TRIBAL CONSULTATION

DRAFT 25 CFR 162 (LEASES AND PERMITS)

held on

Wednesday, April 6, 2011 8:50 a.m.

at the

Indian Pueblo Cultural Center 2401 12th Street, N.W. Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104

Reported by: Yvonne C. Gonzales, NM CCR# 62 46 Shawn Lane Los Lunas, New Mexico 87031

Page 2 1 APPEARANCES 2 Department of the Interior: 3 Bryan Newland Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs 4 Counselor to the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs 1849 C Street, N.W. 5 MS 4141 - MIB Washington, DC 20240 6 Elizabeth K. Appel 7 Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs Regulatory & Policy Specialist 8 Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action 1849 C Street, N.W. 9 Mailstop 3070 Washington, DC 20240 10 Michele Singer 11 Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action 1001 Indian School Road, N.W., Suite 312 12 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104 13 14 INDEX 15 Page 16 Welcome and Introductions 3 1. 17 2. Overview of Draft 25 CFR 162 3 18 3. Input and Comments - Tribal Representatives 14 19 4. Break 55 20 Input and Comments - Tribal Representatives 55 21 6. Lunch Break 78 22 7. Input and Comments - Tribal Representatives 80 23 8. Adjourn 96 24 9. Reporter's Certificate 97 25

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Good morning. I apologize for running a little late. I'm an Ojibwa. I can't help but get caught behind. My name is Bryan Newland. I'm from the Department of Interior, Assistant Secretary's Office. I just want to thank you all for coming out so early this morning to talk about these exciting draft regulations. I can't think of a better way to start the day.

I want to, really briefly, let you know that Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Del Laverdue will be joining us. We're dealing with a couple of things back in Washington. I think everybody is seeing the news, what's going on with the budget. He's wrapping that up and will be joining us shortly.

I want to thank our bureau staff and acknowledge some folks here in the room: Liz Appel and Michele Singer who were instrumental in putting these draft regulations together. I think we have Omar Bradley from the Navajo region. We have Roger Knight from the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development. And any other bureau staff here, I would appreciate if you could raise your hand at this time so we all know where you're at. All right. We almost got them outnumbered.

I'm going to really quickly run through these
-- an overview of the draft regulations and then we'll turn
it over to you guys for comments and questions. We'll do

our best to answer any questions that you have. That's why we have our bureau staff here.

But I want to preface this by saying that these are draft regulations. They have not been formally proposed yet. So that makes it really easy for us to incorporate changes that you guys feel are necessary for us to make in order to make these better. So this is the last consultation session before they're formally proposed. We intend to do some more consultation after that point. We'll get rolling on these things. All right.

Those of you who have read through 172 pages of the draft regulations and are familiar with the existing regulations notice some differences probably right off the bat. The current regulations are broken down into two -- basically two substantive parts. There's the agriculture leasing regulations and then everything else.

The "everything else" is really, we felt, ill-suited to modern economic development, energy development and housing development in Indian country. So what we wanted to do is break it out into specific subparts. A lot of the terms are redundant. But we wanted to make sure that everything was self-contained so that when you're looking at how to do a residential lease on tribal lands, you're not flipping back and forth. We wanted to make this more user-friendly.

1 2

A note about agricultural leases. I know that's very important, especially out in this part of the country. We wanted to address those, but the time line that we're operating under, coming down with -- you know, about a year -- well, two years left in the first term of this administration. It's going to take us another year at least to get these -- you know, to get these rules finalized.

We didn't want to give short shrift to the agricultural leasing regulations. We also wanted to not run out of time in getting the rest of these regulations promulgated. So we intend to address those, but we wanted to focus on the residential, economic development and renewable part at this time.

As I mentioned to you before about how the regs are broken out -- this has been a work in progress for the last 18 months, within the department, to put this draft together. One of the things I wanted to mention about the wind and solar leasing provisions in the draft regs -- you know, here it says -- I don't think it -- well We have a new part in here for just wind and solar development on tribal lands.

Within that there's a section for wind and solar called permits. One of the things that we heard from Indian country was that, you know, it's problematic to do this broad environmental scoping for renewable energy

development when, you know, tribes or tribal companies are just doing resource assessments. So you're putting up met towers or recording data and you have to do environmental scoping for an entire project when you don't even know if you're going to go that far.

We wanted to include some provisions that would allow for very narrow scoping just for renewable energy resource assessments. So that's these wind and solar resource permits. You notice that I use the word "permit" there. That's a term that you're not going to see in these regulations anywhere else. The bureau is getting out of the business of approving permits.

Permits, you know -- for the lawyers in the room, as you know, permits is not an interest in land. It's permission to use land. We said, well, nobody's encumbranced trust lands with a permit. So we want to get out of that business and just streamline this process.

We've heard a lot of feedback about some of the different provisions in the regulations that folks have problems with. I want to let you know that we tried to push this as far as we could, but we do have statutory limits that we can't change. Congress has to change those, including terms of leases, some of the consent provisions.

We hear your comments and concerns and we'll continue to hear your comments and concerns on these issues.

But I wanted to point out that we're working within the statutory limits that we have.

Here's a time line we're working under. You see, we're right at the top bullet right now with tribal consultation. After next week, when we're going to close the period for written comments, we're going to go to back to the drawing board, incorporate the changes we can, make any necessary changes and then we're going to continue the process of having interdepartmental review where all the other departments in the federal government get to take a look and comment on these. We want to get these formally proposed by August.

At that point we'll come back for additional tribal consultation, go through the formal regulatory rulemaking process. You see there at the bottom, we want to get this published as a final rule in the Federal Register before this time next year. All right.

To get into the heart of the draft rule, here's the quick overview on the general provisions. You see in there, there's no BIA approval for permits except for the wind and solar resource permits. Because we do want to know what's going on out there, there's a provision in there for recordation of permits at the LTRO.

You see some other general provisions. That last bullet in there I want to draw your attention to that.

As part of our trust responsibility, we have to retain the authority to take emergency action to protect trust lands in case of emergencies, fires, floodings, what have you.

Residential leasing. You notice there's the consent provisions in direct pay, fair market value and the assessed value of property. We know that in Indian country a lot of times tribes want to lease homesites to tribal members for nominal value, \$1 for 99 years, or folks want to lease their land to their relatives for nominal value. In that case, neither party has an interest in collecting the fair market rent, if you will. So we wanted to simplify that process and make it easier to accommodate folks who want to do that.

This is one of the big features of the draft rule, is the time lines. When I was a kid, my parents were waiting six years to get an approval from the bureau for a leasehold mortgage so we could move out of our trailer and into a home. I know there are a lot of stories across Indian country that are far worse than that.

We want to make sure that folks get into their homes, get on their homesites as quickly as possible. So the regulations have these provisions in there that require the bureau to respond -- this is an enforceable time line. The Bureau has to respond to lease applications within 30 days. Now because this is a trust asset we're talking

about, we're still going to require BIA approval for the first lease out.

So if there's -- for some reason there's a complication, the bureau can request additional time to look at a lease. But as many of you know, residential leases really are not that complicated too often. So we wanted to make sure that, you know, within 30 days we're getting back to tribes and landowners and allowing folks to get in their homes on tribal lands.

I see it's on this slide. Amendments, subleases and mortgages. This is another new feature that's in this draft rule. You heard me mention just a second ago about -- the "first lease out" means express bureau approval. When we're talking about subleases, mortgages and amendments or assignments of those leases, then we're talking about if the bureau does not respond, that there will be a deemed approved of those subleases and mortgages.

So if that gets buried on somebody's desk and the bureau doesn't get back to within the time line there, it's automatically approved for subleases. We have the compliance and enforcement provisions. We have to continue to exercise our trust authority to enforce and cancel leases on trust lands.

Business leases. A lot of these provisions are going to track the residential leasing provisions.

There are some differences that I want to draw your attention to really quickly. There's not going to be any direct pay for business leases, and the fair market value provisions -- we know that we're talking in the commercial context that -- you know, this is profit driven we're now talking about. So we want to make sure folks are getting fair market rent for the lease of their lands. You see right there.

Again, the -- you know, the mirror provisions on BIA approval. The time line is a little longer because business leasing can be more complex. We see it especially in this part of the country with a lot of commercial developments on tribal lands. But the BIA will have 60 days to respond to the first lease out. If we have to take more time, we can request an additional 60 days to examine the lease. That's going to require express BIA approval.

But again, as in the residential context with the amendments, subleases and leasehold mortgages, if the bureau isn't responding, there's going to be automatic approval of this. So we're not going to be -- we're trying to speed up business development on tribal lands, return control over economic development on tribal lands to tribes and Indian landowners. We don't want to be a barrier to that.

Again, enforcement provisions similar to what

you're seeing in the other subparts. The wind and solar resource permit and lease. This is brand-new to our regulations. It's kind of -- we let our staff kind of use their creativity and go to work and see what they could come up with. Welcome you guys' feedback on this. We know that solar development is really big down here. We want to promote that. So we're really looking for your comments on how these are going to play in with what you guys are trying to do down here.

As I mentioned before, we have provisions in there -- I think it's on the next one. The permits for the resource assessment. There's going to be a three-year term with a one-year -- one time, three-year renewal. We're talking about -- we anticipate that there will be improvements involved with resource assessment. But we're not talking about putting up a 300 megawatt solar farm here or 300 megawatt wind farm. We're talking about, you know, very light equipment that's going to be temporary on trust lands so that there's no need to do that broad scoping that I mentioned earlier.

Here's the compensation provisions for the renewable part. See the permits. There's not going to be an appraisal required, because, again, we're talking short-term. You see here again. Time lines. BIA is going to have 20 days to approve permits. We still have the

compliance and enforcement provisions consistent with our trust authority.

Here's the WSR leasing that follows the permits. We have a 25-year period with one-year renewal -- or one-time renewal for 25 years. You see some of the requirements that leases are going to have to have. Due diligence, things with compatible uses, if you have a wind farm and you're talking about agricultural operations on those lands in conjunction with a wind farm.

Again, we're talking about, you know, profit-driven enterprises. So we're going to have the compensation provisions. Here you see at the bottom there about bureau approval of less than fair market value leases before power generation actually begins.

Again, the leasing provisions -- or the time lines are very similar to the other subparts. We're going to have 60 days to look at these leases and respond. For whatever reason, we need to continue looking at them, if it's a complex deal, we'll request another 60 days. I do want to note that these are enforceable time lines against the bureau under our Part 2 regulations.

The amendments, subleases, mortgage provisions are the same with the automatic approval if the bureau is taking too long. Again -- I know it's getting redundant at this point with the compliance and enforcement provisions,

but I do want to reiterate that we're trying to make this user-friendly so you don't have to go flipping back and forth between subparts and rules. We want the subject matter to be self-contained when you're talking about what do I have to look at to get a solar operation off the ground or a housing development.

There you see the deadline for the written comment submissions on April 18. E-mail those -- we really look forward to receiving written comments. You can e-mail those to Consultation@Bia.Gov.

I do want to mention a couple more things.

Today, I'm going -- in conjunction with this event, there's a Department of Energy Tribal Listening Session, I believe, going on in this building. So a lot of what we're trying to do is in conjunction with the Department of Energy in promoting renewable development on tribal lands.

