1	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR/ANC CONSULTATION
2	OPINION-M 37043 - AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LAND INTO TRUST
3	IN ALASKA
4	
5	
6	October 21, 2018
7	1:00 p.m.
8	Anchorage, Alaska
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	Proceedings electronically recorded, then transcribed
20	by:
21	Accu-Type Depositions, 310 "K" Street,
22	Suite 200, Anchorage, AK 99501 - 907-276-0544
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

(On record)

2.3

MR. TAHSUDA: All right. We'll get started here. We'll open up this consultation on the second topic that we're seeking comment on from the tribes here in Alaska, and that is the Secretary's authority to take land into trust in Alaska under the Alaska IRA amendments to the IRA.

Those of you that haven't, if you can sign in again. If you signed in this morning, great, but if you -- if you weren't here this morning or if you did come this morning, if you could sign in again, just so that we have an accurate record of who was here, et cetera, for this.

Also, like this morning, please, if you could speak into the microphone and also state your name and your Tribal affiliation so that we can have that down for the record as well.

I'm going to ask if you -- if you're okay. We had an invocation this morning. Is that good enough to carry us through to this afternoon, or we can offer another one, have another one offered, if you'd like.

Is that good with everybody? I'm hearing no objection.

For those of you that were here this morning,

I'll introduce myself, and I guess also for the record. My name is John Tahsuda. I'm the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Indian -- Indian Affairs at the Department of Interior. With me, I have Matt with the Solicitor's Office, and we have Regina and Amanda also helping out as well.

1.3

2.4

If you have -- in addition to your oral comments today, we will take written comments, and so if you have a paper you want to hand to us, that's fine. I would ask you to hand it to Regina. She will -- she's part of our regulatory Affairs team and compiles the record for these consultations for us. So if you have paper, and you want to give it to her, that will be part of the record of today.

You may also submit written comments online.

We have -- it is at consultation@bia.gov; right?

Pretty simple. You think I could remember that
easily. So you can submit written comments to
consultation@bia.gov as well, and that will be made
part of the formal record for this consultation.

As I said this morning, we recently had the solicitors take a look at the legal opinion that was issued on the authority of the Secretary to take land into trust in Alaska under the authorities of the Indian Reorganization Act. There was an opinion

issued by the solicitors in January of 2017 regarding the -- this authority, and so under direction of the President and the Secretary, we have been looking at various actions that were taken in January of last year, this being one of them.

1.3

2.4

There are a number of legal issues, significant legal issues, as we discussed this morning, that come from analyzing the Indian Reorganization Act, the Alaska amendments to that provision, and also subsequent and intervening laws. So we also have a number of court cases that have tried to interpret the interplay of those laws and -- and any number of other legal issues that create a thicket for us to walk through in -- in making decisions. So our hope is that we can have a good discussion on these issues and begin providing a better foundation for us to move forward with decisions under -- on fee to trust under the IRA.

So I want to also say, as I did this morning, that this is a beginning discussion for us. We want to have a very broad and open discussion. If you have, you know, a question regarding the questions that were put out with the "Dear Tribal Leader" letter on that, again, the idea was to have not focused question, but broad questions so that we can try to

capture as much as possible, and not just the legal issues, but the policy and factual issues that underlie this, so that whenever we have a final decision on how to move forward, we'll -- we'll -- we will have not just a legal basis, but also a factual historical and policy basis to support that.

I'm going to ask Matt if he has any comments he wants to make to begin with. Nope? Of course not. Leave it to me.

So thank you very much. We'll open it up now for public comment, and if anybody that wants to -- again, if I can repeat -- anybody that wants to speak, please take your turn, speak in the microphone, give us your name and your Tribal affiliation so we can associate your comments with that tribe.

You said you were getting warmed up for us.

MR. TRUITT: Good afternoon.

(Speaking Tlingit). For the record and for the transcription, I -- I just said I'm Tlingit. My name is "Tuksak," and my name is "Katishan" (ph). My English name is Ken Truitt, and to round out my introduction, I'm -- (indiscernible) -- people, Raven Coho is my clan affiliation. I'm from Sitka. I'm a child of the Wooshkeetaan, which is Eagle Shark. My father is Gilbert Truitt who was Wooshkeetaan. I'm a grandchild

of the Kicksutti (ph). I'm born and raised in Sitka.

I'm an enrolled Tribal citizen of the Central Council of
the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska, and I am
currently the Chief Operating Officer at Tlingit and
Haida.

1.3

And I -- I want to -- we also commented this morning. For those of you who weren't here, I'll -- I'll try not to completely repeat myself since we were on the record once this morning, but I would -- or once today already. I would say that -- well -- well, I -- I thank you for -- for being here. I think you heard this morning some of -- some of our suspicions and -- and dismay at part of this process, but I -- I certainly want to express on behalf of our tribe that -- that that is not anything personal to you two gentlemen that are here today. You're here on your Sunday just like we are as well.

So we -- we don't think this process is necessary, but to the extent that you are involved in the process with us, we certainly want you to know on behalf of our tribe, we appreciate your time and the time and care that you're taking to be here. However, with that, we are -- unlike this morning, we are not a tribe affected by the questions posed for the morning session. We are a tribe that is impacted by the

questions this afternoon, so we'll probably spend a little bit more time than we did this morning giving you comment on that.

specifically, we have 34 -- 34 -- we have -we have 34 parcels of land in Juneau in what's known
as the Old Juneau Village that are currently under
application for fee to trust through this process, and
the applications themselves, they take up at least
three bookshelves and three binders in my office, so
-- and they are very comprehensive. The applications
cover pretty much everything. So, really, in terms of
what would our formal comment be, our formal comment
is please see our applications and please make a
decision on them, because there are some that are ripe
and ready for decision.

And what it -- just a little bit of history for -- for those who -- who might not know where this is geographically in Juneau, this is in what's known as the "Old Townsite Indian Village." We are -- we are situated -- our main Tribal building is on these lands. In 1926, Congress passed the act that made the Indian Townsite Act applicable to Alaska, and the parcels of land, where our main Tribal administration building stands, was then divided up between the inhabitants of that Indian village.

