every single indicator where 4 the disparity continues.

5 That is real. That is documented. It was not done for 6 the purposes of justifying contracting but was done because our own leadership wants to pay attention to these 7 8 indicators. And we also were aware that we are in the midst 9 of a baby boom with a lot of growth in our population, and 10 we knew that there would be tremendous needs in health and 11 education to grow up this next generation of young people. 12 And I commend that report and would like to submit that for 13 the record.

14 [The information of Ms. Kitka follows:]

15 / SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT

1 Ms. Kitka. I want to go on record on behalf of AFN 2 fully supporting the 8(a) program and assuring this 3 committee that our people are getting solid benefits from 4 that program. As I mentioned, the scholarships, the 5 internship opportunities, the work opportunities are real. 6 Are there improvements that can be done? Of course 7 there are improvements that can be done. But there are many 8 other factors that need to be in place to help our Native 9 population to grow our workforce in these contracting 10 opportunities and in other sectors.

I also want to extend on behalf of our board of directors and our people up there an invitation to this committee and the chair and your staff to come up to Alaska and meet our people and see firsthand some of the contracting that is going on, some of our corporations, our people and our aspirations. And I might suggest a time frame in which you might do that, consider.

18 On August 12th, we have a very historic visit in our 19 state by five members of the cabinet of President Obama, 20 five cabinet secretaries are all going to be in Bethel, 21 Alaska on August 12th. Unprecedented in our history to have 22 five cabinet officials, and they are also planning visits 23 and sending staff out to the Wade Hampton district, which is 24 among the top 10 poorest counties in the whole United 25 States.

And we welcome the attention and the effort and the 1 2 partnership that is being offered to address and raise up 3 the living conditions for our people. And if there is an opportunity for this committee--if, Madam Chair, you cannot 4 make it, please send your staff up. I mean join us in this 5 6 because we are going to have quite a bit of open discussion and dialogue. And we are going to be looking at solutions 7 and things that can go forward. But it is very historic. 8 9 We have never seen that before.

10 I know I am using quite a bit of time on that, but I want to try to get as much into the record. As I said, the 11 12 basis for our Native corporations is our land claims 13 settlement, and it is vitally important to the Native people 14 of Alaska that our corporations are strong and healthy. 15 They hold our settlement lands in them, our cultural lands, 16 our historic and sacred lands. If they go down, the danger 17 of losing our land and our future is very real.

18 So we are committed to do everything that we can to 19 help our leadership that is trying to make these 20 corporations work and are being very diligent and successful 21 to create as many opportunities as possible.

I might want to cite one item. When I think about the IG report and the data and the period of time in which they collected data, I think that that is kind of an incomplete time frame and it is probably nobody's fault. But after the

time frame on that, I mean we have had the worst economic crisis in my lifetime in this country, and how people are faring and how government contracting is doing. I mean. we have to take into account we are still in this crisis and it has not bottomed out.

6 So I would just like to suggest that, you know, the 7 collecting of information and the monitoring and the status 8 needs to continue on. And we need to pay attention to how 9 everybody is faring in this economic crisis and how people 10 are positioning their companies to be able to contribute to 11 this country. We are very much committed to do everything 12 in our power for the economic recovery of this country 13 because we are affected by that in Alaska as well as we know 14 every American is, and we want to be partners in trying to contribute to that as well. 15

16 Senator McCaskill. Ms. Kitka, we are several minutes 17 over your testimony. And I know you have come a long way. I 18 do want to assure you that every word you want to go into 19 the record will go into the record. But we want to make 20 sure since we have five members of the panel that we have 21 enough time for questions.

If there is anything else you want to close with in just a few seconds, you are welcome to do so.

Ms. Kitka. Well, in closing, I just want to reiterate our strong support of the 8(a) program and that it makes a

1 difference, and we are pleased to provide additional

2 information if the Committee has questions for us or wants 3 additional reports or information.

4 We are honored to be allowed to testify, and we are 5 just very proud to be contributing to building the country. 6 I have stated in the testimony that we feel the number one benefit to the Native people from these contractings is the 7 capacity building and the whole nation building experience. 8 9 And we think as we get past this economic crisis, that whole 10 capacity that we have built in our corporations and that 11 nation building experiences can be put to use not only 12 throughout the rest of the United States but in other parts 13 of the world.

14 [The prepared statement of Ms. Kitka follows:]

1 Senator McCaskill. Thank you so much. Thank you. 2 Our next witness is Mark Lumer. He is the senior vice 3 president for federal programs at Cirrus Technology, a 4 service disabled veteran-owned small business based in 5 Alabama. Before joining Cirrus, Mr. Lumer was the principal 6 assistant responsible for contracting for the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, a member of the Senior 7 Executive Service in Army Acquisition Corps with Level 3 8 9 certifications in both contracting and program management. 10 He is an expert and author in the field of government 11 contracting and has received many awards. Between November 12 2003 and July of 2004, Mr. Lumer served as the Assistant 13 Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Policy and 14 Procurement in Iraq.

15 Welcome, Mr. Lumer.

1 TESTIMONY OF MARK LUMER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, 2 FEDERAL PROGRAMS, CIRRUS TECHNOLOGY, INC. 3 Mr. Lumer. Madam Chairman McCaskill, Ranking Member 4 Collins, members of the Committee, the Alaska delegation, I 5 am Mark Lumer. I am here representing Cirrus Technology, a 6 small business located in Huntsville, Alabama. Cirrus 7 Technology is a HUBZone and service disabled veteran-owned 8 small business and a recent graduate of the 8(a) program. 9 Before I went into private industry, I did serve as a 10 contracting official with the Department of the Army for 11 almost 33 years. My last assignment was as the contracting 12 executive for the Army Space and Missile Defense Command, a 13 SES position and a post I was in for almost 13 years. Prior 14 to that, I was on the Army staff at the Pentagon where I 15 helped write the FAR and DFARS for four years. So in a 16 sense, this is all my fault. Part 19 of the FAR, in fact, 17 and part 219 of the DFARS were two areas of my personal 18 responsibility.

