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PALM SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2012
8:52 A.M.

MR. NEWLAND: My name is Bryan Newland. I'm Senior Policy Advisor to the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs. And we have here today Stephen Simpson from the Office of the Solicitor. Elizabeth Appel from the Office of Regulatory Affairs at the Department. And I know we have a number of other folks from the Bureau, in the Office of Special Trustee this morning. If you could stand up and maybe holler out your name as loud as you can. Let's start with the guy with the long hair in the back.

MR. BEARQUIVER: Kevin Bearquiver from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pacific Regional Office.

MS. KOEHNI: Gloria Koehni, Western Regional Office, Real Estate.

MS. FOSIO: Carmen Fosio, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pacific Regional Office.

MR. JAMES: Jim James, Regional Trust
Administrator with the Office of Special Trustee.
MS. BEYAL: Good morning. Ollie Beyal, Acting Superintendent, Palm Springs Agency.

MR. KIRKLAND: Morning. Matthew Kirkland,

Deputy Superintendant of Trust, Palm Springs Agency.
MS. GLINSKI: Good morning. Theresa Glinski, Office of the Special Trustee, Palm Springs Agency.

MS. RAY: Belinda Ray, Realty Specialist, Palm Springs Agency.

MS. MORALES: Cynthia Morales, Realty Specialist, Palm Springs Agency.

MR. NEWLAND: All right. We've got a full contingency to answer all of your questions.

I want to take care of a few housekeeping items this morning. We have with us today a court reporter to take diligent notes for us to use when we go back and review your comments. So before you make your comments this morning or ask your questions, if you could identify yourself by name and the tribe you are representing or organization you are representing. And with that, I think we'll get started. What I'm going to do this morning is run through a brief overview of the proposed regulations.

As many of you are aware, we've conducted three Tribal Consultation Sessions in this last spring throughout the Country, including one in the Southwest in Albuquerque, New Mexico. At the Tribal Nations Conference last December, the President announced that we had proposed this rule. We had sent out notice letters
to tribal leaders about these consultation sessions, sent out a lot of press materials. And this is the second in a series of additional three consultation sessions that we are hosting with Indian Country about this proposed rule.

Stephen is going to click through the slides here. I'm not going to read them verbatim, but I'll hit some of the highlights of the proposed rules. As you see, how this rule has come about, many of you know that this effort to reform the leasing regulations is probably older than me. I know it was talked about in President Clinton's administration and the last administration. We came in office and immediately picked up on the work that had been done. Made a lot of changes to what you may have seen in the past, and we conducted tribal consultation, as I mentioned, last year on a draft rule.

We received over 2,200 discreet comments on the draft rule. We broke those comments out into categories, and we locked ourselves in a room with a number of staff and folks from the Solicitor's office and went through every single comment one by one for hours on end, days on end, and weeks on end. And made a number of changes to the draft rule that led to the proposed rule that you have before you today.

I recognize that the proposed rule may not be
perfect or 100 percent satisfactory to everybody, but please note that it does reflect significant tribal input.

The proposed rule does something a little different than what's -- a lot of things different than what's in place, and the structure of it is different. We wanted to make sure that the leasing regulations were as user friendly as possible. So there's a lot of redundancy you may have noticed. We broke them out into different subparts. Under the current regulation, what you had was agricultural leasing and everything else. And we recognized very early on based on a lot of input that the one-size-fits-all approach to non-Indian cultural leasing just wasn't working. So we developed separate subparts for residential leasing, business, commercial, and other forms of leasing; and then wind and solar energy development leasing. We are maintaining for now the current agricultural leasing regulations and hope to address those in very near future.

The new proposed rule has subparticle general provisions, and then there's a lot of provisions that you see repeated throughout the various subparts. You see here on this slide, some of the significant changes we made based upon our consultations last year. This is not all of the changes that we made. This is just the
highlights, The Sports Center version if you will of some of the changes that we made.

Here you see -- can you guys in the back see these slides very well? Are you following along in your book?