Under that law, parcels of land that were not made claim to by the current inhabitants, the then inhabitants of -- of that townsite escheated or reverted to the -- the local municipal government. So we truly have a patchwork of -- classic Indian Country patchwork of -- of land, of a village townsite land, where the municipality has jurisdiction, where the federal government has jurisdiction. Our land that our -- that we have sought to put into trust currently does not have trust status because, as it became unrestricted, and we as a tribe acquired it, it lost its trust status. So that's why we are seeking to put kind of the historical village site where our -- our administrative offices and client services offices exists. We want that -- we would very much like that on trust land.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And when we say '34, our parcels, you all were in our building, and when you were sitting against that wall, it was very likely that the front leg and the back leg of your chairs intersected three different parcels. We have one parcel that's really no wider than that partition behind you. So it isn't just patchwork; it's a crazy, crazy patchwork.

Of all of our -- of all of our parcels, they take up less than a quarter of an acre of land, but it

would provide, for us to have that status, more streams of potential revenue and services that we could tap into by virtue of -- of having a land base. They're currently, to us in Alaska, tribes in Alaska, we're not able to access, so we have very practical reasons for wanting to see these applications acted on, hopefully approved. And it's very real to us as we continue to seek to increase our own economic activity, because we -- as a Tribal government, we exist to provide services to our people to help raise the status of our people and -- and provide a better community for our people.

1.3

2.4

Our president is fond of saying, "Healthy communities make healthy tribes," and these -- this is a step for us to be able to provide for a healthier community, a healthier Tribal community, and -- and therefore a healthier community in Juneau and a healthier community in -- in our region. So it is very important to us. I really can't stress that enough. And I know when you were in Juneau, you heard from our president. You heard from some of our other elected officials, so I won't -- I won't belabor too much longer, or -- or I won't belabor any longer than is traditional for a Tlingit man with a microphone our views, except to say -- maybe to say some of the

things that were touched on this morning, we'll -we'll probably get to them this afternoon, if you're
going to talk about the effect of ANCSA.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We -- we were a little -- we -- we were more silent, and we thought Ms. Williams did an -- an excellent job kind of addressing some of the ANCSA questions, and we completely agree with her from what she said this morning. And I would add to that, I --I -- it -- from just a casual spectator's point of view, it looks like to me you're all overthinking that ANCSA angle of it. ANCSA is a big law. For sure it did a lot of things, but even in its very initial, very top of the bill itself, it -- it was -- it limited itself to extinguishing aboriginal title, but there's over a million ac- -- a million acres, as you have heard throughout this process, of allotment land in Alaska that was not touched by ANCSA. ANCSA --ANCSA extinguished everything that -- that hadn't been specifically claimed up until its passage.

So you have a tremendous land base, including the land that we are -- that our -- the lands that are in our application, because as I said, they were part of the 1926 Townsite Act, was not subject to ANCSA.

Sealaska doesn't claim those lands in their -- in their land base, neither does Goldbelt, the Juneau

ANCSA Corporation, the local ANCSA Corporation. So you have -- you have a million acres of allotment land that have -- ANCSA has no jurisdiction over, and so -- and as Ms. Williams mentioned this morning, it did not abrogate any other elements of what we as Tribal people have, by virtue of our sovereignty and our rights to self-determination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I guess, I mean, in preparing this morning as I was looking, I was reading through some of the earlier -- and I won't quote all of this because it already happened once. I assume you all were there -but particularly when you were in Fairbanks -- and I only say this because your concern about being sued was -- was a big part of our conversation this morning. This is -- I'm just going to quote from what Lloyd Miller said in the -- at that presentation, that session. And, you know, for -- for those of us in the Tribal world, Lloyd, Lloyd's work has, in his track record litigating, has benefited all of us in this room, and he has an impressive track record in litigation, which you seem to be afraid of, and he said there, "The Department should be worried about being forced back into court if it does not undo the path it is proceeding down."

I mean, you really have to consider what you

said to the three federal judges on the court of appeals and the action that the trial court took based on the government's representations. You do not want to be in a situation, I suggest, where a federal judge holds that the United States has acted in bad faith.

And he was referring to the -- the action that was taken to resend the M-Opinion and throwing into question everything that the government had represented was clear at that point in the litigation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So maybe I'm just a "scaredy pants," but if Lloyd Miller is telling me that, I'm kind of nervous if he's suggesting that there's bad faith on behalf of the government and that there might be a chance that the government is before those judges again trying to explain that. And -- and that kind of, I think, sums up certainly how -- how we feel. It -- it seems --Lloyd's takes on it seems to be the reality that we're living, more so than what we hear you saying as you opened these sessions, but, again, I -- it's -- it's Sunday. It's been a long week for most of us. here with us now, and -- and we have seen you in a lot of these, so thank you for your time. We -- we didn't really have lunch together. We were a couple of tables away, but it was still pleasant, and we're glad you're here.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

MR. TAHSUDA: Thank you, Mr. Truitt. Can I ask you a couple of follow-up questions, actually --

MR. TRUITT: Sure.

MR. TAHSUDA: -- while I've got you here?

So you made reference to greater economic -economic activity that you could have on the land if
they're taken into trust. Could you elaborate on that
a little bit? Because one of the issues that we
struggle with is -- at least in the Lower 48 -- is
that sometimes the trust status of lands actually can
get in the way of economic activity, and, you know,
trying to think through better ways that we can assist
tribes with economic development is one of the things
we'd like to do.

MR. TRUITT: It would certainly provide for us the tax space, so that would be essential to any governing body's ability to raise its own revenue. There are also other federal programs that are unavailable to us because we don't "have a land base," that would be available to us if we had a land base, and there's going to be a myriad of those throughout the different federal agencies, Department of Transportation comes to mind. But they're -- and -- and we could give you that more specifically in

writing as we conclude this.