I have been told I am the most decorated civilian contracting official in the history of the U.S. Army. However, there was a fire in St. Louis about 35 years ago and destroyed thousands of records, so that statement cannot be accurately verified.

24 [Laughter.]

25 Mr. Lumer. The first observation I do want to make is

1 that as a contracting officer for 25 years, the unlimited 2 sole source authority that ANCs have was a very useful tool 3 to me in issuing contracts pursuant to the Competition and 4 Contracting Act guickly. I authorized the use myself about 5 six times in those 13 years at SMDC for hundreds of millions 6 of dollars. I received exceptional performance from the 7 ANCs. The prices proposed were audited, they were 8 negotiated and ultimately determined to be fair and 9 reasonable by the contracting officers. I am really not in 10 favor of having that tool completely eliminated.

Serving now as a small business employee, which was an 8(a) and is currently a HUBZone and service disabled veteran-owned small business, I have to state it is incredibly difficult to compete with ANCs under the current rules. Cirrus has lost contracts that were bundled and awarded to ANCs. Cirrus has lost opportunities to compete where contracts were assigned to ANCs noncompetitively.

18 As a general rule, Cirrus Technology will not compete 19 for any procurements if there is a history of ANC 20 involvement or where there is a likelihood that an ANC will 21 go after the opportunity directly. I cannot provide you 22 with any concrete evidence, but anecdotally, I firmly 23 believe that many small businesses will routinely bypass 24 procurements where ANCs are involved because the chances of 25 winning are so small even if they are allowed to compete in

1 the first place.

2 It is my firm belief that the extraordinary growth in 3 sole source awards to ANCs is a direct byproduct of the 4 extreme shortage of government contracting officers and 5 procurement contract specialists, a situation that, frankly, 6 will only get worse with the addition of billions of dollars 7 in stimulus money. I have seen and heard estimates that 8 most government contracting offices are short-staffed by an 9 average of 35 percent. I believe that figure to be low, 10 personally.

11 Procurement officials are in the constant process of 12 performing what I call contracting triage. They are looking 13 to see what requirements can be legally awarded in the 14 shortest amount of time using the least amount of resources. 15 And that inevitably leads them to using ANCs because of the 16 unique unlimited sole source authority that exists, the fact 17 that they get small business credit for those awards, and 18 the guarantee that there will be no protests sustained by 19 the GAO. There are several areas where the playing field is 20 currently uneven. We have talked about the sole source 21 thresholds for HUBZones, non-ANC 8(a)s; service disabled is 22 three and a half and five and a half versus unlimited. The 23 size standards for most small businesses are determined by 24 employees, typically 500 or 1,000 or 1500 depending upon the 25 NAICS code or sometimes by income as opposed to no employee

limits for the ANCs. That can create an extreme disparity
 in the ability to compete.

3 ANCs may have multiple 8(a)s, as has been identified previously, while other firms are typically limited to one 4 5 each. That ANC's unique authority gives them an 6 extraordinary advantage to adjust overhead rates and general administrative costs, thereby giving them a cost advantage 7 8 that other firms do not have. The inability of companies to 9 protest a contracting officer's decision to award a 10 procurement to an ANC, especially when there are bundling 11 issues, that is a problem.

12 To obtain a HUBZone designation from the SBA, one 13 requirement is that 35 percent of the employees in the 14 company live in any designated HUBZone track, yet there are 15 no minimum requirements for ANCs to employ tribal members or 16 Alaskans. In fact, there is no requirement that they even 17 have offices, though in Alaska, though, almost all of them 18 do. Even the subcontracting arena, there is special 19 incentives, the 5 percent bonus that was talked about. 20 There are no incentives for subcontracts to HUBZones, 21 women-owned or service disabled veteran-owned small 22 businesses.

Having said all that, I truly believe there are many legitimate reasons to provide procurement assistance to ANCs. I do not believe many companies would even object to

allowing ANCs to have some type of procurement preference in competing for government contracts. However, the current situation is out of balance and it may be time to start to swing the pendulum back the other way. I look forward to answering any questions the Committee

6 may have.

7 [The prepared statement of Mr. Lumer follows:]

Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Mr. Lumer.
 Our next witness is Christina Schneider. She is the
 chief financial officer for the Purcell Construction
 Corporation, a HUBZone contractor based in the state of New
 York. Welcome, and we look forward to your testimony.

1 TESTIMONY OF CHRISTINA SCHNEIDER, CHIEF FINANCIAL 2 OFFICER, PURCELL CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION 3 Ms. Schneider. Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is 4 Christina Schneider, and I am the chief financial officer of 5 Purcell Construction Corp. I also serve as the director on 6 the New York state AGC, a statewide trade organization of over 600 construction contractors. We Are also a member of 7 AGC of America with over 33,000 members nationwide. One of 8 9 the founding principles of AGC is to promote fair and open 10 competition within the marketplace.

I commend the senators today for calling today's hearing and am honored to present testimony on this subject. Specifically, my remarks will focus on the effect that sole source awards to Alaska Native Corporations has had on Purcell Construction and other local general contractors.

16 We are a second generation mid-size general contractor 17 based in Watertown, New York. Watertown is a small 18 community in rural, economically depressed northern New York 19 where much of the economy is dependent upon Fort Drum, home 20 of the Army's 10th Mountain Division. From 2002 to 2007, 21 our company was one of two local contractors who held a term 22 contract at Fort Drum. We completed over 96 different task 23 orders under a contract valued at \$57.5 million. Both firms 24 involved in this contract received multiple commendations 25 for the work that we did, and by all accounts performance

1 exceeded contract expectations.