MALE VOICE: No.
Can we dim the lights a little?
MR. NEWLAND: And if you are having trouble seeing the slides, this power point is in the packet of materials that you have. So you should be able to follow along with the paper copies, as well.

They're going to come and dim the lights. This is Slide 6.

VOICE: Page 3.
MR. NEWLAND: It is on Page 3? Slide 6. I'm going by the slide numbers. Slide 6 is an overview of the general provisions. They continue to apply to leases on Indian land and BIA land. The general provisions maintain the requirement to obtain consent from other landowners to occupy or take possession of land if you don't own 100 percent of the interest.

New provisions include the removal of the requirement for the Bureau to approve permits on Indian lands. We know that this was a headache in a number of places. Granting a permit does not encumber trust land,
and really there's no reason the Bureau should be involved in permitting those permits. So we took that out of the leasing regulations in the proposal you have before you.

You see, here's a very broad overview on Slide 7 of the various subparts of the proposed rule.

Residential subpart has been applied to housing, single-family homes, housing for public purposes.

Business leasing is maybe not wholly accurate, but it does apply to commercial leasing, also applies to other leases as well. Religious, educational, recreational, cultural, and other public purpose leasing. And the wind and solar leasing provisions are in the new subpart.

Here on we're on Slide 8. You can see one of the key features in the proposed rule.

Thank you very much.
(Lights are dimming.)
MR. NEWLAND: Is that better?
VOICE: No.
MR. NEWLAND: No?
Can we go darker?
Well, if you are still following along, Slide 8.
This is a key feature with the proposed rule of the timelines that we've instituted. The current regulations allow for open-ended review of leases of Indian land.

The Bureau is under no strict time guideline to complete its review and issue of approvals of leases. Again, based on a lot of what we heard from Indian Country, we said that -- we knew how problematic that was. So the proposed rule has timeframes, enforceable timeframes, that the Bureau has to complete its review of leases within. For residential leases, the Bureau offices in the field will have 30 days to review a residential lease. If there are complexities or delays, we can work with you for a brief extension of that period to address any other issues; but those timelines are enforceable. You guys will be able to hold the Bureau's feet to the fire in holding these timelines.

For business leasing, we recognize that business deals are going to be often more complex than a residential lease. We allow for 60 days to review. And I do want -- a lot of people have asked, "Why do you guys need 30 days to review a residential lease or 60 days to review a small business lease?" I want yo to know that this is not a forecast of how long it should take the Bureau to complete its review. This is a maximum. This is the outer limits of how long we can take for our review. We are working with staff and the Bureau to conduct training to be sure that our folks are giving high priority to Indian land leasing, and that they will
conduct their reviews of those leases in as timely a manner as possible.

If we can go back.
For another thing that $I$ would like to draw your attention to for subleases, we still have the timeframes for BIA review; but with a sublease, if we don't complete our review within the time period set up in the proposed rule, the sublease goes into effect automatically by operation of law. This means that a Bureau delay will not inhibit your ability to move forward with housing or small business development under subleases, and certainly we are not interested in throwing up our hands and walking away from our responsibility to review those subleases. But at the same time, we want to ensure that, if they're lost or, you know, any other imaginable circumstance, that the Bureau's delay does not inflict more harm on those of you who are trying to develop tribal lands.

MR. SIMPSON: You'll notice in the draft rule, when we first had consultation, the same deemed approved provisions that Bryan was just talking about applied for mortgages and assignments. We heard a lot from Indian Country and from HUD how that was not going to work for lenders. That, one, they needed a particular approval, an actual approval, so that they knew when it was
approved. So we changed those -- you'll see here -- to timeframes, but also took out the possibility for extensions of those timeframes, because we wanted to make sure that those financing documents were moving as fast as possible.

The Bureau's review is not as extensive, not as detailed on those, as it is on assignments and subleases and the original lease and/or amendments in the original lease. So we felt that the extensions were not needed for those, and we wanted -- again, we wanted to make sure that they moved as quickly as possible so the financing will work as easily as possible.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you.
Another key feature of the proposed rule is our mind-set. Going into developing this was one that Indian land should be under Indian control. Tribes and individual landowners should be, you know -- this is your land we're talking about here. And the Bureau shouldn't be in the business of dictating to Indian Country how Indian land is developed.