1.3

2.4

MR. TAHSUDA: That would be great to have, I think. Thanks. Was there other questions? Do you have other questions?

MR. TRUITT: No, I just -- I wanted to --

MR. TAHSUDA: Okay.

MR. TRUITT: Yeah.

MR. TAHSUDA: Thank you.

MR. WEYIOUANNA: Hi. My name is Tony
Weyiouanna, Sr., and my village is Shishmaref, but I
work with Ka- -- Kaw- -- Kawerak Land Management
Program. We're a service provider for our Native
allottees.

My question is: There's some Native allottees in our region that are wanting to put their land into trust, but the BIA is saying they're not going to put them into trust, but because they said, you know, the Native allotments are already into trust, but to me, they're not really into trusts the way the Native allottees want them, you know, no development on their lands, and no assistance for whatever they want to do, you know, similar to actually putting your private land into trust and you get -- you qualify for certain assistance, you know.

So then -- so my question would be: If the

BIA is saying that allotments are already into trusts, then what other kinds of assistance could they qualify for? But, you know, other than service providers, assistance, and that kind of thing. So that's my main question.

1.3

2.3

2.4

MR. TAHSUDA: Matt, maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think that the allotments are in -- in trusts. I think they're restricted allotments, meaning they have a restricted status. They have protection, you know, on to -- on title and stuff, but they're not -- but they're not in trusts, so the federal government doesn't own the underlying title.

But, generally speaking, restricted allotments and trust lands are treated fairly similarly, and so I'm not -- I guess that's one of the questions I would have, is what would be the advantage of switching that to trust status?

MR. WEYIOUANNA: Well, there are other programs that say some of the Native allottees -- one -- one thing that we're looking at in our region is the carbon credit program. And, yeah, that's another thing, is BIA Realty is telling us that we can't put them into the carbon credit program, but I think the way that it's set up is that they're allowable, you know -- or we're able to put them into the carbon

credit program if the Native allottee wants to put them into the program to qualify for projects, like -- once you do anything besides building anything on your Native allotment.

1.3

2.4

So one of the ways that we're looking at putting those into the carbon credit program is to have the Native allotment allottees partner with other private owners, such as Native Corporations, to qualify for the carbon credit program, because once you put your land into the carbon credit program, it's for a hundred years, you know, lock up your land for nondevelopment for 100 years, and then qualify for assistance, you know, for your community or for the land owners.

So that's another thing too, is that BIA is saying that they're not allowing it to put it into their -- that program, because they're in trust with the federal government, but I disagree with their comment in Realty. Allottees should be allowed to do that kind of thing for their land, you know...

MR. KELLY: Sir, do you have a business card?

MR. WEYIOUANNA: I ran out. (Indiscernible - away from mic).

MR. KELLY: That's fine. Afterwards, if we can get together, I'll take your information, and I'll try

and get some -- I'm not familiar with the programs that you were asking about, but I'll see if we can track down and get some more information and follow up on that for you. Even though it's not directly related to the consultation issues, it's certainly something we should address.

MR. WEYIOUANNA: I just had to mention -- (indiscernible - away from mic) --

2.3

2.4

THE COURT REPORTER: Microphone, please. You have to have a microphone.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let me help you.

MR. WEYIOUANNA: I just had to mention about, you know, those things that we're running into in our program, because we need to start somewhere, so this is almost related, but, you know, something like that.

MS. THUMMA: My name is Myra Thumma. I'm with the Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government, and I'm also in the Tribal council, and I forgot to say, my -- (indiscernible - heavy accent).

My name is Myra Thumma. I've been raised and living in Venetie, and I've been living a subsistence lifestyle, and I was born and raised there, and I'm still living in Venetie, and also Arctic.

I have a question -- a question. How do you view the impact in the -- of the Alaska Native Claims

Act, the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976, and the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act on the -- (indiscernible - heavy accent) -- in Alaska, to view the impact on ANCSA?

MR. TAHSUDA: Sorry. Are you --

MS. THUMMA: That's the question I have.

MR. TAHSUDA: Oh, okay. Well, that's the question that we had.

MS. THUMMA: Oh, that's the question you had?

MR. TAHSUDA: Yes.

2.4

MS. THUMMA: Oh, okay.

MR. TAHSUDA: So we're looking at it from a legal perspective. There's -- there's obviously that -- you know, that question, when you have the interplay of different laws that are enacted at different times, as well as some court cases that have interpreted them, but I think that one thing that would be helpful to us as we move forward, and, again, similar to what I said this morning, is being able to hear a little bit of -- of your history and the history of your tribe, how you have -- what that history has been through time as you've gone through pre-ANCSA, post-ANCSA, you know, et cetera, and how that can impact the policy decisions we make in addition to any kind of legal analysis.

MS. THUMMA: Yeah. Venetie Native -- Venetie

Native Village Tribal Government, we're not under the ANCSA, and we're under the IR- -- the IRA, and -- and that's a decision that our ancestors made, and -- and we have -- you know, we have all the documents that we exist. We live in our home, you know, the subsistence lifestyle we know, you know, and we have our Tribal laws that we abide by with our people, you know, we're still -- we're still living -- you know, like, our traditional lifestyle is really important to us, and I'm just, you know, kind of -- I'm still learning.

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. TAHSUDA: Thank you, Ms. Thumma.

MR. ERICK: Thank you.

My name is Ernest Erick. I'm also the Native

Village of Venetie Tribal Government. I've been there

almost 30 years, and I know a lot of -- (indiscernible -
heavy accent) -- has been happening since then, but

Venetie really doesn't want to be regulated on how the

trust land is being brought to the State of Alaska.

Trust is not in favor with Venetie and Arctic

Village because we're running our own programs, doing

our own housing programs, doing our own transportation

programs. We're taking careful law and order there.

We comply with the State and federal government.

We're doing it in a good way. We have local judges.

We have local people that's willing to do for -- what's the best interest for our tribe.

1.3

And our land statuses, fee simple title land, owned by the tribe, and we don't want to break that.