2 In 2004, the government anticipated exceeding our 3 contract value limits, so they began preparing for the 4 solicitation of a follow-on contract, which we assumed would 5 be through competitive bidding. We were shocked to learn 6 that the government decided to award the contracts to two 7 Alaska Native Corporations, Chugach and Alutiiq, on a sole source no-bid basis. Our firm and several other general 8 9 contractors in northern New York were totally shut out from 10 competing for this contract.

We were given various reasons for this decision, ranging from there not being enough time to procure this contract using traditional methods to the unbelievable argument that this sole source contract would lead to the most potential for involvement by local companies.

16 In addition to being excluded from bidding, we had no 17 opportunity to protest the decision. Federal regulations 18 dictate that only a competing bidder has legal standing to 19 protest. With no competitors, there is no mechanism for us 20 This was particularly frustrating because we to protest. 21 believe Chugach was ineligible to receive sole source awards 22 because of their multiple large affiliates operating in the 23 same industry classification. We provided the SBA in 24 Washington with documentation to support our claim but have 25 no evidence that this information was ever considered.

1 Even though this particular sole source contract was 2 awarded in 2004, local contractors are still suffering from 3 the impact of its 10-year, 400-million-dollar obligation. We have learned over the past month that most of the current 4 5 construction projects being procured by the Fort Drum 6 directorate of contracting, including the bulk of the 7 stimulus funds allocated to Fort Drum, are going through these two ANC contracts. Local contractors are not 8 9 competing for the stimulus funds.

While it is true that ANCs employ local labor and subcontractors, this contracting preference has eliminated opportunities for general contractors like us. Our firm is a prime contractor, and ANCs have replaced us in performing that function. It has negatively impacted our firm and others like us who no longer compete for this work.

As you know, the foundation of the small business legislation is to temporarily provide assistance to fledgling firms. All dollar volume thresholds--there are also dollar volume thresholds that apply to the 8(a) program. And as we have heard today, ANCs are exempt from all of that.

If you refer to a website called Government Contracts Won, the two companies that were awarded the Fort Drum contracts, Alutiiq and Chugach, have amassed in excess of 2.6 billion and \$3.8 billion in government contracts

1 respectively over the past nine years. According to the 2 Inspector General's report issued last week, these two ANCs 3 represent a total of approximately 2,300 individuals. This 4 equates to 2.7 million in contract dollars per person. То us, these figures alone are staggering. But we also know 5 6 that Alutiiq and Chugach are only two out of scores of ANCs being awarded federal contracts. 7

In the construction industry, as with most businesses, 8 9 when competition is removed, prices soar. The costs of this 10 arrangement to the Federal Government is astronomical. 11 Another side effect of these preferences is the impact on 12 truly small businesses. We suspect many contracting 13 officials use this as a way to meet their small business 14 contracting goals. The award of a large contract to an ANC 15 surely comes at an expense of legitimate small businesses. 16 We think the solution to this is straightforward. The 17 unfair advantages enjoyed by the large Alaska Native 18 Corporations must be closely examined. Their immunity to 19 affiliation rules and size standards and the lack of dollar 20 limits on sole source contracts should be eliminated. 21 Tribal firms that legitimately meet the small business standards would still be entitled to all of the benefits 22 23 offered by the 8(a) legislation.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our concerns.[The prepared statement of Ms. Schneider follows:]

1 Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Ms. Schneider. 2 Let me start with going through some of the numbers 3 with the representatives here from some of the ANCs. Let me 4 go through the three corporations that you-all represent. 5 In 2008, Afognak had 728 shareholders, and you had 763 6 million in contract revenue and you employed 6,400 people. 7 Less than 1 percent of your employees were shareholders of your Alaska Native Corporation. 8 9 Ms. Kitka, your corporation, Chugach, your total revenue for 2008 was 952 million; 62 percent of that revenue 10 11 was from federal contracting. The revenue from the 12 contracts represented 595 million. You had 6,587 employees; 13 2.2 percent of your employees were shareholders, 147 people. 14 Ms. Pata, the Sealaska Corporation, your total revenues for 2008 were \$126 million. Your revenue from contracts was 15 16 only 8.4 million. In fact, only 6 percent of the revenue of 17 your corporation came from contracting. You had 1,069 18 employees, and the largest percentage of shareholders 19 employed, you had a 136 shareholders employed or 12.7. 20 If I add those together, we have less than--in revenues 21 of hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of 22 dollars, in fact, well over billions of dollars. We have 23 literally less than 300 people that live in Alaska that are 24 employed or that are members of your corporations.

25 So my question is to you, Ms. Kita, as you talk about

1 capacity building, how is it capacity building if less than
2 1 percent of the employees of the company are members of the
3 corporation?

Ms. Kitka. Well, first off, Madam Chair and members of the Committee, I came here to testify in my role as president of the Alaska Federation of Natives, not in my role or spokesman for Chugach Alaska Corporation. I would be happy to convey any questions back to that corporation.

9 The Alaska Federation of Natives is a completely 10 different entity than Chugach. It is an umbrella 11 organization, and that is the role that I came here prepared 12 to testify to try to give you--

13 Senator McCaskill. Okay. That is fair enough. Let me 14 ask the other two--

Ms. Kitka. But I would be glad to get questions or information back.

Senator McCaskill. That would be terrific. That wouldbe terrific.

I am trying to get at whether or not this is a capacity building, which traditionally is what the 8(a) program was designed to be. It was designed to allow small businesses to grow and get their foot in the door for federal contracting, to build capacity. And then once the capacity is built, to graduate from the program and go into the world of competing. And, in fact, there are some Alaska Native

Corporations that are, in fact, not really participating in
 the sole source. They are out there competing.

I guess my question is for either one of you, if you would choose to answer it. With such a low number of Alaskans--45,000 people are employed by ANCs and only percent of them are members of the corporations; 95 percent of the employees have nothing to do with the corporations.

9 Ms. Kitka. Madam Chair, on the capacity, since I put 10 quite a bit in my written testimony about capacity and 11 nation building, I would be pleased to spend more time and 12 focus a little bit more on the capacity building in a 13 written response back to you.