So I encourage you guys to kind of wander back and forth, if you will. Look forward to hearing your comments and listening to you today. We have a court reporter here who's taking notes, and this is going to be part of the record that we use to revise these regs, as necessary, before we publish them.

So before you begin with your comments and questions, I would respectfully ask that you state your full name and the tribe that you're here representing. If it's a

difficult tribal name for somebody to pronounce, if you could maybe repeat that or -- you know, keep in mind that we're trying to make sure that we can attribute the comments properly.

So I thank you for your time today.

Appreciate it and look forward to hearing from you.

MR. JAN REIBACH: Jan Michael Looking Wolf Reibach, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. The HEARTH Act is up for consideration. How will these regulations -- how would the HEARTH Act impact the proposed changes? I mean, have you guys been considering that?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Yeah. Absolutely. For those of --

MR. JAN REIBACH: Just residential rights.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Yup. For those of you who don't know the HEARTH Act, which legislation has been introduced -- I know in the Senate. I believe in the House as well. HEARTH is an acronym for Helping Empower (sic) and Advance Responsible Tribal Homeownership. I don't know who comes up with these acronyms, but this legislation would allow -- I hate using that the term would "allow" -- would restore tribal leasing authority back at the tribal government level.

So a tribe -- like what happens at Navajo. If a tribe develops its own laws governing the leasing of

tribal land, the department would approve those regulations and then you don't have to come back to us again for leasing, if you don't want, on tribal lands. Tribes can approve leases. But the department will have to -- consistent with the trust responsibility -- would have to approve the tribal laws governing leasing.

What we wanted to do with these regulations -when we heard the HEARTH Act was moving in the last

Congress, we really ramped up on this draft rule because -these regulations will serve as a baseline. We know with

Navajo we had some problems with delay in reviewing the

Navajo Nation's draft -- or a draft of their laws governing

leasing. It took a number of years. We said, well, the

HEARTH Act will do no good if -- instead of leases being

held up at BIA, their tribal leasing laws are held up at the

BIA.

There are going to be some core provisions in here that we're going to kind of look at tribal leasing laws to mirror, and hopefully, that will speed up the review process for those tribes that want to participate if the HEARTH Act is passed. The department hasn't submitted an official position on the HEARTH Act. We're going to be asked to do so in the very near future. So you can look for that. That's how it's going to play with that piece of legislation.

Page 16

MR. JAN REIBACH: Thank you.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Any other comments? Folks need to let their coffee kind of twist their brains a little bit.

MR. MANUEL MYORE: My name is Manuel Myore, and I represent the Ute Tribe. I'm the Director for the Energy and Minerals Department. I've worked with the bureau for 20 plus years. It seems to me that we went down the same track at one point when we were going to revise the 25 CFR. I understand what was involved in that. I'd like to know what became of that. Was that another smoking mirror kind of process or what?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Are you talking about previous efforts to --

MR. MANUEL MYORE: Yeah. Mr. Wells -- he was the head of that program or that review or that process back then. I'd like to know whatever became of that. Are we going down the same path as we are now than we did then?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: These regulations are 50 years old. I know they've been tinkered with a little bit in the past. There have been efforts -- you're right, there have been efforts in the past to completely overhaul them. Again, the rulemaking process takes a long time. We have already been at this internally for a year and a half. The presentation had the time line that we're operating under.

It's going -- from this point, it's going -if we continue to push at the pace we've been going and
don't encounter any major speed bumps, it's going to be next
February before these rules become finalized. We've got
some leeway before the end of the administration, but not
much. It takes a long time. I think they ran out of time,
is my understanding.

MR. MANUEL MYORE: I was in the subcommittee hearing last week in D.C. with Congressman Don Young and we testified. These issues were mentioned and -- they were really addressed, but more or less the commission or the senators that were on that board were leaning more toward the tribes taking over their own responsibilities as far as APDs, right-of-ways and this sort of stuff.

I remember tribes had testified to that fact and made their point. And I think they were going to introduce a bill to that effect of some sort. I don't know where this is going to run into that or if you guys are going to get involved with the tribal leadership in Native Alaskan affair.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Just really quickly, these regulations would apply to surface use on trust lands. What they were talking about in the subcommittee -- I think a lot of it was focused on oil and gas and mining. I think most people in this room know that's covered by separate statutes

-- you know, a broad number of statutes that interplay with each other. These regs don't address --

MR. MANUEL MYORE: Surface and right-of-ways always include surface.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Right-of-ways are under a separate piece -- separate part of CFR. We're also working on those. Again, we're trying to -- we've got limited resources. We're trying to push out what we can that has the maximum impact, but we're also looking at the right-of-way regulations along the trespass and agricultural subpart. But this is the first part of that effort.

Thank you. Any other questions? Comments?

MS. TERESA LEGER: Hello. I'm Teresa Leger

from the Nordhaus law firm. I'm here representing the -- as

general counsel for the Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Santa

Ana and the Pueblo of Santa Domingo. The pueblos have

submitted extensive written comments to your extensive

regulations, but I thought we would highlight perhaps a few

of the matters orally and then you could look at them in the

regs.

The first issue that we wanted to address is to make sure that in the leasing regs it is very clear that tribes can use the leasing regs for whatever type of business lease they desire. We raise that because we have used the leasing regs instead of the right-of-way statute to

renew energy right-of-ways in order to avoid Strate.

It took us a long time to get that through and approved by the BIA. The BIA did approve those leases. We think that is the best answer to the jurisdictional issues that Strate raises, especially with the cases -- here in New Mexico we have one case. We have an Attorney General opinion saying it really doesn't matter what kind of language you use in a right-of-way because of the relationship where, in a right-of-way, the BIA is issuing the right-of-way and the tribes are merely consenting. Whereas, in a lease, it's the tribe that is actually in the driver seat.

That is really consistent with self-determination, leaving Strate aside. It's consistent with self-determination that the tribe is in the driver seat and is entering into the lease directly. So we want to make sure that your regulations acknowledge that and acknowledge that the listing that you have as to what kind of purposes you can use a lease for, that that would include something like a right-of-way. Because even though we've had a lot of back and forth with the tribe on what common law -- you know, what common law, et cetera, et cetera, is, none of that is acknowledged, I think, in the regulations. We would like to make it little more clear.

We have extensive comment on why the common

law properties do not apply in this situation, but we want to make sure that since that was a big issue that the BIA raised, that it be reflected perhaps simply by a statement saying, "and leases for any purpose that derive an economic benefit to the tribe." Something like that.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Sorry to interrupt. Did your written comments include language that -- the language you would like to see in there?

MS. TERESA LEGER: Yes, we did.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: That's helpful for us.

MS. TERESA LEGER: That's helpful. In some areas, there's actually specific language we suggested. In some areas, there's more -- it's a broad comment.

The other issue is in terms of deferring to tribes with regards to negotiated valuation. I know that there is an emphasis on looking at appraisals. Oftentimes, those appraisals are basically land appraisals intended to appraise tribal land for grazing purposes, because it's out in rural areas. Where, in fact, the tribes have been very good at negotiating a valuation that is in excess -- in a renegotiated valuation that was 113 times more than what the BIA-mandated appraisals came up with. But BIA's mandated appraisal added four months to the process of getting the leases approved, with money that should have been the tribe's sitting in an escrow account while we waited for

those appraisals.

So I think that having more explicit language about a deferral to alternative valuation methods that are more market-based would be good, so that there isn't the fall-back on, well, let's get an appraisal just so that we have something in the file, even though we know it's not going to be reflective of what the market is. It adds a lot of time. So that would be another issue.

We also, in looking at the regulations, in looking -- we felt that what you might have been struggling with in some of the areas where there was perhaps more BIA involvement than presently, is that you may be struggling with the fact of when are you dealing with tribal land and when are you dealing with individually owned land that has fractionated interest.

It might be a suggestion to actually separate those two so that you don't unnecessarily interfere with tribal self-determination and tribal evaluation of what's in its best interest because you're trying to protect perhaps a more complicated -- in terms of consent and other things with regards to individual landowners.

A point I would make to highlight is that the tribes -- the pueblos that have sent me here today are absolutely dead set against having an automatic consent after 30 days. There are lots of reasons why -- especially

with the pueblos that have ceremonial issues, that have transition issues, where 30 days just might not make sense and we should not allow a lessee to get the benefit of a 30-day automatic consent.

Now, that said, we don't mind the fact that the BIA has imposed upon itself some deadlines. We very much applaud that. That's a great thing that you have done here. We look forward to see that more expedited review process. So that 30-day consent as to tribal land, I think, runs through all the different sections that you have.

With regards to waiver requests, though, we noted that there is no 30-day request, unless we missed it, on a waiver request. And there's various places where you require that the tribes seek a waiver of the regulation.

We'd make two comments on that. One, is that you should impose the same kind of deadlines on yourself as you impose on the other matters; and two, that you might look back at that and instead of having some of the matters being subject to waiver, actually say that we will defer to the tribes so that there's not a need to get a waiver on certain things, like alternative valuations as an example.

So there are some things which a tribe is -you will defer -- if you find it is in their best interest,
unless you find a compelling reason not to. So that way
you're not going back for waivers on those things, but you

are evaluating them. But you have the authority within the regulation to evaluate them and determine if you're going to defer to the tribe's judgment and in their best interest to approve it.

So we would urge you to look at those issues. We did feel like there was perhaps a little bit of increased bureaucracy that we saw in these regulations on certain matters. It would be nice to see it go the other way and streamline it more.

The issues -- and little things like issues of having -- that you can approve -- you know, you're going to approve things and you're going to send the approval documents certified mail to the lessee but not to the tribes. I mean, that doesn't make any sense why the tribes shouldn't get notification immediately. Why you're entering into the leased property -- I'm not sure that we've seen that before. Tribes definitely always put that they have the right to enter, but whether the BIA should have the same right -- unless it's in those emergency situations.

The issues with regards to their solar permitting -- why the BIA would need the information developed because that might lead -- we've negotiated solar access permits. We call them different things. Land use agreements. And the information developed in those -- that permitting process, that is something that the tribe and the

energy company have come to agreement on what should be done with it.

Sending it over to the BIA, making it potentially subject to discovery and to FOIA, especially at the permitting stage, that might be difficult. And the energy companies might be a little leery of allowing that to happen because protecting it, according to the greatest extent of the law, just might not be enough protection. I'm not sure why the BIA would need it at that permitting stage. It might need -- moving to the next stage, it might then be something that you need.

With regards to -- sticking on the solar issue, the permitting issue of wind and solar, is that the -- we think that the regulations -- and this actually applies across the board. That the regulations should make sure that they allow and recognize that tribes can use other types of agreements consistent with Section 81 for land use agreements.

With solar permitting, that would be a case where it might be that the energy company and the tribe decide they don't want to go through this process because it adds -- it does -- it does trigger a need, but adds different complexities and time lines, where if you're in the evaluation stage, that the tribe and the energy company should be able to enter into other types of agreements,

short-term use agreements, that don't have to go through that.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you. I really appreciate that. A number of those issues came up in our discussions. I wanted to note just a couple of things really quickly. As you're flipping through your packet there, you see a watermark on every page of "draft." We can go back. Nothing is set in stone. We do want to push this forward. Our goals are to speed up the process, simplify it, make it more user-friendly and streamline it, giving up bureaucracy -- and we've heard that comment from a number of folks that are going to take a look at those provisions that you're talking about.