Our philosophy on deeds of trust and other land use matters is tribal control over tribal land and Indian control over Indian lands. Under the current regulations, the Bureau has broad discretion in lease approvals or disapprovals. The proposed rule kind of
flips the mind-set to the default consideration that leases and subleases should be approved, unless there's a compelling reason not to. This may look on paper like a small change, but it's very significant in that your leases are going to go forward, unless the Bureau finds under -- the presumption is that leases are approved, and these regulations reflect that.

You see here on Slide 10 -- this is Page 5 in your packet -- about some of the other features for subleases, about when BIA approval is not required, when the lease provides for subleasing, the master lease provides subleasing without Bureau approval, or the Bureau has approved the general development plan, sublease form, and rent schedule.

Page 6, Slide 11, is some of the features about assignments, amendments, and leasehold mortgages. BIA approval is not required in certain instances. It's very similar to what's currently in place.

For amendments, this was a big discussion point in our previous consultations. We are going to retain, you know, that part of our trust responsibility to monitor leases or amendments, because an amendment is a fundamental change to the agreement. The legal effect is it's a whole new agreement. That is why amendments do not contain similar, automatic approval provisions like
subleases.
Go to the next one. Slide 12. Rental
Requirements. The current rule requires fair market value on approval. The proposed rule for tribal lands -we are again making a significant change from what's currently in place where in many instances tribal lands or tribes and tribal housing programs, business development programs, want to lease land out for economic value or for other consideration. And what we're going to do under the proposed rule is really defer to the tribes judgment. In that instance, where the tribe says, look, we're getting adequate consideration for this lease, don't second guess our judgment on that. And the new rules reflect that. That is not necessarily the case with individually owned lands for a number of other special considerations that I'm sure we'll discuss today.

We'll move on to the next slide. Slide 13 on Page 7 discusses periodic review of rental payments and direct pay. Direct pay will continue to be allowed for, where there are ten or fewer landowners, you need 100 percent agreement. And when direct pay is in effect, in order to stop direct pay, you need 100 percent agreement amongst landowners.

Slide 14 discusses improvements on Indian lands. This is, again, highlighted in this proposed rule. We
put in the regulation that improvements developed on Indian lands cannot be subject to taxation by states and local governments. This will be important as many of you move forward in developing small businesses or renewable energy projects on tribal trust lands and individual trust lands. And this is really the Department sticking itself out there for Indian Country. This is a cutting-edge issue that's debated in many parts of the Country. It's in regards to states, counties, and local governments attempting to tax improvements on Indian lands.

Slide 15, Page 8. Discussing bonding and insurance. The current rule, the lessee has to provide a performance bond, unless the Secretary provides otherwise. And the Bureau may require the lessee to have insurance. Under the proposed rule, the lessee must provide a performance bond, unless the Bureau waives or the lease is for housing or public purposes. And the lessee must provide insurance to protect the landowners' interest and improvement unless the Bureau waives it. And, again, $I$ know we'll get into discussion on these provisions later this morning, I'm sure.

Here on Slide 16, again, still on Page 8, we discuss some of the consent requirements for leasing on Indian lands. Please keep in mind, we've gotten a large
number of comments on these provisions. There are statutes in place that govern consent to leasing on Indian lands, in fractionated lands, that the Department is bound by. We cannot change those statutes through administrative rule making. And we can only go as far as the statute allows. Really, that's what we've done with these proposed regs.

Go forward. Again, more provisions on Slide 17, Page 9, if you are following in your packet, for consent. You see under Indian land, Consolidation Act. The consent requirements. We put a table in there for your use.

## (Inaudible question.)

MR. SIMPSON: It's not in law. The statute just has basically a list, and we've actually modified that list a bit to make it easier to use, because Congress said -- in the first column here, we have 1 to 5, 6 to 10, 11 to 19, 20 or more. Congress had 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 20 , and 20 or more. So if you hit those 5, 10, or 20, you didn't know where you had to go, and that didn't make much sense. So we did it this way instead.