14 Senator McCaskill. That would be terrific.

Ms. Kitka. Because I absolutely know that the capacity building, in my judgment, based on my years of experience, that that is one of the strongest benefits of this program statewide and--

19 Senator McCaskill. Okay. We would welcome that 20 testimony.

21 Yes?

Ms. Pata. Madam Chair, I would actually like to answer this question. I am actually very proud of Sealaska Corporation and the work that we have done, particularly around shareholder hire. If you look at the numbers that

you talked about, 12.7 is the shareholder hire rate, if you take out the U.S. employees versus our offshores out of the U.S. jurisdiction employees, which is about 455 of them are Mexican employees, we get to a 21.4 percent shareholder hire ratio.

6 But if you look at the way that we do our business, our 7 business in Alaska and our corporate headquarters, we have 8 80 percent shareholder hire in our corporate headquarters, 9 which I think is an outstanding ratio considering that in 10 the 40 years that we have been in business, the first 20 11 years of business development for all the Alaska Native 12 Corporations was very challenged with trying to develop 13 folks--our shareholder base that had gone to school and had 14 been able to get the education necessary and the skills in 15 businesses outside.

16 One of the things that Sealaska does that I am so proud 17 about is our scholarship program and our internship program. 18 And you have the numbers in the materials that we submitted 19 to you. But in our scholarship program, we do not just give 20 our scholarship, we actually continue to track our scholarship. And so that as we are recruiting for any 21 22 opportunities in the corporation, we recruit to that 23 scholarship base. We also are very proud of our internship 24 program. And you can also see in the materials that we 25 submitted to you that we give you a number of stories of how

our Sealaska core management team really started from either
 the scholarship program or the internship program or both.
 Most of the--the majority of our vice presidents and core
 management team is shareholders.

5 I think that is--when we are looking at the capacity of 6 the corporations--and I cannot speak for the other 7 corporations because I only represent Sealaska Corporation as the board of directors. But I do know that we are 8 9 looking for models and sharing models, not only amongst us in Alaska but in the lower 48, and that these models of how 10 11 do we use scholarship programs, as the tribes are looking 12 across the country to implement scholarship programs, are 13 looking at best practices and what works.

14 I think some of the things Sealaska has done through 15 experience, we have learned tracking makes a difference in 16 being able to recruit back home to our own community that 17 those have left our community and to get them back. And so 18 I think one of the things about this government contracting 19 program, 8(a) program, in this business development, and one 20 of the recommendations that we made, is that we really look 21 towards taking those best practices and using them to be 22 able to implement better practices. And some of the things 23 that Native American Contracting Association, NCAI and 24 NCAIED, have done in trainings with lower 48 tribes is 25 really sharing some of those best practices.

Senator McCaskill. Ms. Lukin, did you want to address
 the less than 1 percent of your employees being
 shareholders?

4 Ms. Lukin. Senator, I came here today to speak on 5 behalf of the Native American Contractors Association. As 6 such, I cannot speak to the direct operations or businesses 7 relating to another organization. Certainly, I am sure that 8 I can find the proper person to answer that particular 9 question regarding Afognak Native Corporation. But I would like to speak in general terms about shareholder hire and 10 employment of Alaska Native people. 11

As you know, I hope, that the goal of every Alaska Native Corporation is to hire as many qualified shareholders and their family members as possible. In fact, we have in place Public Law 93638, which allows us to provide a preference for qualified shareholders, Alaska Natives and American Indians.

18 In addition to that, we are really focused on 19 mentoring, growing our Alaska Native students to be at a 20 point where they can earn management level positions within 21 our Alaska Native Corporations. Remember that we are really 22 talking about first generation college graduates such as 23 myself as a great example of somebody who--you know, I come 24 from a family that did not have a college education. So 25 really, I am the first generation that is qualified to earn

1 those management level positions.

2 I would also like to note that a lot or most of the 3 Alaska Native Corporations have shareholder development departments focused specifically on helping to train and 4 5 mentor and grow our shareholders to earn those positions. 6 They do everything from helping shareholders build life 7 skills, to resuem writing, training. They help them with mock interviews and then help walk them through the hire 8 9 process. So I wanted to just focus on that in general 10 terms.

11 Senator McCaskill. Yes, and I am going to go ahead and 12 give my colleagues from Alaska an opportunity to question 13 now since I am over my time. I have a number of questions 14 that I want to ask, and so hopefully, this will not take too 15 long.

16 Senator Begich.

17 Senator Begich. Thank you very much, and this line of 18 questioning, I am going to follow up on it, also, actually. 19 You know, I think there is an ongoing misunderstanding 20 how the corporations operate. Not only do you have the 21 for-profit arms, you have the non-profit arms, which are a 22 significant portion of the business that goes on, which has 23 a huge percentage of Alaska hire, Alaska Native hire. But, 24 also, they are providing the health care. They are 25 providing the major part of the social network.

1 So tell me if this is a fair statement, that 2 individuals that may work for a time being--or like, for 3 example, I met four interns from NANA Corporation that were 4 working for some of the subsidiaries here throughout the 5 country and came by here a couple weeks ago. They may or 6 may not stay in those corporations. They may go to one of They 7 the sister corporations, for example, the health care. may be an administrator. They may be a practitioner. 8

9 Is that a fair statement? That if you take a very 10 narrow look at 8(a)s by themselves, you can argue the 11 percentage all kinds of ways because that is what numbers 12 But if you look at the big picture, what ANCs were set do. 13 up for, is that cross sharing not only for American Indian 14 tribes but also for within the corporations within 15 Alaska--and, really, the village corporations have kind of 16 grown in the last few years versus the regionals.