We're just trying to open the doors to the corporation. It's better going after a fee simple title land instead of creating other -- other problems for the State, Native people within the State, you know, and we didn't take the money from the federal government, or we didn't take the money from the State of Alaska. We went on our own. We made a trail around of our land, our forefather, and we done it a good way, in a good way.

So I think that other organization should realize that, you know, under our case, you know, the Indian Country case, you know. We were not spoiling the State of Alaska. We just want a government and exercise some of our constitution and Tribal laws, God's law, and the common laws that we have. Those laws are very important today, and it's been recognized out there in the State of Alaska and the federal government, and we -- we honor that to everybody's stake, you know, because I don't want to get the money because I want trust land. I want to be able to govern my membership, the best interest.

We don't have no alcohol or drugs related, very small amount, but as of being Tribal Council in a Native Village to enforce these laws. I hear a lady from Venetie done a lot from the last 20 years, enforcing the law -- coming in, enforcing the law, drug law, the alcohol law, so these are complied with the common laws that we have. So bear in mind, we came a long way ourselves too. Our documents come from past 1934. It's written in Indian way. We honor that.

And I never have trust for attorney advisory, advisors, never did, you know, they're here to collect the data, but once he put the comment on the table, he's going to use that against me. So I'm afraid of people that's attorney advisory. That's how I think.

Thank you.

1.3

2.3

2.4

MR. WEYIOUANNA: Do I need to introduce myself again?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've got you. Thank you.

MR. WEYIOUANNA: I'm Tony Weyiouanna, Sr. I represent Shishmaref, but I work with the Kawerak Land Management Program, our regional nonprofit in Bering Strait region.

Two years ago, I -- I think in 2016, there was a small presentation by BIA, and maybe DOI, maybe. It

was on land to trust, and there was a lady that also presented from Metlakatla, you know, their land is already into trust, so -- and I know that once you put your land into trust, you're supposed to be able to get quite a bit of assistance from the federal government, but the way I understand it from Metlakatla and their presentation, that they haven't received all of the assistance that they're -- they're eligible for, for having their land into trust. Metlakatla was the only full-fledged reservation in Alaska.

2.4

And -- so once the process for the land into trust is fully authorized, you know, for tribes in Alaska to be eligible to put their land into -- into trust, is the federal government going to fix the problem that they're having with Metlakatla in not providing all of the assistance that they qualify for, and is there a guarantee that the village that put in their application will qualify for those assistance?

MR. TAHSUDA: I'm not -- well, I guess there are some programs that would be affected by having fee to trust or restricted lands, but in general, if you're a recognized tribe, if you're on the -- the '94 list, as we call it, then you're eligible for the programs that you're eligible for, and you can apply for those.

We have a budget that we have to abide by, and we don't -- we don't create that budget ourselves.

Congress tells us. They say, "You have this much money," and -- and then we try to meet all the needs we can with what -- with what they give us, and so it's -- to be honest, it's never enough; right? I mean, at least none of the tribes in the country seem to think it's enough.

2.2

2.4

So I don't know that getting land into trust is going to impact that budget situation for tribes up here greatly, you know. I think that's a different -- that's a different question, different process, you know, getting more resources to tribes in general and to tribes in Alaska is -- is a little bit of a different question.

MS. TUCKER: Hi. My name is Kalani Tucker, and I'm from Knik Tribe.

My question is just kind of that tribes being able to put land into trust would have them be able to reach their full kind of capacity of Tribal sovereignty. That's kind of the missing link right now. It would make them be able to create ordinances and maybe kind of beef up Tribal courts, which is a huge deal right now. We're trying to really do that.

So my question is: What -- you're concerned

just because you don't think it's been great in the Lower 48? Or I'm just wondering, if tribes want it, what is your reasoning to not? Is it just a lot of paperwork? Is it going to cost money? I'm just, like, why not, is my question?

1.3

2.4

MR. TAHSUDA: Well, there's -- there's a couple of questions there that we're actually hoping to get thoughts from, and that's part of what a consultation is, the dialogue, is getting -- getting the input from the tribes.

So we have questions about the legal authority to take land into trust under the Alaska provisions of the IRA, and so -- and those won't stand alone.

They're -- they're subsequent acts that deal with

Native land and Native people, et cetera, in Alaska, and we have to take that into consideration. So that's one question, what is that.

And then the question is -- also, I'm not saying this -- this is something we get from tribes all the time across the country. Some tribes aren't all that happy with land being in trust. They like it being in -- in, like, reservation status or in a protected status. But when it's placed in trust, there are some additional -- so there's additional protections that come with it, and there's some

additional hurdles that come with it, and they're not always happy about the hurdles.

1.3

2.3

2.4

One of the things that -- that there's been a lot of discussion in recent years about is, can we find something that has more of the protections but less of the hurdles, and so that's -- that's sort of a policy question and discussion, and -- and obviously the tribes need to have a really -- we need to know their mind on that, you know, and it doesn't have to be one for all. I mean, you know, there obviously could be different situations for different folks.

But one of the questions, then, for us as we consider both the legal implications of the fee-to-trust provisions of Alaska IRA amendments is also the policy question of what is important about that? And this is part of what -- in filling out this whole picture we want to get from you, you know. So you said some things like courts and things like that. Those are important things. Those are things that we need to hear that you think would be an important part of this. Going along with that, there's going to be other questions that -- that -- that the tribes need to think about.

Who's going to fund those courts? Where -- where is that going to come from? Who -- who should

be subject to those courts? That's a big issue that we have in the Lower 48, you know, who -- who is subject to the Tribal courts, and what's the -- what's the extended jurisdiction over what lands? Are they reservation lands? Are they just trust lands? know, there's a lot of -- there's a lot of complicated questions, and -- and -- so I think those are things that we would like to -- to also get, as I said, sort of factual -- and -- and -- and when I say "policy," I would like to hear -- I think it would be good for us to hear from the tribes here about what are the positive benefits that you would see from that, and if you think that there are some negative things that we could take into consideration and -- and try to -- to avoid, that would be good to hear as well. So that's basically what we're asking, I think.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MS. TUCKER: My -- my only thing is the -- the tribes that don't want to and do think it's negative, that don't have to. It's optional to apply. So the tribes that do want to, for whatever reasons, are just -- that's -- I kind of guess why I'm confused is the -- the people that don't want to don't have to, so I don't really see why that's a part of it, but I guess that's why we're here, so...