MR. NEWLAND: And to clarify for those of you following along, if you look, for example, where there is 6 to 10 Indian landowners, the consent requirement is 80 percent. That does not mean that if you have 10
landowners that you need to get consent from 8 landowners. What that means is you have to get consent from those individuals holding 80 percent of the interest in the land. So if one landowner owns 90 percent of the interest, you only need that one landowner to consent. And this has, $I$ think, been a point of confusion and contention in a number of discussions we've had about this rule.

People say, you know, you are making us go around and get consent from eight people, and we don't even know where half of the people live. But maybe the half that you know where they live has 90 percent of the interest. You only need their consent. And that's something we're bound by statutory law that we are not allowed to change through administrative rule.

On Slide 18 on Page 9, again, we're talking
about consent on fractionated lands for fair market rental. Again, another point of much discussion. A big issue is -- I'm sure many people here this morning know about it -- fractionated lands -- those folks whereabouts are unknown. Maybe they have been absent from our communities or tribal communities for a number of years. Can I get a show of hands in this room on who here is an individual allottee? Who owns an interest in individual lots?
(Show of hands.)
So, guys, I don't have to explain to you the problems that are related to fractionated lands. Those of you who just raised your hand, the Department owes you a trust responsibility directly as an individual
landowner. And the Department owes that same responsibility to those landowners, whether their whereabouts are known or unknown. We are well aware of the difficulties and frustrations and obstacles posed by exercising that trust and responsibility on behalf of individuals who haven't lived in your communities for a number of years. Whereabouts are unknown. We do owe that trust of responsibility to them. We have had many, many discussions on this point about whether, when, and how the Department is going to waive their right to receive compensation for the lease of their land, even if they can't be found.

And for a number of reasons, we decided that we were not going to do that because of that trust and responsibility. And I'm sure that we'll have an opportunity, again, later this morning to discuss this issue and have a dialogue about it.

Here's some of the provisions about wind and solar leasing. Again, what we were trying to do here is spur development, especially in this part of the country,
this part of the Indian Country where a number of tribes have expressed an interest to develop their wind and solar resources. The current regulations, when combined with the environmental law, require us to do environmental review for the project, even before you know you want to go forward with the wind project, for example. And that was a very onerous process. What we said was let's break that down into two steps, especially for wind development. Do the assessment activities first to find out if you actually have a wind resource to develop. It's a much simpler environmental review process.

And, then, once the assessment is made with the tribe, the landowners want to move forward with a full-scale wind development, then you do the full-scale environmental review for that project, as it would be developed. And it is our intention, our hope, that this puts another piece of the puzzle in place for renewable energy development on Indian lands. We know that there's a number of other things related to financing and taxation, also tax on improvement, provisions that $I$ mentioned earlier. But this is a big piece of the puzzle that we hope will facilitate that development.

Here's our timeline that we want to get this proposed rule done by. The Department is pouring all of
its resources into meeting these timelines. We have a number -- you see the representation we have from the Bureau and Department today. We have a number of people who are fully committed to working on this, reviewing all of your comments one by one, incorporating them into the final rule where we can, and getting this done by the summer. And I can tell you that without the blood, sweat, and tears that $I$ have put in this, Stephen and I and others have given each other black eyes and whatnot in a lot of our meetings. We want to get this done. And I know a number of you have been working on this for a long time, and you want to get this done as well.

We encourage -- we're going to record all the comments that are made today and will review those. But it is incredibly constructive for us to get your comments in writing. Suggested language, suggested changes to the proposed rule. And if and when you do it in writing, submit it electronically. That makes it much easier for us to parcel out the comments, put them with the corresponding rules, and review them in an efficient manner so we can meet those timelines.

So with that, $I$ will quit boring you, and we'll open up the table now for comments and discussion this morning. We have some scheduled breaks, and we will go as long as the discussion takes us today. And, again, I
want to remind folks to speak up, say your name and tribe or organization so we can get it for the record.