17 Is that a--

18 Ms. Kitka. Well, Senator, I would like to address 19 that. And it was kind of going to be my follow-up to the 20 chairman. And I will use my daughter as an example. My 21 daughter is a graduate of the University of Alaska nurses 22 program with honors last August. She was supported by 23 scholarships from her native corporation. There is a 24 critical nurse shortage in our state, in our villages and 25 communities, and she graduated with honors, and now she is

working for the Center for Disease Control on influenza
 things.

If you took a look at the growth of teachers in our village schools and in our hubs, in our communities, you will see the incredible growth of Native teachers. I bet if you looked at every single one of them, virtually 100 percent of those teachers would have been funded from their village or their regional corporation's scholarship programs.

10 As far as I know on any of the scholarship programs, 11 nobody is just trying to only put money into like law or 12 business management. They are trying to create 13 opportunities for our young people in whatever areas that 14 they want to go to, and some gravitate towards working with 15 the corporation and we really encourage them. But like I 16 said, like my daughter, she is in the health field in a 17 critical area of need, and there are so many Native teachers 18 that are there as well.

19 Senator Begich. Thank you.

20 Ms. Pata. I would like to follow up on the rippling 21 effect of what I see as today's investments. I know as a 22 corporation we are taking--and in my testimony, I talk about 23 the longer term. We as Native peoples across this country 24 always are concerned with the seventh generation to come. 25 And so as I look at that, these investments we see today

have rippling effects. It is that student, that person who got that first time scholarship, who went to college, and who then now maybe more in that family will go to college. It is how they invest in their communities.

5 But it is the way we do our business, too. It is our 6 corporate business philosophy. The way that we stay 7 connected to our non-profit values as far as cultural and 8 community values that are very important in what we do. We 9 have not only the tribal organizations, we have the 10 non-profit associations that function. And we very much 11 have the same people. So no matter what hat we are wearing, 12 we are all the same Alaska Natives concerned about the 13 subsistence and the other political issues that affect our 14 communities. And so, we have to invest in those, too.

15 Senator Begich. Let me ask one other--and I have got 16 about a minute left here.

17 The analysis, which, again, I have a lot of 18 questions--there is a committee report that came out late 19 last night that I have had a chance very briefly to review. 20 But, you know, when they talk about shareholders within the 21 corporation, it is not uncommon to have other Native 22 corporation shareholders that are not of the corporation 23 that runs the corporation.

24 Is that a fair statement?

25 Ms. Pata. That is a fair statement. You know, when

1 the shareholders were divided, when--

2 Senator Begich. The regions.

Ms. Pata. --the regions were divided, they kind of
drew lines around the map where you were living at the time.
Senator Begich. Right.

6 Ms. Pata. Not unlike some places in the lower 48 when 7 we are dealing with those issues and so--

8 Senator Begich. So we have to be careful when we talk 9 about the numbers of shareholders of your corporations 10 working for the corporations. The real question is Alaska 11 Native hire within the corporate structures that exist. And 12 one of the biggest strengths you have is the issue of 13 in-state and how much you have been doing there.

14 For example, one of the interns I met, it was the first 15 time he was out of his village ever, ever. And people have 16 to have that perspective when they deal with what we are 17 doing in Alaska, that it is a very unique situation where a 18 young person may not have ever left the village and this is 19 a new experience. But when you think of shareholders, I 20 think of it from a broader perspective, and that is a fair 21 statement, I think. Thank you.

22 Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Senator Begich.

23 Senator Murkowski?

24 Senator Murkowski. Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 I think we all recognize that there is nothing in the

1 Federal Government requirements when we are talking about 2 government contracting here, that in order to get a contract 3 here in Virginia, you have got to be a Virginia-based company. And so, there seems to be some suggestion, both in 4 5 the report that we have seen and from some of the testimony 6 that we have heard today, that, well, the criticism is, is 7 that we are not seeing enough local hire, enough shareholder 8 hire. Also in the report, there was some criticism directed 9 that we are not seeing a substantial number of Alaska Natives that are part of the executive structure. 10

11 I will ask you, Ms. Lukin, you come from Port Lions. 12 Now, tell me--and I am not asking you to wear your other hat 13 here, but as a resident of Port Lions, what kind of economic 14 development can we really see within a tiny, tiny community 15 like this? And I am going to let you answer the question. 16 But, Jackie, you come from southeast, where I was born 17 down there. We were born in a national forest. This is 18 land that is not available for development. We are working 19 with Sealaska to try to allow for some of that. We have got 20 the CEO of NANA Corporation, 60 percent of NANA's lands are locked up as federal lands. And when we are talking about 21 22 the ability to hire your people locally, the reality is, if 23 you are going to have a government contract, more likely 24 than not, it is going to be out of the state, and more 25 likely than not, how easy is it to get an individual, a

young person, whether they are from Port Lions or Angoon or
 from Quyana, to come here to Virginia?

3 Can you just speak to that? Because, Ms. Lukin, you 4 have obviously got some very present experience as a young 5 Alaska native who has left the village and come out into 6 this world.

Ms. Lukin. Yes. Quyanaa. Thank you for the question.
My village, like so many in rural Alaska, is not
connected to any other communities by road. It is only
accessible by small plane or a seasonal ferry from the
mainland or boats.

Senator Murkowski. How much does it cost to get from your village to Anchorage?

Ms. Lukin. If I were to fly from my village to Anchorage, it would be several hundred dollars. To take my family, it is over \$1,000 to leave the village. And we are probably less expensive than many in, say, the Bethel region or the Aleut region or other areas in the state.

19 There are no economic opportunities in my community. 20 We had one single store, which I think would be comparable 21 to what you might have here is like, what, a 7-Eleven? But 22 it closed because it could not sustain itself in our 23 village. We have minor commercial fishing, but the prices 24 for fish have been drastically declining over the years. 25 And we used to have timber development, but again, the

prices for timber dramatically went down in the mid 1990s. The likelihood that an Alaska Native Corporation is going to be pursuing contracts out of the state is very high because there are contract opportunities in the state of Alaska but there are only so many opportunities, and there are 200 Alaska Native Corporations.