MR. TAHSUDA: Well, it's -- it's -- they don't

have to, yes, and they can leave it in fee simple, right, and they can work with that, as Venetie has done; right? But there's also folks who are looking -- so there are some original reservations in the Lower 48 in which they have a restricted fee status, right, and so the tribe actually owns the land in fee, but it has most of the protections that trust land does, but it doesn't have some of the hurdles because the United States doesn't own title to it, then we don't -- then the tribe doesn't have to come to us every time they want to do something with that land; right?

2.4

If it's in trust, you have to come to the United States, because we actually -- the United States -- when I say "we," I mean the United States, not me, individual -- the United States owns that land, actually, and you're the -- you know, so the tribe is the beneficial, the beneficiary of that, but that means before you do something on that, if it has -- if there's significance to it, things like MEPA and what not, you've got to come to the United States and make sure you get -- go through the MEPA analysis, you do all this stuff. A lot of times, you know, on restricted fee lands, you don't have to do that. So there's the question.

But it's not -- it's not a freestanding

authority to take land into restricted status. 1 that's -- that's the question, is if -- if you want 2 3 something like that more, then there can also be a 4 discussion about, you know, changing the law so that 5 there would be that option for tribes as well. 6 Congressman Don Young, you know, has this proposal out 7 there, that why don't we do that? That if -- as an option, just as an option, you don't have to do it, 8 9 but there would be that option for the tribes everywhere; not just Alaska, but in the Lower 48 as 10 11 well, to have this restricted fee status. So just to 12 think about that. Is that an option that should be 1.3 considered as well? 14 MS. TUCKER: Thank you. 15 MR. NEWMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Matt 16 Newman. I'm a staff attorney at the Native American 17 Rights Fund. In that capacity, I work with tribes 18 across the State of Alaska, including the Native 19 Village of Venetie Tribal Government, and others. 20 A couple of items today that -- that I want to 21 focus on and --2.2 MR. TAHSUDA: Matt, I'm sorry.

MR. NEWMAN: Yes?

2.3

2.4

25

MR. TAHSUDA: Are you here representing a tribe?

MR. NEWMAN: I am here on behalf of the Native

Village of Venetie Tribal Government, yes.

2 MR. TAHSUDA: Okay.

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I give him authority to speak today -- (indiscernible - away from mic).

MR. TAHSUDA: That's fine. This is a --

MR. NEWMAN: (Indiscernible).

MR. TAHSUDA: -- consultation, so we want to respect that.

MR. NEWMAN: That's right.

So one thing I kind of want to start out with is I -- I need to take issue with kind of some historic items that are being presented here, because in the "Dear Tribal Leader" letter that Ernest and others at Venetie received, you know, it -- it mentioned that the 2017 Tompkins memorandum was under review pursuant to this Secretary or Chief of Staff order, but then simultaneous to that, and -- and what happened as well, was the solicitor's department withdrew that Tompkins memorandum and then inserted a new one by Assistant Solicitor Jorjani, which really took to task the Tompkins memo saying, "Well, it really didn't look at ANCSA. It didn't look at FLPMA. It's incomplete," and -- and the issue I take there and what needs to be addressed to the Tribal leaders in this room, is the history of the trust lands issue

in Alaska, including the authority to take land into trust, the policies around Part 151, all of that was developed over decades in Alaska.

1.3

2.3

2.4

The authority to take land into trust is a question that has been asked in this state since 1978 when the Native Village of Venetie Tribal Government submitted a letter to the BIA asking for it to take some of the fee simple lands of a former Venetie Indian reservation into trust, and the culmination of that policy and that legal debate was the 2013 Akiachak opinion, which has thus far gone unmentioned.

Now, I know that opinion was appealed and the appeal resulted in the fact that the case law itself was mooted, but separate from that case, and this is something that led to it being mooted, is this department, the Department of the Interior undertook a rulemaking, a public comment period that lasted almost six months, hundreds of hours of testimony, hundreds of pages of written comments. You had these same questions: Authority? Does Part 151 work? What's the impact of ANCSA, of FLPMA? These same questions were posed to the Tribal leaders in this room in 2014. You got answers. Those answers were memorialized in the final rule that came out December 23rd, 2014, removing the Alaska exclusion, which prohibited tribes

from even participating in this program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

But all of that rulemaking, all of that testimony that these leaders gave, we're just playing make pretend that it doesn't exist anymore, and we're asking these questions over, and it just doesn't make sense. And the harm that it's doing, is it's not just an academic exercise, because in between 2014 and now, tribes in Alaska have been putting together -- those that choose have been putting together trust land applications -- I know my colleague Kristi Williams has worked on several -- and those tribes have now had their petitions paused, and we've been informed in previous consultations, there'll be a six-month administrative review, and then we're going to have to wait another six months for an answer to what the agency wants to do. So at least a year now is being added to the wait time for the tribes that believed in good faith that the 2014 rule on Alaska Tribal trust lands was going to be enforced.

The other thing it's going to harm is that last Wednesday, this past Wednesday, you had a consultation for ANCSA Corporations. I attended that on behalf of a village corporation client of mine, and I'll tell you what I noticed was so incredible, is that there's finally some healing happening in the

community that has taken a long time since 2014, because this was a very divisive issue, whether we have trust lands in Alaska or not. And it was amazing to see in that consultation on Wednesday, you had Calista, Sealaska, Doyon, others, standing up and saying, "If our tribes want to do this, we're going to be on their side." That's a big change from four years ago, and now those wounds that have healed those divisions that were had are being reopened.