MR. SIMPSON: And Liz is going to be walking around with this microphone so we can make sure that our court reporter can get all the comments and discussion.

MR. DAVIS: Good morning. My name is Tom Davis. I represent the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. I am the chief planning and development officer for the Tribe; therefore, I work for the Government. I do not work for the individual landowners. I do not represent their interests, but we have concerns about how they are affected. Welcome to Indian Country. You are sitting on Indian land, and we thank you for coming to our neighborhood.

First of all, generally speaking, we have known about these provisions and have been in communication with your staff and the agency office, and known about these rule changes and applaud most of them on the surface. They're going in the right direction. There's a number of provisions that are definitely advantageous to developing Indian Country; however, when we look at the detail that's contained in the Public Register which we relieved in early December there are some serious concerns, and I'll give you an example. Some of them are minutia.

For example, the operating Indian reservation is approximately 32,000 acres. One-third is tribal trust land, one-third is allotted trust land, and one-third is fee land. With regards to that, we have a number of semi-available master leases, subleases. Most of these leases are on allotted trust land. The tribe also leases land and also (inaudible.) So we have a number of multiple-layered concerns that would affect the tribal government, will affect a lot of trust land, and will affect the operation of our own agency office. That is, hopefully, when you institute the changes, you have the resources to back up with regards to training and so forth.

Getting down to specifics. I'll give you an example. Permits. I applaud the fact that you are trying to put permits in the hands of the allotted trust landowners. However, relinquishing the trust agency's responsibility is a concern for us because, as regulator of Indian trust land of all lands within the reservation -- for example, a permit may be issued or may be, under the rules, may be conveyed by an Indian landowner to a non-Indian party contrary to the land use regulation of the tribe. And in that regard, there's something that needs to be done with regards to consent and operation. Okay. And that has an impact on tribal
government, and also puts us in a position of possibly being in conflict with our own landowners.

So this is an example of many things what we have concerns about and in greater detail of what we have seen over the past six weeks. And being the fact that also in addition to this that we were shorthanded over the holiday period during this review; therefore, with all these concerns in that comment period, we ask that you extend the deadine for the comments for at least 30 days, if not 60 days. Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much for your comments.

With respect to the permit provisions, we know that they are not -- there are either advantages or disadvantages in doing that, you know, there are trade-offs in every decision that we make with putting that on there. I do appreciate you noting those comments. With respect to extending the time period, you know, that's certainly something we will consider.

MS. ENOS: Good morning. Bryan, good to see you again. I know you've seen me many times. You and Dell will see me again more times (inaudible) about this outrageous, unconscionable proposal and (inaudible) tribal people.

Let me introduce myself first before I get too
carried away here. My name is Diane Enos. I'm the current president of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in Arizona. With me today are numerous, just a few, of the affected landowners in my community, but I have some comments that $I$ wish to make on behalf of the community itself.

I'm here to present public comments on the proposed residential, business, wind and solar leasing regulations. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community has close to 10,000 enrolled members. We have 52,000 acres in central Arizona. A lot of that land is becoming more and more valuable for development, but I need to tell you that about close to half of our population is under the age of 18. That statistic ought to tell you a lot about our housing needs, about the coming housing needs that are going to become even more as the years pass.

The community and its members have very grave concerns regarding these proposed regulations. Specifically, we are concerned about the residential leases. If adopted, these home-site leasing regulations will make homes on allotted lands virtually impossible for most of us and most of our families.

I want to acknowledge the Agua Caliente staff person who spoke. I think he articulated some of our concerns, as well. But I want to tell you also that I
know firsthand, as an individual Indian that owns an interest in land allotment in my community, it's frustrating because $I$ have complied with all the BIA requirements about 30 years ago in getting a homesite. I, like a lot of people in my community, went and got the required 51 percent interest signatures and approvals from my family and my relatives for my homesite. My family built my house, literally, by hand. And in doing so -- we didn't have a lot of money. So to make a foundation, we had the bricklayers go down maybe a foot, not even a foot, and put down concrete blocks and fill it in with cement. That was the foundation. And then the bricks came in to complete the house, and the rest of it we did ourselves.