How likely is it somebody will move? Very unlikely.
I just moved myself, and it is hot here. But we are very
connected to our culture and to our community, to our family
and to our traditional way of life. So to uproot your
people and move them to somewhere outside of your community,
it is very difficult to do.

13 Senator Murkowski. But let me ask about that because 14 what we are attempting to do through the use of the 15 educational scholarships, primarily, is to provide for that 16 level of educational opportunity so that there can be a 17 level of exposure to how we can make business opportunities 18 and translate them back to the village. Sometimes it is 19 going to work; other times it is not going to work. But as 20 you point out, we are really just in that first generation 21 of educating young Alaska Natives and now bringing 22 successful in bringing them back home; is that correct? 23 Ms. Lukin. Yes, that is correct. And I would also 24 point out that through the scholarships and small business 25 programs available to--and by the ANCs to their

1 shareholders, there are some in my dad's age bracket who at 2 the age of 53 decided to start his own small business, 3 sports fishing charter business in our village. And he is still going strong today, used his dividends to help 4 5 purchase a small boat and got scholarships to help him get 6 the Coast Guard's trainings and the certifications that were 7 necessary to operate his small business in our village. So 8 there are opportunities like that that are growing in rural 9 Alaska because of the 8(a) program.

10 Senator Murkowski. Thank you.

Senator McCaskill. Thank you, Senator Murkowski.
 Let me ask a couple of questions that may be awkward,
 but I am curious.

14 Would the three of you have any problem with competing 15 with other ANCs?

Ms. Pata. No, I think we actually do compete with other ANCs on various contracts.

Senator McCaskill. I mean, actually taking away the ability of you to get a sole source contract if, in fact, the other companies that you were going to compete against were all ANCs, so that it would actually be a competitive bidding process but all of the bidders would be ANCs.

23 Do you-all have any problem with that?

Ms. Pata. I am not here to speak about that at this point. Obviously, we would have to have, you know, a

1 consultation on that issue. It just brings to light two 2 issues for me. One is, you know, sole sourcing--the issues 3 around sole source contracting and whether or not it is a 4 good federal value is not only an issue of 8(a) contracting, 5 certainly not an ANC only issue or a tribal issue because 6 tribal governments have the same ability to sole source as 7 ANCs. And I think that the separation of those poses an issue for me. 8

9 I think, though, once again, we look towards 10 recommendations for improving the program. We would be more 11 than glad to sit down with you and your staff and the 12 Committee and have consultation with tribes across the 13 country as well as the ANCs to come up with some 14 recommendations that could address some of the concerns.

15 Senator McCaskill. You know, because, believe me, you 16 do not need to explain to me that we have got a problem with 17 noncompetitive contracts. It is how I found out about you 18 guys, was I was looking in to all the noncompetitive 19 contracts that were let in Iraq. And as I started pulling 20 the thread, I started finding all of these noncompetitive 21 contracts across our government.

This is by no means an effort to say that the ANCs are the only problem we have in Federal Government as it relates to sole source contracting. We have lots of problems surrounding sole source contracting, especially at DoD and

1 Homeland Security. And that is why the President issued an 2 executive order in March directing his executive branch to 3 prefer competitive bidding because we have gotten into this 4 incredible explosive growth, not just in the ANC area, not just in the 8(a) program, but an explosive growth in 5 6 contracting across the board. And that is why this Subcommittee was created, is we need to look at all of the 7 8 contracting issues.

9 If you might be willing to compete with other ANCs and 10 if we put that out there on the table, what about accepting 11 the exact same rules as the Indian tribes? Would you-all 12 have any problem with having the same rules for contracting 13 as it relates to a status of economically disadvantaged?

I think everything you have talked about in terms of--I also served on the Indian Affairs Committee briefly and I also have been informed and briefed--although not firsthand knowledge, because we do not have significant tribes in Missouri--of the incredible dysfunction of our government in terms of making sure that we have opportunity and economic opportunity for Indian tribes.

21 So I think all the things you have talked about in 22 terms of scholarships and empowerment and all of those would 23 equally apply to the Indian tribes.

24 Would you-all have any problem with accepting the exact 25 same rules as the Indian tribes have?

1 Ms. Pata. I guess, once again, I would have to say, 2 you know, that we obviously are not here to be decision 3 makers for the body of people who sit behind us or that we 4 represent here today without having those conversations. 5 I do want to clarify, though. I think there was some 6 concern about the differences between tribes and ANCs. The 7 differences between tribes and ANCs are really the issue of 8 proving that you are disadvantaged. And tribes one time 9 prove that they are socially disadvantaged, and then they 10 are able to continue to operate multiple 8(a) contracts, 11 very similar to ANCs.

12 The only other difference that is out there is in the 13 management responsibility, and even at that, tribes are 14 allowed to be able to put forward management plans to show 15 that they can--that they would have a non-Native manager as 16 long as they had a mentoring program in place.

17 So as far equitably being able to compete on sole 18 source contracts and those elements, we are the same. So I 19 am trying to discern from you exactly what are you--are 20 those the only two issues that you were concerned about? 21 Senator McCaskill. Well, the main issue is that 22 regardless of how large an ANC gets, it is still 23 economically disadvantaged. It does not matter how big it 24 Whereas with Indian tribes, at a certain point in time, is. 25 they lose their status as economically disadvantaged if they

1 get to a certain size.

2 Ms. Pata. No. I am trying not to disagree with you, 3 but it is my understanding that tribes prove they are 4 socially disadvantaged the first time, the one time. 5 Senator McCaskill. They are socially and economically. 6 Ms. Pata. Disadvantaged the one time, and they 7 graduate out of the program just like ANCs graduate out of the program. So ANCs' subsidiaries are--ANCs' 8(a) programs 8 9 graduate out of the programs. Tribes graduate out of the 10 program, too. That is also the same. 11 The difference, the tribes no longer, according to SBA

regulations, have to prove themselves, continually prove themselves that they are socially and economically disadvantaged. They do that one time, whereas the ANCs have been given by congressional support the recognition that they have already proved they are socially and economically disadvantaged because they are addressing a community of socially disadvantaged folks.