1.3

2.2

2.3

2.4

And so I just really want to emphasize to you gentlemen, Alaska and Alaska tribes are ready to move into this new phase. This policy discussion has occurred. Everyone worked really hard for years to come up with an answer, come up with policy solutions, and they worked. We've had an Alaska tribe successful complete the trust lands process down in Craig. Other tribes are working their way through the administrative process.

This program, which is voluntary on a tribe-by-tribe basis, can work in Alaska, and the only thing -- and I see -- I want to emphasize, we have members from the State of Alaska here today. We have corporation members that came on Wednesday. The stakeholders in Alaska who are going to work this program think we can do it. And so I'm requesting the

Interior Department, please, just let this program work in Alaska. The tribes, the State, the boroughs, the corporations, they can work out how to make what is historically a Lower 48 program work in this state. The courts have told you. You have the authority to do it. Congress has directed you and the IRA that you must do it. So let's get out of the way and let these tribes and the people of this state find the solution for themselves through the administrative process, as happened in Craig, and I hope it's going to happen in the future for tribes across the state.

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm Athabascan -- (speaking Yup'ik.)

For the record, I'm Kristi Williams. I'm a
Tribal citizen of the Gwichyaa Gwich'in Tribal
Government. I'm speaking here today as a Tribal
citizen, not as a Tribal leader.

Our tribe has a petition before you for trust land. It is a very small parcel of land, 1.92 acres, which is just under two acres of land. The parcel that the land encompasses in Fort Yukon, we have no plans to change what's currently happening on that land. It's where the Tribal government has its offices, its administration, and it's also the -- the

home of our Tribal hall. It's -- it's a community center for our entire village.

1.3

2.3

2.4

The application has been pending since

December of 2014, so we got in line right -- right as

the Alaska exception was lifted and the Akiachak

litigation was settled. We really have been looking

forward to movement on this petition, but

unfortunately, similar to the tribes that are waiting

for federal acknowledgement, we've been waiting and

waiting and waiting.

There were some hiccups in the road. This is a brand-new process for Alaska. A lot of tribes here are not familiar with the process of how land is taken into trust in the Lower 48. The Department of Interior didn't do a lot of initial work helping tribes understand what the process entails, so there was a learning curve, and there still is for many tribes. But it seems that in making tribes, again, have this opportunity taken away, that you're treating us differently. You're treating tribes in Alaska differently than you're treating tribes in the Lower 48, and they still have the opportunity, but we had it for -- for a breath, and then it was taken from us.

So we really respectfully ask that, for at least the pending petitions, that you move these

applications forward and you reconsider rescinding that M-Opinion, and you move forward to advance this opportunity for Alaska tribes. As -- as my colleagues both stated, this -- this is a voluntary activity on behalf of the tribes, and it's also discretionary on behalf of the Secretary. So if there are parcels that have issues, you don't have to take it into trust. It's a discretionary authority.

So, you know, each application can be looked at individually to see if it's a right fit for trust land with the tribe, but it's up to the tribe, you know, it's a paternalistic view for the Department to tell a tribe what it can do and what it can't do and what's best for it. That's up to the Tribal government to determine for its membership. So I -- I just ask you respectfully to reconsider this opinion and to please move these applications forward.

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. SINK: I'm Charlie Sink with Chugachmiut.

I think I'll start out on a fundamental level
on -- on -- on this one. It's the IRA decision of
1936 where Alaska tribes recognized as Indians, the
Alaska Native people are recognized as Indians, and so
we -- we agree with that decision. And it follows
from -- from that act that the Secretary can, at -- at

its discretion, turn fee lands in- -- in- -- into trust lands.

1.3

2.3

2.4

I'm -- I'm glad Matt made -- made a distinction between restricted lands and trust lands, because it's probably not something suited for everybody, but -- but it's an option. And as we talked about this morning, like our chief from -- from Chenega who spoke this morning about trying to -- to maintain this identity in the communities that exist, what we're seeing is the restricted lands, the Native allotment lands, and the townsite lot lands are being turned over to fee simple, and some of them are being sold.

We have some tribes trying to acquire some of those Native allotments back, but outside of the Venetie equation and the Metlakatla lands that are -- in our area, are subject to ANCSA, which -- which means that if you develop the lands, you can be taxed.

And then I have two villages on the Kenai Borough, Port Graham and Nanwalek, are trust townsite lots that are -- when we -- there's kind of an agreement with his to -- to build housing. You have to be able to form a lien against the lands so the land is taken out of restricted status and put into fee simple, and then if people don't make payments,

they can be foreclosed on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

So we had this, kind of this economic plight where if lands are -- are -- (indiscernible) -of fee simple and taxed, it's creating a burden on the local people, for those can't necessarily afford making the payments, you know, even though it's kind of like a subsidized kind of a housing with lower payment, if you don't have an economy and can't pay these things, these lands are being taken away from the local people and -- through this taxation effort. And so we have to worry about that, and then how do we plan for that? And so one of the plans for some of the tribes is to try and acquire these lands on -- on the Tribal umbrella, and then it be -- since they -they were restricted lands before, they would like to try and acquire them to keep the identity of the communities.

And -- and I mentioned those two villages

because to the north lies Seldovia, and Seldovia is a

good example of how townsite lots were -- restricted

townsite lots were turned over into fee simple, and in

the community itself has become predominately

non-Native. All the Natives live on -- on -- on

Corporation land up behind Seldovia, and so -- so -
so it displaces the identity of these communities, and

so the option of having to put -- being able to acquire land fee simple and put it into trust may be motivation for some of our tribes.

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. JOSEPH: Victor Joseph, Tanana Tribal member, Tanana Chiefs, Chief Chairman on a 42 member organization, 37 federally-recognized tribes.

I'm thinking about this, and once again I'm frustrated with this consultation process, because action was took before consultation was provided, and proper protocol would require you had the discussion first before you take action, and so this becomes really important when we start looking at the withdraw of the 2017 M-Opinion, and so I think it's really important that you look at that. And, by the way, I don't think it should be stopping, and I also believe that it should be reinstated during this consultation process.