With the right-of-way stuff, I do want to note that that is something that is coming up frequently in the comments, too. We're going to take a look at that. Thank you.

MR. ANTHONY AGUIRRE: My name is Anthony

Aguirre with the Navajo tribe. This is more for other

tribes' information. The issue was raised about

right-of-way. I guess the Al/Strate -- the jurisdiction

issue, but the way the Navajo deals with that -- and we can

deal with it now. I'm not saying you can't put something in

the regs that clarify this, but in terms of -- there's

nothing to keep the tribes from negotiating right-of-way

leases. We do that for the major transmission lines all the time. We require consent to jurisdiction. We also put statements in there that say the right-of-way remains in Indian country forever.

For the smaller types of right-of-ways like power lines or water to people's homes, that we have standard terms and conditions which are part of our consent. So if somebody wants a right-of-way, the applicant has to get -- this is jurisdiction. That's our standard terms and conditions that are submitted to the BIA when we give our consent. So that's another way to try to maintain jurisdiction over the applicant. Thank you.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you.

MR. DEAN SUAGEE: Hi. I'm Dean Suagee. I'm an attorney with Hobbs, Straus, Dean and Walker reporting for a group of tribal clients. This is just a comment on the effort to streamline the process. I want to suggest that in conjunction with reviewing these regulations, you also look at the updating and revising the list of categorical exclusions under the procedure's schedule in NEPA and the department manual.

The Council on Environmental Quality issued a guidance document recently at the end of December advising federal agencies on how to evaluate their categorical exclusions and revise their lists, and suggested agencies

ought to do that every seven years periodically. It's been 14 years since the BIA did theirs. There wasn't really any consultation for the tribes back then.

You're going to run into -- you're not going to deal with -- you're not going to be able to streamline the process unless you expand the list of categorical exclusions. There's really no justification for having to do an environmental assessment on a typical homesite lease.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you for that.

Without getting into it too much, because the consult for environmental quality works directly with the president, we have been in discussions with him and the folks in the department about the department manual, environmental review process and how that's going to interplay with that. We're well aware of that. We are working very hard to make sure that, you know, exactly what you're warning about doesn't occur. We made these changes in the environmental process, you know --

MR. DEAN SUAGEE: I think if you don't try to engage tribes in consultation regarding revising the economic procedures, you're going to get pushed back. Even though, you know -- everyone agrees that it serves -- most people agree that it serves -- it will serve tribal interest. If you don't engage in consultation -- we're getting pushed back for not doing consultation. Let's say,

hey -- you don't have to do rulemaking, but you do have to publish things in the Federal Register. There should be some recognition of the interconnection between the two subjects.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate that. Your recommendation on consultation is well taken. Any other comments on Part 162? You've got to get those hands up high or else we're going to miss you.

MR. MONTE MILLS: Hi. Monte Mills from -here on behalf of the Southern Ute Tribe. I'm just
following up on the question about -- or the comment about
NEPA regulations. It may be -- it's just from a lack of
time to read the regulations clearly thus far, but on the
WSR permit and lease provisions, how do those interrelate
with the NEPA requirements?

Because it appears like the permit, the three-year and then potentially three-year extension of the permit process, is intended to be a feasibility period where those things can be studied. But in terms of the requirements for granting a permit, the regs require that all environmental reports and other things be submitted before the permit is granted.

So I just wondered how that discussion went in the drafting of it. How do you guys see the relationship between the NEPA requirements and the granting of the

permits?

MR. DEAN SUAGEE: See, there needs to be categorical exclusions for that --

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate that comment. David, did you want to

MR. DAVID JOHNSON: This is David Johnson from DOI. I came into the writing process fairly late in that process. I know that discussion has been ongoing. I don't think there's a resolution to it yet. So, actually, I think it's a fair question. We're looking at it and trying to figure out what to do there.

The whole process with the permit first was to enable there to be some level of -- a hint on both sides for the WSR purposes. I think the concept here is that hopefully the review for solar and wind will be somewhat -- is something that we can get in a cookie-cutter fashion. But we haven't got that resolved.

MR. ANTHONY AGUIRRE: Just one quick follow-up. I think if you look at this with the idea of these permits for wind and solar resources, I don't -- that's something that really ought -- sounds like a really good idea. It's certainly -- it's something we really ought -- ought to make sense as a categorical exclusion. Unless you write that in the NEPA procedures, you're going to end up either doing environmental assessments and qualities or

getting sued.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Again, I appreciate that. We are looking at that and working on that, you know, today. It's ongoing.

I just want to note for the process we're going through today, that if we could make sure that, you know, everybody has a chance to speak before we -- folks take a second crack at the mike. I just want to make sure that we get everybody's comments and questions on the record. And that's not -- I'm not saying that because I don't want to talk about NEPA, because we know it's out there. We want to work on it. We've heard it. I'm sure we'll hear more of it today.

Any other questions? Roger wanted to

MR. ROGER KNIGHT: Roger Knight with the Division of Energy, Minerals. When we worked on this process, that is one of the big problems we had. There is one statement in the regs that if a tribe does the permit and does the feasibility study by the tribe for the tribe, then a lot of -- it's a cat. ex. -- a lot of the provisions are waived.

So that's one statement that we did put in there to try to eliminate that NEPA process. But it's something that I think we really need to address, because you have the tribes -- you have to go back twice for

negotiations. You're doing your NEPA when you don't know what's going on. You're taking a larger area with your resource assessment and then you're bringing it down when you're doing your actual leases. So it's something that we really need comments on. We would like to have any input on that.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thanks, Roger. You had a comment up here.

MR. LESTER TSOSIE: Good morning. My name is Lester Tsosie. I'm here on behalf of the Ak-Chin Indian Community in Southern Arizona. For my Navajo citizens, (native language spoken.)

The Community Council designated me to provide some comments on the BIA draft regulations because the Community is -- as you all are probably also engaging in numerous economic development activities, and we'd really like to use the regulations to, you know, fulfill our dream of self-determination and be able to develop those economic development activities.

Ak-Chin Indian Community is about 22,000 acres in South Central Arizona, south of Phoenix. About 16,000 acres of that is designated for farming, but the rest of it is designated for housing as well as commercial and industrial development.

We would like to just share with you some of

the comments we're going to present to the BIA before the official deadline. There were eight questions that were provided to us to provide comments on, and I'll probably answer or address a couple of those.

The first one is, do you agree with the policy changes made in these draft regulations. We agree with the goal of the policy changes -- increasing efficiencies and transparency of the BIA approval process -- however, we feel the proposed regulations do not realize the intended goal, specifically, the regulations -- 172 pages in total -- are long and extensive. The length alone may be imposing to lessors, and consequently, deter potential leases and economic opportunities. The burden of the regulations prevents tribes from being competitive in the leasing market, especially the business leasing market.

The regulations could be more simplified. The regulations fail to strike a balance between fulfilling the federal government's responsibility of protecting Indian land while promoting tribal economy, autonomy and self-government. Any regulations governing Indian land should be -- make every reasonable attempt to facilitate the leasing of Indian land and should not unduly delay or frustrate the leasing of Indian land.

The time limits for BIA approval should be made firm and all documents -- leases, amendments,

assignments, subleases and mortgages -- should be deemed approved if the BIA does not act within the prescribed amount of time. Correspondingly, one of the stated goals in the regulations is to encourage the BIA to approve leases, amendments, assignments, mortgages and subleases unless there's a compelling reason not to; however, the lack of firm deadlines, by which these documents are approved, will allow the BIA to circumvent this stated goal.

The imposition of leasing regulations on housing leases is a significant departure from current practices and it will make it harder for tribes to provide housing for tribal members. At Ak-Chin there's no Indian allotment. Just our reservation land.

The regulations use "Indian landowners" to refer interchangeably to individual Indian landowners and tribes. The BIA's approach to leases, especially business leases, should, however, be different and have much more deference to decisions made by tribes regarding leasing of their tribal lands versus leasing the lands owned by individual Indian owners.

We recommend that Part 162 regulations define "Indian landowners" to mean only individual Indians and create a new definition for "tribes." This may require separate regulations for these leases because the actions which the BIA should take to protect the interests of

individual Indian landowners and the deference that the BIA should give tribes when deciding how to manage their land may conflict.

We recommend that the BIA adopt regulations that are consistent with the 111th Congress' S. 3235, Helping Expedite and Advance Responsible Tribal Homeownership Act, HEARTH Act, for those tribes who would like to utilize such a leasing process.

In terms of residential leases, we do not agree with the policy proposed in the residential lease section, which is a significant change to the currently accepted practices regarding residential leasing on tribal lands. Further, the proposed regulations, which are a replication of business lease rules, will create significant burdens on tribes' efforts to make housing available to members.

Specifically, the current draft would stifle a tribal member who wanted to lease a tribal home on their own reservation with all the business lease requirements for appraisals, bonds, insurance and other approvals. The maximum lease term allowed under Section 162.311, Subsection B, cannot exceed 50 years. Thus, for a tribe which leases a tribal house to a tribal member who is 18 years old, such lease will expire when the tribal member is 68 years old.

The effect is that 68-year-old tribal elder is

then forced to start all over again to renew the lease or else they cannot -- there cannot be a holdover -- they cannot be a holdover tenant. Such a policy is inconsistent with many cultural practices.

Previously, tribes used 25 CFR Section 103(b) as the authority to lease tribal land to tribal members without requiring to -- requiring a lease approved by the BIA. Often, the houses leased were constructed with HUD or other tribal funding. HUD requires that all homes constructed with HUD housing funds must be assigned to tenants pursuant to a lease that meets certain requirements of federal law and regulation. Any attempt by the BIA to regulate the lease of HUD-funded homes will create a dual regulatory system with conflicting requirements.

We strongly recommend that the regulations exempt from coverage of the leasing regulations any land leased by a tribe to tribal members through a tribal housing authority or department, especially for homes constructed with HUD or tribal funding.

In terms of businesses leases, it is unclear what "developed land" means in the context of business leases. As tribes diversify, they're looking to opportunities beyond a standard ground lease. Tribes have constructed shopping plazas, office buildings and industrial complexes and are interested in leasing space in these

buildings, not the entire building. Not all tribes are interested in leasing the whole property to another entity and having that entity sublease the property pursuant to a master lease. Instead, some tribes prefer to maintain control of the property and instead to enter into leases directly. Leasing space in a building is similar to receiving a permit to use tribal property and conveys to the tenants a much smaller interest than what is conveyed through a ground lease.

Our recommendation: clarify that agreements to rent space in a developed tribal building are permit agreements, not leases. Otherwise, revise the regulations to make them more accommodating to the diverse range of business leasing opportunities on tribal lands.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Excuse me, sir. I want to try to make sure that we keep our comments --

MR. LESTER TSOSIE: Okay.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: You can come back.

MR. LESTER TSOSIE: Sure. These are some of the comments we're presenting to the BIA. And I guess one thing that is very important is that Ak-Chin is trying to -- it has positioned itself to really take advantage of market-driven drivers out there in terms of economic development.

So having to go through the BIA right now is

very, very lengthy and extensive. So we want to be able to work with the BIA to see if we can provide regulations that will help us react, for one, quickly, have a short-term lease that we can use as long as, you know, we address all the compliance issues.