I think if you look at the history of the program, part of that was at the time when ANCs were being included, tribes were just getting this new gaming opportunity and many members of Congress were not quite sure whether or not, you know, how that would be. And so that is why they--that is why the ANCs have this congressional recognition but the tribes have to prove that they are still socially and

economically disadvantaged. But they do not have to
 repeatedly have to prove it to themselves.

3 Senator McCaskill. Well, I guess then if--I think we
4 have got something on the table here.

5 Ms. Pata. Yes.

6 Senator McCaskill. If there is no difference, then I 7 would hope that you-all would be willing to accept and 8 support a change in the law that would make sure that you 9 are on completely equal footing as it relates to socially 10 disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged, because, 11 certainly, some of your corporations are much, much larger 12 than many, many, many Native American corporations.

13 I do not think any of you would argue about that, would 14 you?

15 Okay.

16 Ms. Lukin. Ms. Chairman, as Jackie indicated earlier, 17 we are not in a position today through our organizations to 18 negotiate on behalf of our people. We need to go through an 19 extensive tribal consultation process to ensure that the 20 government-to-government relationship between Native peoples 21 and the United States is maintained and we have the 22 opportunity to hear everyone's voice. So we would be happy to have that discussion. 23

24 Senator McCaskill. Okay.

25 Ms. Lukin. But we would like to go through the proper

1 process.

2 Senator McCaskill. Oh, I understand. I just wanted to 3 put it out there, that that would seem to me--

4 Ms. Lukin. And I would also clarify--

5 Senator McCaskill. --the starting point of just some6 discussions.

Ms. Lukin. Absolutely. And the only other point I
would clarify for Jackie is it is proving economic
disadvantage. In fact, tribes and Alaska Natives are
automatically socially disadvantaged. Thank you.

Senator McCaskill. Right. It is the economic disadvantage where the difference is, not the socially disadvantaged.

14 Ms. Lukin. Thank you.

15 Senator McCaskill. Mr. Lumer and Ms. Schneider, can 16 you explain--especially you, Mr. Lumer, with your background 17 in contracting--what would be in your mind a rationale for 18 allowing a corporation a 5 percent bonus for subcontracting 19 with one of their affiliates of taxpayer money?

20 Mr. Lumer. Madam Chairman, I was here for the earlier 21 discussion. I frankly do not agree that that is allowable.

22 Senator McCaskill. You do not?

23 Mr. Lumer. I do not.

24 Senator McCaskill. Okay. Well, I believe we have got 25 people that are allowing it, so we need to get you back in

1 government.

2 Mr. Lumer. That is another whole discussion, ma'am.3 [Laughter.]

Senator McCaskill. Well, that would--because it is our
understanding, based on the information that we have
gathered at the Committee, that, in fact, a 5 percent bonus
is being paid.

8 Mr. Lumer. I believe it is allowed by law, but I 9 believe by regulatory process, it is not allowable.

10 Senator McCaskill. Okay. Let me ask this.

Do you think there is any limit that would be appropriate, Ms. Lukin or Pata? Is there any limit? I mean, would there be a point that if an Alaska Native Corporation was netting profits of 10 billion a year, 20 billion a year, would there ever be a point in time that you would be willing to say that you ought to have to compete with everyone else for contracts?

Ms. Lukin. Again, Senator, actually, you know, there are a couple of points I would like to make here. One, I think it is important that we remember that Native participation in the 8(a) program honors the government's commitment to Native peoples.

In addition to that, I think that I would reiterate my earlier point on a tribal consultation process, and I would also--I forgot to mention earlier--encourage us to also

remember other committees of joint jurisdiction on this,
 including the Indian Affairs and Small Business. So again,
 we would be happy to work with you in a positive, joint
 effort with our people.

5 Senator McCaskill. I am painfully aware that this is 6 not my decision. I understand other committees have 7 jurisdiction.

I do want to point out for the record that I think 8 9 there has been a little bit of a blurring because the 10 legislation that you proudly spoke of, Senator Begich, was passed in 1971. The first contracting preference came about 11 12 in the '80s. And, in fact, even in the '90s, there was 13 additional contract preferences put in. So the idea that 14 this was envisioned back in 1971, that we would fast forward 15 to 2008, I am not sure that that necessarily follows 16 because, you know, one came almost 30 years after the other. 17 Ms. Pata. And if you inferred that from my abbreviated 18 oral statement, I apologize because what I was basically 19 saying was that Congress enacted ANSCA and Congress also 20 enacted the procurement preferences.

You know, if you studied the ANSCA history, as probably all of us have, the first 20 years are pretty grueling for our corporations and very, very difficult as we dealt with the challenges of building capacity. And that is one of the reasons why in those years when we were looking at

1 amendments to ANSCA that we were also looking for ways of 2 really trying to make the corporation model work. You know, 3 it was a model that Congress invested in because they did 4 not want to deal with the economic conditions that were 5 present in the reservations during the '70s when this was 6 all being debated. So I think we have tried--this corporate model worked to the extent that it threw us into 7 an environment that we had to understand corporations and 8 9 shareholder value but still never left our cultural and our 10 personal values.

11 Senator McCaskill. I also wanted to point out that 12 there are subcontracting going on with major, major 13 multinational corporations that are big players in 14 government contracting, such as Wackenhut. I believe your 15 former corporation, Ms. Lukin, had a major subcontract with 16 Wackenhut. And Blackwater has been a subcontractor. Korvis has been a subcontractor. So it is not uncommon for an 17 18 Alaska Native Corporation to, in fact, subcontract with a 19 company that is much larger than the ANC; is that correct? 20 Ms. Lukin. Ms. Chairman, yes, Alaska Native 21 Corporations, tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, like 22 all other federal contractors, can enter into joint venture 23 agreements and subcontract arrangements under the FAR and 24 the SBA regulations.