Secondly, when we look at land-into-trust issues and know that the Alaska exemption has impacted us in many, many areas, and having to fight that fight and to get to the point where we could finally put land into trust was a real big thing for us and we were celebrating. Now to go back and to have this discussion again, and it appears that it could be

challenging us from putting land into trust, it even becomes more frustrating. You're worried about litigation? Litigation will happen if this continues to move forward.

1.3

2.3

2.4

And, you know, I think the thing is, is that Alaska is different than the Lower 48. I understand that, but also, too, a lot of our tribes don't have a lot of fee land. They hardly have any land. I think about the application that -- (indiscernible) -- tribe wants to put in land in trust, is land where my great grandfather, my grand- -- my grandfather, my grand- -- my grandfather, my the land they want to put into trust.

In thing is, is if the tribe wants to put land into trust, it should be the tribe's decision to put that land into trust, not yours, not worry about what I may like and what I may not like. That's my decision. That's my tribe's decision. Please get out of the way and let our tribes be able to put the land into trust if they so choose to. That's their government. That's their sovereign right. They know what they're doing when they ask, "We want to put land into trust."

I also know that our own Congressman Young, when the order came down, was really upset, and he

called up the Secretary and started hollering at them, you know, but the decision was made. And we also need to understand that the relation struggles that was spoke about here were very true. In the Interior, Doyon and TCC were on opposite sides, very divisive, and it was good to hear that they're standing up. If our tribes want to put it into trust, let them put it up in trust. We can develop a processes. We know how to work with each other. We know how to work with the State here and other governing bodies that are concerned with the issues, to work through them through ourselves.

So once again, we're needing to really look at the consultation process that's being used and use it appropriately so we can have meaningful dialogue, not just two hours. This is a big issue, and it's taken us years to get here and only a swipe of a pen to stop it.

So thank you.

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. DEMOSKI: Peter Demoski from Nulato Tribal Council. I'm also Elder Advisor for the TCC Executive Board.

Sitting here, I'm listening. I hear the chief of Tanana Chiefs Conference, and I hear these two lawyers over here. Basically, they're telling you to

why re-open a land trust issue? It's working before.

And I agree with Victor. It's not your decision to

tell the tribes what to do. You're putting obstacles
in their sovereignty rights.

1.3

2.4

I have a question for the Venetie issue,
though, or Fort Yukon people. The land, the 1.8
million acres that you took in fee title, and you
recently compacted with the United States Fish and
Wildlife Service to control and manage those
1.8 million acres, if you proceed with your re-opening
the land into trust issue, will that interfere with
our rights to put in the same application that Venetie
did? We -- we have a national refuge right outside
Nulato, and we're thinking of applying for a compact
with the same people they did for us to control and
manage that refuge.

MR. TAHSUDA: I don't -- I don't think it should impact that. That -- there's a decision about the compact, and those considerations were part of a different process.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. This is Kristi Williams again. I just wanted to add to Chief Demoski's message, that trust land, actually, I don't know if we described it fully, but if -- if the land were to be put into trust, the tribe could manage their own Fish and

Wildlife resources, so that is an important point, I think. Venetie has a decision, and Arctic, with what they want to do with their fee simple lands. They aren't trust restricted. They're fee simple lands. But if they were in trust status, they would be able to manage those lands.

MS. PITKA: Hello, again. I checked out of my hotel. I'm good now.

MR. TAHSUDA: Okay.

1.3

2.2

2.3

2.4

MS. PITKA: Okay. Rhonda Pitka, Chief of the Village of Beaver and Vice Chair of the Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments. The Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments is a consortium of ten Tribal governments in the -- in the Interior of Alaska. We encompass land in the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge, Yukon-Charley National Preserve, and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

You know, within our -- within our area, we have those ten tribes, and I think only Fort Yukon and Venetie were going to be pursuing applications, but we support those tribes in their applications, and instead of throwing roadblocks in the way of tribes exercising their sovereignty and their Tribal responsibilities, I would suggest that you offer technical assistance. Technical assistance would be a

lot more effective than doing a lot more of this stuff. But the M-Opinion should have been consulted before -- before it was withdrawn.

1.3

2.3

2.4

There was a very effective consultation that Matt Newman brought up in 2014. The transcripts are pretty detailed. You can find them online. That's where I found them.

The consultation today is also bothersome for the reasons that I mentioned earlier, it being a Sunday, our elders not wanting to -- to do these on Sunday. It -- it goes against religious beliefs.

It's not okay.

I'm trying to find my place in my notes right here. There was one more thing that I wanted to add, but I can't remember right now, and I'll probably remember on the plane tonight.

MR. TAHSUDA: You can always write it and send it in to me.

Any other comments?

MR. SINK: I guess I'll ask a question.

There was a proposed revision that's contrary to the goals of the Trump Administration to decrease federal regulations and would create a two-step review process for all off-reservation acquisitions. Is there a two-step process that's going to be

considered, or is that part of the land into trust review?

1.3

2.3

2.4

MR. TAHSUDA: I'm -- I'm not sure where that's -- which one --

MR. SINK: Yeah, no, I just -- it's some other comment paper that I -- that I saw. They're raising issues, "Create two categories of off-reservation acquisitions. Gaming and non-gaming is prohibited by a gaming regulatory act." It's out of context, I guess.

MR. TAHSUDA: Yeah, I'm not -- I mean, I guess one of the -- I don't know. This is more of a solicitor's question, but I guess one of the questions that at some point we would have to cross is, you know, how -- we do have different -- there are different processes to -- there are different paths to process on-reservation fee-to-trust applications and off-reservation fee-to-trust applications, because at least in the Lower 48 there are different -- different implications for those. So I'm not sure where that puts folks in Alaska, I guess, you know...

MR. SINK: I -- I'll -- I'll address that.