One example that came up within our community is that we're building this beautiful, multispace building where we're going to lease to entrepreneurs and small businesses that are just starting out. We want to be able to use like a one-year lease and then -- you know, most small businesses will succeed or not after three years. So we want to be able to have that flexibility. So we're suggesting language in here that will be almost incremental in the shorter time units up to the maximum of 25 years.

So that's something that we really want to impress and emphasize as we present this information. Thank you very much.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you for your comments. I appreciate the substantive remarks we're getting today. We know we're departing in a number of instances very far from what's currently in place with the regulations. This is going to involve a large amount of training of our bureau staff to implement properly in a way that benefits tribes and Indian landowners, you know, going forward after these rules come out.

These comments -- I'm going to reiterate over
and over again today that these comments are going to be
read by myself and everybody else involved in the drafting
process. And they make a difference. Because you guys are
doing this on the ground. We're trying to make this better.
We appreciate the guidance in how to make this work for you
guys.

Are there any other questions or comments?

MS. MARGUERITE SMITH: Marguerite Smith. I'm actually from the Shinnecock Nation. We don't have trust lands yet, but apart from that, one question that comes to mind is with regard to coastal tribes and how will these regulations and how will the staff interact with other bureaus. For example, the offshore energy development work. I'm going to go to that energy meeting. But some of these wind projects will be both onshore and offshore in scope.

Is there any discussion or consideration given yet to those projects that may reach both on and offshore lands?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Well, offshore development is, as you acknowledged, governed by -- I think it's BOE.

MS. MARGUERITE SMITH: BOE -- BOEMRE.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I'm losing track of the acronyms. I haven't been with the feds very long. You know, that's a good question. I don't know. You know, we

can take a look at that.

MS. MARGUERITE SMITH: They have been very active at doing consultations, at least in the Northeast. So we're interested to make sure that the BIA is also in consultation with them.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate that.

MS. MARGUERITE SMITH: Thank you.

MR. SCOTT WESTON: Good morning, everybody.

My name is Scott Weston from the Oglala Sioux Tribe of Pine
Ridge, South Dakota. My question being -- we talked about
the lengthy process of leasing. Is there any resolution to
the undivided interest or the process to slow that down when
we come to trying to put a HUD house on to some undivided
heirship land? Because right now within our tribe, the only
way that we do -- you know, the only way that we can right
now -- unless you're a total individual owner, you have to
have -- you have to have -- I mean, you've got to get 100
percent of your undivided heirship's permission. You've got
to have that. That signage.

So, is there something in these draft regulations that will negotiate or try to determine some of that and define that issue?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I thank you for your question. We're working with the consent provisions. I know there's a lot of -- it's a huge issue. As -- I mean,

we have the Cobell litigation. We're working within the statutory limits that we have. We talked to members of Congress. We heard from Indian country about fractionation for many years. But we can't change, by regulation, the statues that are in place. So that's where we are on that issue.

With respect to working with other agencies, are you talking about HUD and things like that? I know that you had mentioned that in your remarks. We have reached out to HUD and are discussing our regulations, and that's going to be part of the interdepartmental dialogue.

We consult with Indian country, but we also consult with the other departments on their regulations and our own to see how that affects programs that they're operating in Indian country. So those discussions will continue as well. Thank you.

MS. SARAH LAWSON: My name is Sarah Lawson.

I'm the Trust Services Director for the Muckleshoot Indian

Tribe up in Auburn, Washington. My question actually kind

of goes to that issue of consent. I saw in Part 162.010

where it says, "An Indian landowner of a fractional interest

in a tract must obtain a lease ... unless the Indian

co-owners have given the landowner permission to take or

continue possession without a lease."

We have a lot of fractionated land like most

Indian reservations do. That just presents sort of a hornet's nest in my mind. So my question, I guess, what was the thought behind doing that? Because I can completely see in the future the landowners on a fractionated interest that we have given permission to someone to continue to have permission -- or I'm sorry, continue to have possession of property with a home and then later getting into a family argument and withdrawing their consent. If there's no actual lease in place, we've got a problem.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate that -bringing that to everybody's attention. That's -- I mean,
you know better than I do about how sticky that issue is
when you have multiple landowners. Who gets the possession
of it. You know, we've kicked around a number of ideas on
how to address that within the regulations and more
generally.

We welcome any written suggestions you might have. If you're concerned about -- I'm looking at it right now: 010(b). If you have a way that you think that it could be rewritten to avoid those types of disputes or better resolve them, we would certainly welcome that and look at that in our redrafting period.

Sir, I want to make sure that everybody gets a chance to talk before folks get a second crack at the mike.

I'm not trying to cut off dialogue here, guys. Because

people have a lot of very good things to say. I just want to make sure everybody gets their chance.

Is there anybody else?

MS. KARIS BEGAYE: Hi. My name is Karis
Begaye. I'm from the Navajo Nation. I had a couple of
clarification questions, I guess. The Navajo Nation will be
providing comprehensive comments to the regulations. At
this point we're just trying to understand what the thought
process is behind developing these regulations.

The Navajo Nation, we do issue our own business leases. Looking at this, we did have some practical questions to it. The first one is the permits. You were mentioning that the tribes can issue their own -- approve their own permits, and all we have to do is give it to the Land Title Records Office for recording.

The issue that we, the Navajo Nation, run into

-- because that's exactly what we do. We issue our own

business leases, but then we have to submit it to LTRO for

recording. The practical part of that is always unclear

exactly what is required to be submitted for recording. Is

the BIA going to be considering doing a checklist for

further clarification on that issue, because we run into

situations -- we did an MOU, actually, with the BIA. And we

listed in that MOU what we needed to submit for recording.

And that started -- well, one, it expired; but, two, the

list started growing over time. We were just unclear as to what exactly needs to be submitted for recording. We've run into an issue where we still have a lease that we approved back in 2006 that's yet to be recorded.

So we just need clarification, I guess, on that aspect. What exactly are you looking for? When you're saying all you have to do is submit it for recording -- it's a little more complicated than that. I think it will be helpful if the BIA would provide clarification or if we would require documents for that.

The other question I have, in reading this -or a second comment, is on the grazing -- or I'm sorry, the
landowner issues where we're required to -- it looks like -if a business owner or an entity wanted to come into the
tribe and lease lands, that they could put a request to the
BIA or whoever are the owners of the land, the landowners.
The title records of BIA and the tribe are not always
compatible. I guess we have a little bit of a concern
there. You know, the lessee can come and just rely on what
the BIA tells them who the landowners are.

First is the tribe which can have a separate or different list than what the BIA has. Which one is going to dictate? There's a little bit of a sovereignty question with that, whether, you know, the landowner can just ignore what the Navajo Nation has on their records and just go with

the BIA, whether that will supersede.

The next question I have is on -- or the third comment is on enforcement. There is a 10-day to show cause, like if there's no payment, which is fine. We at the Navajo Nation -- we do our own enforcement. We have our own policies as to how to try and collect on rentals. If we're unable to do so and we have an uncooperative lessee, we then defer to the BIA for a unilateral termination. But it takes a long time to get that done.

Is there going to be some time lines inserted in here, that upon receipt of the tribe's resolution or presidential letter, to request that you guys unilaterally terminate it? Will there be some set times? Or what documents are you guys looking for to be able to carry out that duty?

For example, you know, we have several enforcement letters that we send out. Then we have resolutions. Then we have letters from the president. And then we submit it to the BIA, but then we don't get a response for quite a long time.

What exactly are the parameters? What are you looking for from the tribes, so we can get that enforcement done right away? Otherwise, the rental will start accruing and instead of it just being \$5,000, now we're looking at \$100,000. So just a little clarification on that.

My fourth comment is on the performance bond. We ran into a couple of issues where we have some of our leases expired. And the performance bond is held by the BIA. We sometimes have tried to collect on that whenever the lease expires or there's a termination that goes through, there's rental owed on the lease.

The question I have for that one is, how do we get that performance bond? We've oftentimes asked the BIA, can you submit the performance bond back to the tribe because we have this outstanding rental, but it's already been given back to the lessee.

What exactly do we need to do? Is there some -- to ensure that that doesn't happen, I guess. Is there some safeguards that we can have in here to make sure that the tribes are contacted before the performance bonds are released, especially if there's outstanding rental owed on those leases?

The sixth comment I have is kind of going back to recording. Is the BIA going to be looking at doing some training for the tribes? The reason why is because we do submit legal surveys and legal descriptions and oftentimes those are not sufficient.

I think a lot of it is just because the tribes

-- we don't really know what to look for in the legal
surveys. We don't really know until the BIA tells us, oh,

Page 46

this isn't sufficient. You need to redo it. And it's oftentimes embarrassing because then we have to go back to the landowners and lessees and say, sorry, you know, we need to process the lease all over again.

So I just wanted to know if the BIA will be considering maybe doing training or even putting in here to ensure that there is training conducted for the tribes, especially on legal surveys and legal descriptions.

The seventh comment I have is on -- I was looking at your fair market value section. It talks about allowing for another valuation of the land, but it doesn't actually address it in the regulations. It says that -- it's mentioned in Paragraph D, and there is no Paragraph D, unless --

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: What page is that?

MS. KARIS BEGAYE: Section 164.21 -- 162.421.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: The business leasing

provision?

MS. KARIS BEGAYE: That's correct.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: You're talking about Page

81 -- or 82.

MS. KARIS BEGAYE: Page 82. And it says, "unless we approve another type of valuation pursuant to paragraph (d)."

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: We've had a number of

folks point that out. That's on the radar.

MS. KARIS BEGAYE: We, the Navajo Nation, created a separate valuation system. We don't do appraisals. We do it all in-house. So I was curious as to what that valuation would be that you guys would allow so other tribes could implement the same thing that we've done, because it's cost saving and it's a lot faster.

My last comment is on insurance. In the regulations, it implies that the lessee obtain insurance on the property's improvements. I just don't want to see any situation, I guess -- we, the Navajo Nation -- we often build our own businesses, buildings, property, and so we carry our own insurance on a lot of these properties.

The way I read the regulations, if this goes into place -- not that this would apply to the Nation at this point, but if something happened and we would be subject to this, then we would run into the situation where we would have to -- I guess my interpretation would be that we would have to require the lessee to hold the insurance on our own property, our own buildings; whereas, right now we are the ones that do the insurance. It's just limiting a little bit, I guess, we see. And there's just some clarification that I have. These are initial comments -- or questions I have.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I really appreciate that.

If I can just take 30 seconds to respond. Most of your comments and questions dealt with practice, BIA practice and how we're going to implement that. To answer your question about training, there's going to be a lot of training involved from the standpoint of the bureau training, you know, field staff, in how to implement these. We can work with the bureau director and regional directors to see how we can incorporate tribes in that process.

When you're talking about the LTRO, I do believe that we're talking about, you know, coming up with some MADA forms and things like that in conjunction with these regulations. I really appreciated your question about the conflict between BIA records versus tribal records and tribal -- as a matter of sovereignty and self-determination, tribal policies and laws prevailing.

This is difficult because we do have to retain our ability to carry out the trust responsibilities. With that said, we have -- we worked very hard to flag as many places in here as possible where we could incorporate deference to tribal law to the greatest extent possible.

I'll flag that, and we're going to go back and look at that and see what kind of options we have with that regard.

To be honest with you, it may be that -- as a matter of federal law, it may be that, you know, we just have to use the bureau records. But I've noted it. We're

going to go back and look at that. Because we do want to make sure that tribes have the control over tribal land use to the greatest extent that we can make possible.