25 Senator McCaskill. Okay. I think that--and let me

just--because I am curious. I have had a penchant, a bug that is bugging me about line standing. And I found out today for the first time--I was conducting a hearing where there was line standing, and I am curious how many of the people in the audience hired someone to stand in line for them for this hearing, if you would raise your hands, if you are willing to.

8 Only one, two brave souls? Okay. All right. I was 9 just curious.

Senator Begich. Our Alaskan people understanding
 waiting and being patient.

12 [Laughter.]

13 Senator McCaskill. I have a feeling there might be 14 more people in the room that did not want to raise their 15 hands, but congratulations to the two of you who were 16 willing to raise your hands.

I think we are going to conclude the hearing there, unless the two of you have something that you are anxious to ask. I am feeling a little uncomfortable since I am the only member of the Committee left here, and it does not quite seem fair, you guys.

22 [Laughter.]

23 Senator Murkowski. Madam Chair, if I just may add my 24 thanks. We have a large contingent of Alaskans that have 25 come back for this hearing. I think it is fair to say that

when you sent out your letter some six weeks ago, there was a great deal of angst about this hearing, the direction that you were taking with it, and a real concern that a program that has really yielded benefits for so many in Alaska, from the furthest point north to the smallest communities south, there was a concern about this.

7 But I have seen interviews, talked with some of the 8 CEOs of our ANCs, talked with people who are back here 9 representing their native corporations, and they feel very, 10 very strongly that they have a story to tell. And I think I 11 can speak--I will speak for them in saying they want that 12 opportunity to present not only where they have come from 13 but where they feel they are capable of going given some 14 opportunities.

15 I do not think any of them are afraid to present the 16 facts. They are willing to work certainly with you and this 17 Subcommittee. And I hope that some of the suggestions--I 18 know NCAI has been working on this since the hearing back 19 in, what, it was 2006, and looking at proposals. I know 20 that NAC has been looking and assessing. We want to make 21 sure that it works not only for Alaska Natives but when they 22 assume these government contracts, whether they be in Fort 23 Drum, New York or wherever, and are able to employ thousands 24 of people helping the economic recovery of this country, 25 that it works on all sides.

So we want to work with you on this, but I do think that the message from Alaskans is we have a success story here, we are proud of it, and we are pleased to be able to speak to it. So thank you for giving this opportunity today.

6 Senator Begich. Madam Chair, I just want to say thank 7 you very much for the opportunity. Thank you for allowing 8 both Senator Murkowski and I to be here and to outnumber you 9 on the backend here. I appreciate that.

But it was, I think, especially toward the end here, a very positive opportunity to figure out what is the right thing to do for the long-term benefit of not only Alaskan Natives but American Indians and Hawaiians and all of us together. So thank you very much for the opportunity. Senator McCaskill. Let me close with a couple of

16 comments.

First, the record will stay open for 15 days for anyone 17 18 who wants to submit information for the record. We will 19 consider any information that is submitted for the record. 20 I also want to make sure that there is no 21 misunderstanding about this. This has absolutely nothing to 22 do with whether or not the Native people of Alaska have had 23 struggles and challenges that are unique to the Native 24 people of Alaska. And one of the reasons I was concerned 25 about line standers is I know how many Alaskans traveled

here and they deserve a seat at this hearing. And sometimes the folks that just are regular citizens get squeezed out at the door because of people who have been standing in line. That is why I was curious about it. And I am glad we had people standing during this hearing. And I hope none of them came all the way from Alaska because they did not have enough room because of line standers.

But more importantly, what I want to make sure everyone understands, that this is about whether or not we have created preferences in the law that are capable of being outgrown, and whether or not the preferences that we have created in the law are something that should be permanent, and whether or not the preferences we have created in the law are providing good value to taxpayers.

15 I hope Alaska Native Corporations soar, and I think 16 they have the capability, many of them, in fact, the largest 17 ones, to do very well without sole source contracting. In 18 fact, many of them are. And a lot of the income for these 19 corporations, based on our analysis, is not even from 20 federal contracting. In fact, the majority of the income 21 from all the Alaska Native Corporations are not from federal 22 contracting. So the question is there. 23 When we are going to say to the government you do not have 24 to worry about whether or not you can get the same goods or 25 services for cheaper, are we going to continue to have a

1 compelling rationale to carve out this kind of exception for 2 companies that have grown as big and as powerful in the 3 contracting field as some of the ANCs have? And that is 4 really what this is about.

5 I hope that the people of Alaska continue, the 6 shareholders of these corporations continue to receive 7 scholarship and cultural benefits for decades in the future. 8 The question is how long will we continue to have a 9 preference in the law that squeezes out good companies like 10 Christina Schneider's and lots of companies in many, many 11 states in this country that have the willingness to work for 12 the government for less to provide the same service. And 13 that is really what this is about.

14 I think we have gotten mixed up with whether or not 15 Alaska Natives are entitled to something from the Federal 16 Government and whether this is the best mechanism to deliver 17 And that is what this discussion is about. If there is it. 18 an entitlement program that is deserving of the people of 19 Alaska, perhaps it needs to be through another way and not 20 in a way that is driving the competitive process the wrong 21 direction.

As I say, you are one small piece of this problem. You are not the major problem on competitiveness. There are many, many other problems on competitiveness. But we thought it was important enough to take a look at. I

1 certainly appreciate all of the witnesses. I appreciate the 2 fact that the two senators from Alaska were able to be here. 3 And to all of you who traveled from Alaska, thank you for 4 coming and we respect and honor your traditions and we are 5 glad you were here. Thank you, and this hearing is 6 adjourned.

7 [Whereupon, at 5:06 p.m., the Subcommittee was 8 adjourned.]