That's -- that's -- that's a good one there, because

what -- what are our -- our boundaries? And so I think

that's -- that's where ANCSA comes in to play, because

it kind of defines boundaries, but I heard earlier that

the tribes were established before ANCSA, and so it's an interesting take on -- on things, because we don't have reservations, except for the one identified, Metlakatla, but we do -- we do have boundaries that was established by ANCSA, and so does that mean a tribe can -- can acquire lands within its boundaries? And so -- so is that -- is that the defined boundaries created by ANCSA, or is that the defined boundaries created by -- by the region? So there's 12 geographic regions in Alaska and a 13 one outside, so when you look at the geographic regions, are tribes able to acquire land in that region or not?

1.3

2.2

2.4

So that's an interesting question, because when you're looking at economic development for the tribes, there may be an occasion for acquiring lands or health clinics and other -- other common needs of the -- of the tribe, and also economic development, so I don't think that's well defined what -- what -- what the boundaries are, because if -- if reservations have boundaries, do Alaska tribes and regions have boundaries? And I don't think that's been addressed.

MR. KELLY: I think the fee-to-trust regulations of Part 151 distinguish between reserv- -- on-reservation lands and off-reservation lands, and those are defined. There are many ways you can

determine boundaries for different purposes, but for purposes of the fee-to-trust regulations, the relevant distinction is between whether the subject parcel is within an existing reservation or outside of an existing reservation. And so under that dichotomy, under that split, because there are no reservations in Alaska, all fee-to-trust applications would be considered off-reservation applications.

1.3

2.4

Last year -- excuse me, it was earlier this
year, a national policy memo went out, which is good
for a year, stating that all off-reservation
applications from anywhere in the country, and
regardless of whether it's related to gaming, are all
going to go through the Department of Real Estate
Services, which is currently headquartered in
Washington. My understanding is it may be moving
somewhere else.

And so in other words, the applications are not going to be processed in the region the way most on-reservation applications are. If an on-reservation application is related to gaming, gaming-related applications also come to the central office to go through a separate office that handles gaming issues, but ordinarily, fee-to-trust applications, if they're on-reservation, are handled at the regional level, but

because these -- those in Alaska are considered off-reservation under that definition in the regs -- which is not to say that there may not be other ways of defining boundaries for different purposes, and it may be worth considering for purp- -- purposes of this consultation the relevance of those other boundaries for the kinds of jurisdictional issues, for example, that could arise in the fee-to-trust context or any other. There may be federal programs. There may be national resource management issues, all of which may hinge on what is a definable territory. And so to the extent that that is relevant to the 151 issues, it would certainly be worth having comments on that.

1.3

2.3

2.4

MR. SINK: Yeah, to add to that, there -there -- there's a trend to creating Tribal
conservation districts through the USDA, so there
might be some relevance there as -- as far as tribes
taking control of their lands or territories, that
those go beyond ownership and applies to -- to regions
of land. So there are some things that's probably
need -- need to be interpreted and be better defined
here; although, you know, kind of like the off- -off-reservation concept, because, I mean, if you're
not restricted to be an on-reservation, you know,
where can you get the lands? And I don't know if

we've defined that yet or not.

1.3

2.2

2.4

MR. ERICK: I've got a few minutes. Ernest D. Erick from Venetie.

I just want to thank everybody for being here and speaking your tongue in a good way, but I've got to be taking off here shortly here, you know, and -- and we have -- we'll probably be there at the BIA conference there in Fairbanks and everything else, and I guess we're going to have to bring the whole tribe.

Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Kristi Williams again.

I -- I just want today say thank you as well to -- to both for being here. I used to work for the federal government, so I know that your jobs are not easy and you have a lot of pressure, and as my colleague, Ken, said earlier, it isn't anything personal. It's just that we have a vested interest in this, and I know that you are working on behalf of your tribes and -- and the federal government and the people of America, so I appreciate what you're doing here.

Another consideration for a consultation would be -- and you'd have to speak to Victor Joseph, who unfortunately isn't here, but during the Tanana Chiefs Conference convention in March, it's the biggest

convention outside of AFN, and all of the Interior tribes will be at that convention, so I would suggest that is another place for consultation.

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. WEYIOUANNA: Tony Weyiouanna from Shishmaref and Kawerak.

I agree with Victor Joseph with his concerns question- -- questioning why these consultations are opening up again, you know, because if you look at Akiachak and that village -- (indiscernible - heavy accent) -- into the trust program, Akiachak, I don't know if there's some kind of problem with the process they've got to get into the program. I -- I don't really see what the problem is, unless you're seeing what kind of problems are running into.

One of the things about the trust program is that I -- I think there should be an option for whoever put their land into trust to have an option to take the land back out of trust, say, 50 years down the line or 100 years, you know, so I don't know what the restrictions are in the trust program.

MR. TAHSUDA: Well, there's a process for individuals; right?

MR. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. TAHSUDA: So there is a process under the

regulations for individuals to ask to have their land taken out of trust in -- in -- under the 151 regulations. Is that it? All right. Ken, do you have --MR. TRUITT: No. I was just --MR. TAHSUDA: Oh, okay. Thank you, guys. You've given us a lot of information. I would encourage you again to help us think through not just the legal issues, et cetera, but also the background information and what's important to -- to the tribes up here, or individuals, if that's the case, you know, in having the option to put land into trust. Thank you, and we'll close out this session. (Off record)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
3	STATE OF ALASKA)
4	I, Kasidy Pighini, CSR No. 14046, Notary
5	Public in and for the State of Alaska and reporter for
6	Accu-Type Depositions, do hereby certify:
7	THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through
8	129 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the
9	U.S. Department of the Interior/ANC Consultation,
10	recorded electronically by Accu-Type Depositions Court
11	Reporter on the 21st of October, 2018, and thereafter
12	transcribed under and reduced to print:
13	THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the
14	request of:
15	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR -
16	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
17	Anchorage, Alaska
18	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 13th day of
19	February, 2019.
20	SIGNED AND CERTIFIED BY:
21	
22	Kasidy Pighini
23	Notary Public, State of Alaska
24	Commissioner Expires: 08/25/2020
25	