So thank you very much.

MS. CELENE HAWKINS: I'm Celene Hawkins,
Associate General Counsel for the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe. I
just have a couple of comments on the wind and solar regs.
From my standpoint and from the tribe's standpoint, we can't see how the permitting process is going to facilitate development.

A lot of times when we're at the feasibility stage, we're not actually having a lot of work done on the reservation. Most of it is really the nondisclosure and sharing of information. A lot of this stuff is the transmission studies and stuff including -- requiring placement of anything on the reservation.

So I guess my question would be, why is that the only place that the BIA is still going to require a permit? I guess along with that, we're also seeing that when payment standards are set by regulation, it can be harmful to the tribes negotiating their own rates.

For example, we're seeing development coming in and limiting their offers to the published BLM rates for leased land. So I would really encourage the BIA to rethink the idea of just publishing a straight form for the permits

if they are done, to really stay away from that leasing. I think it would be very harmful to the tribes for being able to negotiate their own rates.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you. With regard to your first question, a lot of times when we're talking about met towers and other equipment that -- it's kind of a hybrid between a permit and a lease. You're talking about short-term possession of a very small part of tribal lands.

I think the idea with the WSR permit provisions in there was -- again, we have to -- we're talking about possession of trust lands that implicates the trust responsibilities. So we have to make sure that, you know, we're looking at that. So that was -- that's the intent behind the permit provisions in there. Because a lot of times we're talking about -- we're talking about very small possession with a very small footprint for a short period of time. Those are the types of things that we wanted to cover with the permit.

I do appreciate the remarks that you had about the data collection things occurring off the reservation or not directly tied to the land. We're looking at that as well.

MS. CELENE HAWKINS: You might look at the meaning and scope of the permit. It's pretty broad. Right now I would be worried that it would cover almost anything.

And I would also look at BIA imposing a lot shorter time lines that are generally proposed under Section 501. So those shortened time lines would also need to be developed.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JEFF WARNKE: Hi. My name is Jeff Warnke. I represent the Chehalis Tribe in Washington State. Chairman Burnett was unable to make it today. He simply wanted to extend his thanks to everybody who's worked so long and hard on these draft regulations and taking it on the road and leaving your families and coming out to speak with us.

He specifically -- the Chehalis Tribe is wanting to address 162.415, business leasing. In particular, Section -- Part C which addresses taxation of permanent improvements. The Chehalis Tribe is engaged in a business venture with a nontribal partner. We needed to do that because we're a small, rural tribe. We thought we had covered all our bases by working with the state on taxation issues. We got a favorable opinion from the state.

As things turned out, we, one day, got a tax assessment from the county, not on the dirt -- because it's in trust -- but on the permanent improvements to the land. It was a little shocking to us. What we found since then that there's very little case law or guidance from the courts to determine exactly what the legal issues are around

whether the tribe is liable for taxes -- or I should say, the joint venture is liable for taxation or not.

We're currently in court on the issue. We are just encouraging other tribes here today to speak up and really kind of take a look at Section 415 and weigh in and support these changes that will clarify that the permanent improvements will not be subject to taxation by the state or county. Again, I just want to thank you.

The other thing that the chairman wanted me to mention is we are very supportive of the time line you have. We think it's aggressive, we agree. But we do think that the sooner we can get this thing wrapped up, the better. We'd just encourage you to stick to those time lines and get these things done. Thanks so much.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you very much. Just a note in there. That's on Page 78 of the packet you may have. That's something that we're well aware of. We know that it's also going to affect renewable energy development on tribal lands. You're talking about non-Indian improvements on trust lands and who can tax and who can't.

Certainly, as a trustee, we want to weigh in on that issue very clearly and state that -- you know, there under 415, that it's not subject to taxation by states and local governments, those types of improvements. So thank you for your comments.

Any other questions or concerns?

MR. ANTHONY AGUIRRE: Anthony Aguirre, again, with the Navajo Tribe. If we're talking about speeding up the process for homesite leases -- again, I don't think I have a pretty good handle on the procedures. I am way -- I asked for the old ones. I'm going back to the basic question on leases.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Can you hold up your microphone closer to your --

MR. ANTHONY AGUIRRE: I'm going back to a basic question on leases. We have on the Navajo Reservation set-asides --- that's what we call it, but -- for use by the Navajo governmental people. Usually we don't talk about leases until we're talking about trying to get somebody outside the tribal government a property interest, whether it's a member or an enterprise.

But when it comes to turning these, they can -- like for homesites, I'm not sure why, if there's not a withdrawal like a -- we'll call it, you know, a 10-acre withdrawal. But I'm not sure why you can't have, in the lease preauthorization to assignments or transfers, to individual members of that tribe without BIA approval.

My intent has always been individual members don't need tribal -- BIA approval to live on their own land. They've been doing it for years. So if the issue -- I don't

see where a lease would be -- is even required, is when you're trying to create some instrument that allows encumbrance so you can get a loan to finance a home.

But if you're dealing with tribal members, then I'm not sure why you can't have preapproved forms, preapproved assignments, preapproved mortgages. So why do we need the BIA's approval on those for internal use? I'm not sure why the BIA can't do that preapproval in something like a master lease.

We deal with master leases or -- is going from -- you already have a lease and you're going to assign it to another tribal member, why do we need the BIA approval?

That's internal use. It's always understood that the land is for native people.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate that. The issue of master leases and long-term assignments to tribal members from the tribe is something that has come up in the other consultation sessions we had. Again, that's another one that I personally have flagged. When we sit back at the table, you know, later this month and open this up in the Word document and rewrite, we're going to take a look at that issue. But I appreciate your comments on that.

I know we're coming up on time for a scheduled break. Before we do that, are there any other questions or comments at this time? Why don't we take a break for 15

minutes. Then we'll come back in here and we'll pick it back up again.

(Recess taken from 10:10 a.m. to 10:38 a.m.)

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: We've heard a lot of interesting comments this morning. I'm sure we'll hear some more. I just want to add, as a practical standpoint, to the extent that folks are going to be submitting electronic comments -- I know that a lot of times what we see is a PDF signed letter. If you also have suggestions or recommendations on language -- you know, what we do is we order some pizza back at the department and sit around a table with a projector and we work on this stuff.

If you have flagged something in here like a particular section, you have an idea on how to replace that, it might be helpful if you also submitted a Word document along with your PDF. That just makes it a lot easier than having Liz exercise her fingers in those meetings trying to type verbatim the suggestions. That's one kind of practical thing I wanted to highlight for folks.

I guess at this time we'll just open it back up for additional tribal comments or questions. Does anybody have anything they want to bring to our attention?

Yes. I want to make sure we get you a mike.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: Good morning. My name is Ernee Werelus. I'm a landowner from Fort Hall, Idaho. I have a couple -- a few questions about your document. I would like to refer to -- this is the business lease in 162-005, Page 19 and Page 24.

We have -- what I do at Fort Hall -- I started an association for our tribal members. So what I do is advocate for them on their behalf with the tribes and with BIA and OST. So that segment, particularly, is bothersome for me because on D it says, "We will not lease fee interests or collect rent on behalf of the fee ... owners."

And that's exactly what my issue is.

Can you go to Page -- and you go to the provision 162.016 -- when it comes to compensation for the lease, they count the multiple owners on the tract as well as what's on the entire lease. So what you're saying is they do not lease a fee land because it's not under your jurisdiction. And then in 162.016, you count that into the compensation coverage for distribution. So that seems a little bit odd, and I have a problem with that. So it's kind of ambiguous, I think, for me.

The other one is the residential lease.

Generally, the residential lease will not be advertised for competitive bidding. We all know reservations all over

Indian country have lack of homes for members. And I've

often wondered why does the BIA -- or the CFR doesn't say like they do in lease provisions, that any homes that are available for leasing should be advertised and bidded out like your lease -- agricultural leases. That was on 162.303.

The other thing that we have problems with is that when the lease goes out from the bureau on homesites, there's no compliance. Lack of compliance consists of old cars, permanent fixtures on the lease land. And somebody has to determine when the lease expires to that homeowner after its duration, what is considered permanent and what is considered the owner's property. So that hasn't been defined.

Trespasses happen all the time in home leases because no one is keeping track of it in the bureau or tribe. We don't have parties that will, you know, go out and check on them. So we have had homesite leases leased out by the bureau where it's been leased out to a nonmember and he will live there for \$50 per month and that's all he's paid for five years. There is no tracking of compensation to the landowners. That's happening, too.

The last of my questions is fee to trust.

I've worked with a family that has -- under the Burke Act,
have purchased some allotments. For the last 70 years they
have been trying to transfer that back into trust. Their

hang-up is the BLM required a certified survey. They have to have around \$2,000 to \$3,000 upfront before they will give a certified survey copy to the bureau.

It is the government relationship with BLM.

And I'm not sure why that cannot be waived or said in a different way so that doesn't cause hardship for landowners to transfer their fee land into trust. And this has been going on for 70 years. The parties that purchased it under the Burke Act has all passed away. It was inherited by his children. They've all gone. And the daughter inherited it. And she just died two years ago, and it is still in process.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate your comments. I'll work backwards on the fee-to-trust issue. We know that up in your region, the cadastral surveys and environmental assessments and things regarding the department manual -- we're well aware that that's an issue. We're working with our sister agencies the best we can to clear them up. So your comments are well taken. They help us relay that message in that effort.

On the trespass, we also know that that's a problem. As I mentioned before, a lot of what we're talking about in the regulations is with regards to policy. But just as important as the policy is the practice and how it's implemented. When you get into talking about enforcement, that's a resource issue and a practice implementation issue.

The regulations have provisions in there about when we learn that -- when we learn of a lease violation.

We're going to work with bureau staff to ensure that enforcement of a lease violation is a priority because the regs will have limited value if they don't mean anything in the back end. I appreciate your comments on that. Thank you.

Any other remarks?

MS. SARAH LAWSON: Section 162 -- I'm sorry.

This is Sarah Lawson from Muckleshoot again. Section

162.313, where it talks about -- go back to it myself.

Mandatory provisions for leases. We work a lot with the

Indian Estate Planning Institute out of the Seattle

University School of Law to help a lot of Indian landowners

do wills, providing for the disposition of their property at their death.

But a lot of times people forget that they have a lease and the lease doesn't show up on their ITI report. So my thought is that if we add the person's ITI number, if we make it a requirement to add their ITI number -- I'm sorry, not their ITI. The BIA number on the lease so that it would show up on an ITI and they would note to put it in their will, it might help with that process of remembering. We wouldn't have leases that kind of slip through the cracks, become residual under a will in a

probate.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you.

MR. ERIC SCHMIEDER: Hi. My name is Eric Schmieder. I'm with the New Mexico Tribal Homeownership Coalition, and I would like to comment specifically on some of the residential lease issues that we see in this document. I would like to kind of preface that with just a couple of real world examples without taking up a lot of time.

Section 184 Indian Loan Guarantee Loan (sic) has been around for maybe 20 years. When it first started, over 60 percent of those loans were done on trust and allotted lands. The latest figures that I see show that it's something like 6 percent. What we've seen is that those mortgages are being done on fee simple lands to Indians. But the areas that loan was targeting, which was where the housing is needed so much, which is Indian country, the reservations and pueblos of New Mexico, for instance — that loan simply isn't being delivered by the private sector in any numbers anymore. It's because of the long process it takes to get leasehold mortgages and documents approved and everything else.

The other thing that's happened here in New Mexico recently -- and I guess it's nationwide -- is that Bank2, which was our largest performer, I think, in New

Mexico, was using a lot of mortgage brokers. So there was individual meetings between lenders and tribal members in getting loans made.

They have put a moratorium on all of the tribal mortgages. And so they're only doing fee simple stuff right now. The problem is -- the reason that they're doing that is because they have a huge backlog of unguaranteed loans because they haven't been able to get title status reports and mortgage approvals in a timely manner.

We really think that the approval of leases and mortgages should be delegated to the tribes. And the BIA is -- and we're not talking about all leases and all mortgages. We're talking about residential leases and mortgages, because that's what we're familiar with. We think that those approvals should be delegated to the tribe. We just don't think that the bureau is equipped to handle those in a manner that's going to be quick enough to make these mortgage programs work on Indian trust land.

There was a question about this deemed approved where a mortgage and the lease, I guess, can be approved if it isn't approved in a timely manner. I'm sympathetic to that. I just don't know how that would work with the mortgage industry in terms of actually then getting the documents for loan guarantees that center around the

mortgage. I think you've raised some of those questions in your distribution. So I don't know that it really works.

We're recommending changing all the references from 30 days to five days. You can do that real easy. In a Word document, there's a global way to do that. Really easy.

"What must the lease include if it contains an option to renew?" This is 162.312. "We must record any renewal of a lease in the Land Title and Records Office." we see a lot of leases that are with this 25 years, with another automatic renewal at the end of 25 years. So we think that doesn't make sense, because it's really an automatic renewal and it's in the lease to begin with. So I don't know that it -- I don't know what you record or how you document that it's been renewed.

process for a leasehold mortgage under a residential lease."

It's requiring the lessor to approve it within 30 days, I guess. But -- and I think I had the right lease. The one-stop lease which was approved. And I think the bureau has signed off on allowing us to -- for -- mortgaging for residential purposes a mortgage loan without additional approvals from the tribe. So we don't think that's necessary, because I think it's built into that one-stop lease again, which I say the bureau has approved. I think

it's going to slow stuff down.

What will BIA -- this is 162.362, "What will BIA do about a violation of a residential lease." That will require the lessee to provide response within 10 business days. We thought that maybe -- we're wondering why you didn't use 30 in that case.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: So you want the longer time, but you want the quicker -- okay.

MR. ERIC SCHMIEDER: That's right. I really think the intent of that regulation is good, but I don't think that the 30 days is going to solve it. In order to build residential markets -- in order to get the private sector to participate, which is the -- that's where a lot of the money is right now that might be available for homeownership. It's got to be streamlined more than that.

I thank you very much.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you very much for those comments. I wanted to note a couple of things. We're aware of what's going on with the HUD 24 program. We have, you know, discussed with folks at the American Indian Housing Council that issue, these regulations, the HEARTH Act, which -- again, I will note Congressman Heinrich here in New Mexico, as many of you know, has been a big advocate for tribal homeownership. He was the original sponsor of the HEARTH Act, which will do exactly what you said, is let,

you know, the tribes do the lease approvals rather than us.

So we're working -- you know, I can't -- again, I can't come out and say what the department's position is on the bill at this time, but other than to note that that bill is out there and would do exactly what you're referencing.

With respect to the 30-day time periods -- you know, folks have a tendency to think that if you put 30 days or, you know, the 99-year leasing authority under the statute, that that means that it's going to take up that entire time. That's the limit. It's going to be incumbent on us as the department and our staff with the bureau to not make it a practice to wait until Day 30 to stamp a letter and say we need another 30 days.

We've just committed -- as committed to making sure the practice, the implementation of these regs, accomplishes the policy objectives. So we hope that we can get to a point where it doesn't take 30 days to approve, because you know -- we all know that, you know, banks like to move a lot quicker when they're talking about money.

I just wanted to point that out. That's the outer limit. We're going to work on the implementation to make sure that we have sound practice and that we're not waiting until the last minute. So, thank you.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: Can I ask a question?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Sure.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: If the recordation of any leases -- residential leases is given regardless of who gives it, whether it's a tribe or BIA -- if it's not recorded, we -- we, landowners, receive quarterly reports on our lease tracts that is under lease. Many of my folks that want to make their wills and kind of get rid of fractionation do not have any of the encumbrances, such as leases -- homesite leases on some of their tracts on the quarterly report. Some folks have actually sold their land -- because when they got their ITI, it didn't show any encumbrances of utilities or gas lines or pipes or anything. So they sold it. Then later found out that they have sold property that would bring in a lot of compensation.

So my question, then, is, if you're going to allow homesite leases to be given to tribes or BIA, the recordation on some of those properties, whether it's tribal assignment or individual land, there's no recording on your TSRs to recognize that there is an encumbrance of a homesite.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: That's really a technical question. I'm going to confess ignorance. My wife would agree I don't know everything. I don't even know that much. If you want to talk after, maybe we can collect some of our staff to work with you on that.

Page 66

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: I'd love to visit with you.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Do we have any other questions or comments?

MS. GERMAINE EWING: Hi. My name is Germaine Ewing with the Southern Ute Indian Tribe. We have, I guess, a concern that there doesn't appear to be anything in the regulation regarding cancellation or a time frame associated with a cancellation of a leasehold mortgage loan.

So -- although ours generally do come up on the title status reports, it takes us a very long time to get those documents released. So what happens is there is a term that's -- basically, the occupant can't do anything with that property. If they choose to refinance it or add on to their property or remortgage it, then they're tied to being able to release the first mortgage even though they paid it off.

So we've got to see something in the document associated to a time frame of when those documents will be released and it will be removed off the TSR.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you very much.

MS. SARAH LAWSON: Sarah Lawson from the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, again.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: You don't have to apologize for saying that now.

MS. SARAH LAWSON: I didn't apologize. I just said "again." So Section 162.323, when rental payments are due. Section B says, "Unless otherwise" --

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Can you say the page number just to helps folks?

MS. SARAH LAWSON: Sure. Page 40. Section B says, "Unless otherwise provided in the lease, payments may not be made or accepted more than one year in advance of the due date." We're a compacted tribe. We are admittedly not on TAAMS and have not had any TAAMS training, but it is our -- or what we think we know about TAAMS all comes from the agency.

According to the agency, they cannot accept any future payments with the way TAAMS is set up. So I guess this is more of a procedural issue where -- we seem to have been led to believe that TAAMS cannot accept any future payments even less than a year out. And yet it's in the regs that you could pay your four-year lease six months into the future. That might be something that needs to be cleared up or addressed with the TAAMS team.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you. Appreciate that. Any other comments you have, halfhearted or not? We're going to miss you. You've got to get -- here we go.

MS. TERESA LEGER: Teresa Leger from the Nordhaus law firm with the Pueblo of Laguna. Following up

on that issue, which is -- although it is often the case that lease payments or annual -- it is also possible for an Indian tribe to negotiate an upfront payment, which probably could be better for that tribe to get everything upfront and then they have the money right away.

So I think that the regulations have to acknowledge that and have to acknowledge that the five-year review would not apply if indeed you don't have any payments that are happening after that first five years, because you've been paid everything upfront. So that's just a follow-up to that.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you. Any comments? Folks didn't get their second cup of coffee.

MR. LESTER TSOSIE: Hello. My name is Lester Tsosie. The proposed draft regulations -- in current practice is that when we submit a lease type to BIA, they often require company documents for the lessee. And I'm wondering -- I don't see that in the draft here and yet -- is it then at the discretion of the local BIA office to make such a requirement? Because it doesn't seem consistent to do them -- one in one place and not do it in another place.

One -- some of the documents being required was incorporation documents as well as authority-to-sign documents. And it's not -- I don't think it's clear in your draft or current practices going on. Your comment on that?

Page 69

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I don't have a comment.

If there's somebody from one of our BIA staff here, if you want to address that or maybe we can -- I just don't have an answer for you on that.

MR. STAN WEBB: Stan Webb, BIA, Phoenix.

That's in our region. Yeah, we would require that. Make sure the lease is enforceable. Organizational documents and a resolution from the lessee. Gloria has just reminded me of something. It's just in the manual. It's not in the current regulations, in the draft. We would require that.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Do you have

UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Is that going to be in there, too?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: We can take a look at it.

If you feel it's something that should be in the regulations, then we need to take a look at it. That way it's necessary we get your input.

But, again, when we talk about processes, I want to make sure that you -- there is a distinction between policy and how it's implemented. A lot of things that -- a lot of times folks think things are enshrined in the policy really overburden or confuse it. We want to have the flexibility to implement. At the same time, if there are things that you feel are very important as a matter of practice to include in the regs themselves, then we want to

hear about that.

MR. MONTE MILLS: Hi. Monte Mills from

Southern Ute again. I think in looking at Section 162.138

on Page 90, Sub C, there's your requirement for business

leases at least. That organizational documents,

certificates, filing records, and resolutions or other

authorization documents be submitted to the BIA.

I don't know if that answers the question. I just have one other question. And that is, what's the deadline for comments next week? The "Dear Tribal Leader" letter said the 18th.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: April 18. I've been on the road doing consultations, so I don't remember what day it is. If I said next week, I meant the 18th. I'm sure that the tribes who -- the tribes who submit comments on the 20th, they're not going in the recycling bin. If we get them by the 18th, that's really facilitating us hitting those targets, those deadlines.

MR. GREG SAMPLE: Greg Sample, tribal attorney with Drummond Woodsum. I've been traveling back and forth between the DOE round table -- and perhaps you've already covered this topic, but I wanted to ask about a memorandum of lease for recording as opposed to the lease itself, particularly now that you've gotten and are working on regulations for business leases.

The lease, in my experience, often has a good deal of the financial transactions worked into it. The parties to the lease often prefer that that not be a public record. It's quite standard in real estate practices to record a memorandum of lease identifying the parties, the terms, obviously the specific land covered by the lease so that anyone would have notice that somebody's got rights in that land for a specified period of time. But I don't think that it would be necessary to disclose the business terms that that business lease incorporates.

If you could consider that, that would be a big help to negotiating innovative business terms.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I appreciate that. I don't know how many folks were at the National Indian Gaming Association Conference where we just came from, but Deputy Assistant Secretary Laverdure talked about that in the context of gaming with the revenue allocation planning and proprietary information. We all come from Indian country. We're very sensitive about protecting tribal business data from folks who want to blanket -- you know, cover us with FOIAs and try to get that information.

We're going to do our best to try to protect the information you're talking about.

Any other comments, questions? Part 162.

MS. SARAH LAWSON: Sarah Lawson from the

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. At Section 162.407, which is on Page 73, Section (f)(2) where it says the BIA may consent to a business lease on behalf of "individual landowners of a fractionated tract where the Indian Landowners are unable to agree upon a lease during a three month negotiation period."

We actually had an issue about 20 years ago on the Muckleshoot Reservation involving a mobile home park lease when the Indian landowners vehemently objected to renewing the lease with the lessee. But the lease was approved over their objections.

It seems to me that the language "unable to agree" seems a little bit like a slippery slope where it could also get confused with the landowners actually not consenting and voicing their nonconsent to the lease.

They're not the same, obviously. "Unable to agree" and "do not consent" are two separate things. But it seems that that could be misconstrued at some point.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you. I believe that we've exhausted everybody's thoughts on these draft regs. I do want to add again and reiterate several times more that these are drafts. Your comments of -- especially Sarah. You deal with this -- I mean, you have experienced unique circumstances that have arisen, that, you know, when we sit down and collaborate on these rules, we try to think about the universe of circumstances that might arise. I'm really

not that creative, so I can't think of too many things that might come up.

The regs cover the entire country. We know that everybody has unique circumstances. So you guys bringing those to our attention, things for us to consider, is helpful. That's why we're committed to this consultation process. It makes a difference. You guys will see, based upon these consultations and what moves forward later in the summer -- I mean, you'll see that this session today and the comments we've received made a difference.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: I just have one question.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Just wait a moment.

Behind you.

MS. MICHELLE TREVINO: My name is Michelle Trevino. I'm from the Yakama Nation, with the Land Enterprises. Since you brought that up, there's one area that I don't see in these draft regs, and that's for transmitter sites.

On our reservation, we have transmitter sites.

And when you brought up the subleasing, we have all these -we have these sites. And you're saying they have -- what?

-- ten days or something to get -- for subleasing to get
approved if it's not -- is that the bureau that's going to
approve that?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I don't know what you're

referring to by transmitter sites. Do you mean cell phone towers?

MS. MICHELLE TREVINO: Cell phone towers, TV towers.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: If you're talking about a sublease, now that's where we have the automated approval section in there. That there will be a date after that period when the lease would become effective. If it's an initial lease out of trust land from the landowner, whether it's a tribe or individual, that is to have express -- would have under these draft rules -- would have express approval of the bureau.

MS. MICHELLE TREVINO: Yeah, because with these, you know, you're entering into a whole another area because a site may be for a cell phone. But when you go up and look at the antenna, there may be a microwave, you know, like for, you know, CB radios or -- you know, different things. There's different -- we're starting to hit another area.

It's almost like this transmitter site area should be just like the -- what is it? The wind solar, whatever, power. It should have its own section because it's just the same -- just like that. I didn't -- it was kind of confusing to me. I'm not in -- I haven't been in leasing for about two years. So I was like, okay, then,

where does the transmitter sites fall. Do they fall under the business lease or -- you know, I was just kind of guessing now. But I had to ask so when I go back, I'll be clear on it.

Because that generates -- not to the Land

Enterprises, but to the Yakama Nation, millions of dollars.

If they're subleasing, the tribe's missing out, you know.

They may not cover -- you know, it's not -- it may not be negotiated or the tribe does not get to negotiate that part in a timely manner.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: If you're talking about a for-profit enterprise, then it would fall under, as this is currently constituted, business site leasing regulations here. So to answer your first question, that's where that would fall.

If you're talking about subleases, I guess -this is dangerous territory when I start talking about legal
stuff, but generally subleases can't -- lawyers can get
pretty crafty how they do this. Subleases can't trump -can't expand the scope of the original lease that they come
down from.

I hear some chuckles because I'm sure there are attorneys in the room that say, yeah, right.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: I just had a quick question. Do you have a sliding scale of consent

Page 76

requirements for residential leases or business leases from landowners? If it's a lot of land, do you have a consent form that has a sliding scale?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: You mean like if it's ten owners or less?

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: Right.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Yes.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: Is that applied in -- to the residential?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Yeah, I believe it is.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: Well, that's going to be hard to get in.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I don't know if you were here when I mentioned at the outset, things like that in the terms of the leases are governed by statutes. We can't change those statutes by the regulations. We've only got what we got to work with. So that's where we're operating under.

Any other questions? I thought I saw a hand up back in the middle. Comments. There you go.

MR. ANTHONY AGUIRRE: Anthony Aguirre, Navajo
Tribe. So to answer the person who talked about his
cellular towers, one of the problems that we run into -that -- do you use a right-of-way or do you use a -- some
kind of lease or permit. I think right now we've been

processing cellular sites -- trying to do it by way of right-of-way. The BIA is, I think, split on that. Eastern Agency and Western Agency, whether you can do right by that right-of-way. Western Agency said, right-of-way, okay.

Eastern Agency says, no, you need a permit or a lease.

What we're trying to come to now is that we're reintroducing this -- the old BIA revocable use permit that they use for radio towers. We're converting that to now -- for cellular sites. It's not considered -- it depends on your use -- the terms and conditions are like a lease. It's a permit. But ours allows a co-location, like an antenna. I think it is -- that doesn't require BIA approval if a permit is preauthorized.

So that's one way we can do it. And it's not the BIA that's granted anything. We will approve the permit. Of course, the BIA has got to consent to it, but it will preauthorize co-locations because it's not -- it's a permit. It's not considered a lease. That's the way we're doing it. It's limited to five years.

This is what the BIA has always done, but they call it "revocable." Some companies don't like that because of the nature of revocable. You can revoke it at will. But anyway -- so that's kind of how we're dealing with it. Then you get away from the Al/Strate issue, too. That helps you deal with that. Thank you.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you. Appreciate that. Has everybody said their peace already. Do you want to break for lunch or We're here all day or we can be. It's up to you guys if you want to continue. If you want, regroup in the hallway and then break. We can come back after lunch.

There's a federal bar association conference going up in Santa Fe beginning today. Folks may be coming in on their way up to that. So we may have some new comments later in the morning or early afternoon.

If folks want to wrap up for the morning, I guess we can do that. I'm not going to stand up here and stare blankly at you guys. Why don't we do this. It's a quarter after 11:00 right now. We'll be back here -- the agenda says 1:00. Let's call it a quarter to 1:00. Indian time: we'll start at 1:00. We'll wrap this up in the afternoon. So, thank you, guys.

(Lunch break from 11:17 a.m. to 1:17 p.m.)

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I think we're going to pick it back up now. I see we lost a lot of folks. They're probably in a burrito coma or something. I realized over lunch that I didn't introduce myself properly this morning. I kind of just dove head first into this. I get so excited

about leasing regulations and I couldn't wait to get to it.

My name is Bryan Newland. I'm a counselor to the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs. I work under the Assistant Secretary Larry Echo Hawk and Principal Deputy Del Laverdure back in Washington. I'm an Ojibwa from Northern Michigan. I've been in this job for almost two years. It feels like 20. I've got some gray hairs that weren't there before. It really does a number on you.

But with that -- so you guys just have an understanding of -- it's not just this Indian guy up there with a ponytail talking about leasing regulations. That's who I am. That's why I'm here.

Again, I want to acknowledge our staff who's in the room. Liz Appel from Office of Regulatory Affairs. She's does a lot in getting this process rolling. So I want to thank her and her team for helping with that.

At this time I guess I'll just open it up to any other comments folks have on these leasing regulations. Again, we have our court reporter here. If you could say your full name and the tribe you represent, it will be helpful for us.

Someone has got to raise up their hand to stretch out their bellies for a moment. We'll give it a minute or two here. Then, if everybody feels they have said their piece and we heard everything, we can wrap it up.

Otherwise

MS. DIANE ENOS: Good afternoon, Mr. Newman and staff and everybody else that's here. My name is Diane Enos. I'm the current president of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community near Scottsdale and Mesa, Arizona.

Our area is fairly well located within the metropolitan Phoenix area. We have over 9,300 members -- enrolled members. And almost half of our membership is under the age of 18. The Salt River Indian Community is a self-governance tribe. We have compacted many functions from the BIA for about a decade and a half.

I'm reading from my notes because this topic really means a lot to me. If I don't read my notes, I'm bound to go off on some other areas that probably are not as on point as this needs to be.

In view of our self-governance compacted role, we have had an opportunity to review these draft regulations in depth. We look forward to submitting written comments within the time lines allocated for public comment on the draft regulations.

Before I go any further, I need to acknowledge some of the staff. Ruben Guerrera from the Office of Congressional Affairs and Legislative Affairs, Stacey Gubser who is our Director of Community Development, and Nicole

King who is with our Office of General Counsel. One of our staff attorneys. It's their work that has provided me with some of these notes here. We have had numerous meetings. I believe we met with you in D.C. on this very topic.

The general view of the commercial leasing sections of the draft regulations does have some very positive aspects. On our first review, we believe that some of the provisions will provide clarity to the commercial leasing process. While the commercial leasing regulation will provide clarity to economic development for Salt River, the draft homesite leasing regulations will provide grave hardships for our people.

Salt River has the majority of its developable land for homesites held in what's called "allotted status" with extreme fractionation on some of those allotments. I heard some of the comments earlier about some of the tribes that are in the same situation as we are. So it's not just us. I know you're hearing this across Indian country.

We have experienced the implementation of these draft -- proposed draft homesite leasing regulations over the last year. While these are still not in effect, they have already started to implement them in the Phoenix area region. This implementation has put a stop to building homes in the community and caused the community production of homes from an average of 40 per year to four -- only four

in the last year.

The draft homesite regulations as proposed will drastically hinder homeownership opportunities and the ability of the Indian tribal people to meet the common housing needs of their families. Unfortunately, the draft homesite regulations amendment goes in the direction of commercial leasing. Requiring homeowners to a pay appraisal rental value for a homesite lease will set Indian housing backwards over a decade, forcing Indian people to live in substandard housing and shifting our ancient tribal values of co-sharing and support within families to those of commercial values.

Salt River families want to live near their family. If an allottee wishes to give a small portion of land, about a third of an acre or less to their children to build a home, those young people are stopped in their tracks because they have to gain signatures now of 100 percent of ownership or people that have undivided ownership in the allotment in that parcel or possibly end up paying the family members and other co-landowners for fair market value for a lease. This changes homeownership.

In addition, the bonding and insurance requirements in the lease are again more suited for the commercial setting. Homesites are for homes, not for commercial gain. We need to adjust the regulations to focus

on what is important. Creating opportunities for families to live near their family and creating safe, well-built homes for the people.

Again, Salt River Indian Community wishes to thank the BIA for the clarity provided in the draft regulations, commercial leasing for commercial leasing, but we implore you and we invite you to see what the draft homesite leasing regulations have done for families in Salt River and to see what hardships and bureaucracy that will be if -- created by these -- will be created if these draft regulations are adopted.

I just want to add one more item here. I was just talking to my -- one of the attorneys here, Ms. King, talking about the inability of people to write wills because you don't have a valid homesite. You can't get a valid homesite. You can't write a will. That adds again to the fractionation problem that is so common in many allotted land reservations.

I could go on and on. As I said it before, this topic is a painful topic to us. Not least of which our elderly people have been living in a home, for example, for -- probably 50 years or more under the old regs. And maybe the land -- they actually signed a document that didn't get filed in the land and title, but they've been living there. They don't know any other home.

Those homes are falling into disrepair sometimes. It's difficult for the community to go in and make repairs for those homes if they don't have a valid homesite lease in place. And lots of times they can't get one because some of the members have not -- are not willing to sign. They may not be locatable.

It really creates problems. People ask -- and I used to manage an allotment -- how can you let some of your senior people live in such substandard housing. And we want to help them. We want to offer some resources, but we can't because you've got maybe 100 other people that own that house. They don't have a valid homesite lease.

So in terms of directly and clearly explaining the suffering that these regulations are creating now and will continue to create even further -- that's just one example. And like I said, I could go on and on. I think you get my point. We look forward to submitting some proposed changes for these regulations. Again, thank you for your time.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you, Madame

President. It was great to meet with you back in D.C. I

know that some of our team was at the Salt River Community

to see what you guys have going on. We're well aware of the

challenges that you guys face with fractionation and folks

whose whereabouts are unknown. And we're working with our

Page 85

Western Region to try to adjust that. But I appreciate very much your comments.

MS. DIANE ENOS: Thank you.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Anybody else?

MR. LESTER TSOSIE: This is Lester Tsosie of Ak-Chin again. I'm just wondering. Are they going to make this testimony available to tribes, written format, otherwise?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: You mean the record from the consultation?

MR. LESTER TSOSIE: Correct. And when?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I'll leave that up to Liz.

MS. LIZ APPEL: This is Liz Appel with

Regulatory Affairs. We have our court reporter

transcribing. So we'll post those transcripts as they come
in on the Web site. It's on the BIA Web site: WWW.BIA.gov.

17 There will be a link.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: We'll do our best to -the consultation period ends on the -- officially on the
18th. We'll do our best to get everything up in a timely
manner and make that available -- it will be on our Web
site. You know, that sometimes -- it may be hard to
navigate. We'll work with our IT folks, the people that do
the Web site, to make sure it's easy to find. But that will
be available.

1 MR. DAVID JOHNSON: I'm David Johnson. I'm 2 with the Office of Indian Energy Policy Development. I just 3 want to make a comment about the leasing regs, the intent behind them and this new push, particularly WSR regs, the 5 HEARTH Act and several other initiatives going on in the 6 They all seem to have the same couple of department. problems on how to make it quicker, better, less 8 bureaucracy.

I just wanted to remind the folks that the WSR regs are one possible avenue towards improving the ability of tribes to tie into wind and solar power. Another is the TERA regs at 25 CFR Part 224. The long term impact of that is that a tribe that can follow the TERA process, can actually be in charge of certain elements of its own energy development, from leasing to environmental work. That's another avenue towards possibly resolving some of those problems.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you, David. I see a couple of new faces who weren't here this morning. My understanding is the Department of Energy has wrapped up its round table. If there's anything anyone else wants to say, I guess now is the time or hold your piece until, you know, you're able to submit written comments.

Does anybody else have anything they would like to add to this discussion? Going once, twice. All

right.

MR. MELVIN ROMAN NOSE: My name is Melvin Roman Nose. I work with the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribe. My question is mostly what sort of effect do you expect to get out of it? And how do you expect to implement this once these get approved?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: David alluded to the intention just a minute ago. I touched on it this morning. What we're trying to do here is -- stepping back from a global perspective. What we're trying to do is make it easier for people to get into homes on tribal Indian lands, to start small businesses or large businesses. We're trying to make that process easier. The devil is always in the details.

One of the things that we know is that the bureau -- we can't let banks, lenders, business partners -- they can't wait for these things to sit on somebody's desk for approval. We know that speeding up our review is a big part of facilitating economic development, energy development and homesite development on Indian land. That's the goal.

What we have before you guys today with the draft leasing regulations -- to use the term, they're half-baked, but they're our best shot so far. Knowing that they're not perfect, knowing that in this consultation

process we're going to hear a lot of things, recommendations on how to make it better, things that might -- find some things that might cause problems at a level. We're going to go back and work on those over the next few months.

But the intent, largely, is to speed things up, simplify it and promote homesites, economic and energy development on Indian lands. And to really restore, to the greatest extent that we can, that authority with the tribes in the exercise of inherent sovereignty. We're under a period of self-determination. That's what we're going for. So that's the intent.

MS. HEATHER WHITEMAN RUNS HIM: Has there been any -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm Heather White Man Runs Him, General Counsel for the Crow Tribe in Montana. Has there been any examination of what types of corollary services are going to be necessary to implement these effectively? I mean, I see a lot of time frames that look great for getting things done.

Like you said just a minute a go, the devil is in the details. There's just a lot of practical application problems with our regional offices and our local offices, where the appraisal issue, I've seen, is a huge, huge problem for us in our area, because right now there's a backlog on appraisals for the current transaction, both land sales and leases. It goes probably over a year.

We don't have any appraisers on staff at the tribe. We don't have any tribal members who are certified as appraisers. We don't have anybody in our surrounding community. So bringing in people from the outside, even if a tribal member decides to purchase their own appraisal, can be prohibitively expensive and take quite a while to get somebody in from a community like Billings. That's pretty far from the tribal land.

So, you know, just some of those issues that most concern me about this. Have you guys looked at all about beefing up those offices at the area level to make sure that that's not a bar to successful implementation of these regs?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: I think -- I don't want to be premature about what the future budget proposals are going to look like. That's something that we know is going to be a priority. I mentioned this morning that this is going to be meaningless if we can't enforce them and we can't carry them out.

We're working with the BIA Director Mike Black right now to start figuring out how we're going to train our staff. We had the suggestion this morning about including tribes in that process. How these are going to work. How they're going to be implemented.

Just to be perfectly honest, when we make big

changes like this, there's going to be bumps. There's going to be hang-ups that occur when they go into effect. We're trying to do our best to identify or anticipate what those are going to be and train folks so those actually do make a difference. It's not just policy on paper. We know that money has got to be there for enforcement and realty staff and things like that.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: That's the forefront of our thinking in developing the FY-2013 budget request for Fort Hall. That's where I'm from. Instead of using appraisers, what they did to us is that -- OST did a market study of our reservation and that's what they used. They don't use appraisals.

My question on market study -- because I don't know where they got their information, if they got it from the records of BIA -- which is not accurate appraisals from back history. They use the market study that they have gathered the data from old records to apply to our new leases. And I have a problem with that.

So I don't know if the group that's doing this drafting has heard that the market studies are in poor health. It might be a good idea to look into that and see why they decided that. Because we had a backlog. The only appraisals they will do quickly is land sales. But appraisals for anything else is clogged somewhere along the

Page 91

line, I guess. That's the reason why they have done a market study on our reservation.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: We can take a look at that.

MS. ERNEE WERELUS: Yeah. It would be interesting.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Do we have any other remarks or questions on these?

MS. GERRI HARRISON: I'm Gerri Harrison. I'm with the Navajo Nation, Legislative Associate within our -- one of our divisions there. But problematically for our tribe is our tribal council does not meet until April 18, which is the deadline. They normally don't get into any -- forming any types of positions or comments until later in the week because they have statutory reports and requirements for hearing the president's state of the nation and so forth. So, is there a possibility of extending the deadline for comments?

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: There's a possibility, but in all reality, if you send us your comments, we're going to get it. The April 18th date -- I don't know if you saw this morning, you know, the PowerPoint that we had up. We have a series of deadlines that we're trying to hit so these get promulgated in time before the president's first term is up.

We can extend it if we get enough requests,

but if you send me your comments, we're going to get them.

If it's April 22 -- you know, we're not going to ignore the

Navajo Nation's comments if we get them on the 22nd.

But we are going to begin -- I just want to reiterate -- we are going to begin compiling everything on the 18th and we're going to move forward. As soon as you can, I would really recommend that you get those to us.

Anybody else?

MR. ANTHONY BEGAY: Good afternoon. My name is Anthony Begay, Mariano Lake Chapter President from the Navajo Reservation, and also from the agency, agency roads committee member, vice chair. I just got here recently. I forgot this was going to happen. We were actually in another meeting and came over. I had a good lawyer joke I was going to start with, but I don't think it's a good time right now.

But individually, I've been working on a business lease for the last ten years with the BIA and the Navajo Nation. You can ask me about everything with the BIA regulations. I've gone through it and still going through it to this day and yet I still haven't got a business in place. You have to understand that these are in place for certain reasons.

A lot of discussions were going on about appraisals and concerns of different tribes and pueblos

we're having. One of the things that we really should think about is uniting and addressing these issues. The Navajo Nation has a lot of resources with the appraisals, DOJ.

Just a lot of capabilities. Maybe we can utilize that.

Unite in one place and then present it to the BIA. Then they'll listen.

But other than that, also being a chapter official, we do have a lot of issues with homesite leases. A lot of processes going through. Takes a lot of master planning as we put in place water lines, the terrains and stuff like that.

Also, one of the things that we run across is flood plain studies of the Navajo reservation. Being 27,000 square miles, we don't have one. We don't have flood plain studies in place.

These are the things that I've been looking at, trying to work through it. Not being educated as much some of you -- I don't have a lawyer's degree or anything like that. Just common sense. It's kind of mind boggling what you guys go through. I always say educated people really just make themselves into a mess sometimes.

It's always the first -- when you run into a problem, it's always the first solution that you run into, that you think of. Being that person, I always think, why don't we just do this, with a gut feeling. That's how we

approach this -- a lot of things going on within our community.

So I've been addressing the council delegates at the Navajo Nation. I'm glad that one of them actually took notice of the CFR in place. The more I learned about it, the more I can actually address these at an individual level but also the community level, maybe the Navajo Nation level. At the same time, in working with the Department of the Interior, Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, maybe we can really get these things going.

But I'm glad you guys are coming out. I forgot about this, like I said. I wanted to go to the one in Vegas just for the trip. Just kidding. Other than that, I'm really glad you guys are coming out. I'm seeing some Web sites that I can look into. I've been working really close with BIA Realty. I've gotten to learn a lot of the process they go through.

Navajo Nation, same way. The business site lease issues. They always refer back to the BIA regulations. We are doing our own business site leases, but the only thing they did with it was just take off the BIA name off it. So we might streamline that more. But also with the infrastructure, renewable energy and all these things. Hopefully, that you guys can really work this out. Get some good opinions.

And I will look at the Web site to see all the comments that were made. Unfortunately, I wasn't here for the early morning because usually that's where all the action goes on than the latter part of the day. That's all I can say. Thank you.

MR. BRYAN NEWLAND: Thank you very much. Does everybody feel like you've spoken your peace so far? I know a lot of you have provided some written comments. If anybody else has anything else they want to say, now is the best time to do it. Otherwise, I think we're going to close up shop.

With that, I want to thank everybody for coming out. We heard a lot of great comments today. I think that is going to inform us going forward. As a former bureau skeptic myself, you know, I understand the skepticism about whether consultation is meaningful. I hope that everybody in here is pleased that -- when the formal proposals comes out later this year, to see that a lot of your recommendations are incorporated into what we're going to advance.

We take our obligation to consult very seriously. It's one of the reasons President Obama backed the UN for the rights of indigenous people. It's something that all of us coming from Indian country like. We know what that means.

Page 96

So you guys, I hope, are going to be pleased with what we're able to incorporate from this discussion and from your written submissions.

Again, I want to thank you on behalf of the Assistant Secretary, our office, for coming out. Look forward to reading your comments. And with that, we'll adjourn for the day. Thank you.

(The Proceedings concluded at 1:45 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Yvonne C. Gonzales, NM CCR #62, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that on Wednesday, April 6, 2011, the Proceedings in the above-captioned matter were taken before me, that I did report in stenographic shorthand the Proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by nor related to nor contracted with (unless excepted by the rules) any of the parties or attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the final disposition of this Proceedings in any court.

Yvonne C. Gonzales, CCR New Mexico CCR #62

License Expires: 12-31-11