Now, as the years have passed, I have added on to that with the assistance of my tribal government for home improvement loans. But there's a problem with the original structure right now in that it's eroded. Some of the irrigation has affected the stability of it, and I have a hole under my house that $I$ keep filling up with dirt and with cement wherever possible.

I cannot get repairs to my house by my tribal government; although, there are program monies for seniors, and I am a senior. And there is assistance available to do that, because I went back and found out
that my original homesite lease, my grant of authority from my fellow family members, is invalid. I don't have a homesite. So my tribe cannot come in and fix the problem in my house. Even if I wanted to build a new house right next to my existing house, I can't do that, because I don't have a homesite.

Back then, I had to get signatures from one page of people. It was probably about 12 or 14 people. Over the years, people have come and gone. The land has become more fractionated. These new requirements now require that $I$ get over 110 signatures. And as I told you before, Bryan, and I mentioned to all the Federal people in Washington, not all of those people are findable. Some of them have not been in the community for a while. And some of them don't like me. We all have family issues, every one of us. And some of them know that the BIA is proposing payment, and they're going to stand there and fold their arms and say no and demand payment. "I want my rent."

And I bring this to your attention because, not only does this affect the allotted landowners, but I am simply about one of about 400 in the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community who has houses that don't have a valid lease and are limited to what assistance we can get. Can't do a mortgage. Can't do any of that.

There's over 400 houses and 400 families. And the folks that are with me today are just a few of those.

The community overall supports the proposed regulations on commercial and wind and solar. We will provide some written comments on these specific areas of the proposed rates by the end of the deadline; however, the community urges and requests that you withdraw and separate out the proposed homesite lease regulations for further consultation, as was suggested by Agua Caliente. I am going to suggest that you do that indefinitely, because we are a self-governance tribe. That means that our government has a lot of direct communication with our landowners; but across this country, a lot of tribes and tribal members do not have this information. And they are not going to know it. If you put these regulations in place, as time progresses and these regulations come to light by other tribal members across the country, they're going to say, "Hey, what happened? How come I didn't know about this?" Tribal governments are going to say, "What are you doing?"

So we ask that you withdraw the homesite lease regulations from adoption until further consultation and further work. We must have more opportunity to review the detrimental impacts that these regulations will have on tribal communities nationally and tribal families.

For the record, I want to note specifically the community's key concerns regarding the proposed homesite regulations. Our legal staff have analyzed these. As I mentioned earlier, Bryan has seen this before, Dell has seen this before, Larry EchoHawk has seen this before. And, in fact, $I$ recall Mr. EchoHawk right now, who was on travel, to further discuss these proposals. Our legal staff is here. I'm going to ask for some time for Theresa Roser to address those specifics, time permitting.

An appraisal of costs, specifically our concerns, the first one on the appraisal cost and the increased delay in the homesite process. A potential homeowner will be required to obtain an appraisal or market study assessing the valuation for rental compensation of our land, of our families' land. Who is going to pay for this? The No. 1 question. The BIA? Office of Special Trust? Are there additional budget funding from the Federal Government to pay 1,500 to 4,000 for an individual appraisal? I tell you, a lot of our people don't have that money. No. 3, the homeowner? How many of us here can pull out one to two to $\$ 3,000$, because we have asked about the cost of that. It's not workable. Simply not workable.

The second area, going beyond the requirements
of the Indian Land Consolidation Act and requiring a waiver of rental compensation by 100 percent of the allotted landowners is another very serious, grave concern that we have.

After the Office of Special Trust determines and assesses a fair market value, the potential homeowner then asks all other landowners or people that have an interest in a particular allotment to waive in writing the rental compensation. Not only is it burdensome because you have got private fractionated land from all across the country, but this requirement goes above and beyond the provision of ILKA, as these proposed regulations require all 100 percent of the landowners to waive their rental compensation.

ILKA requires the lessee to obtain certain percentages based upon fractionation of the land. We have done that in the past. I think that's what $I$ did. I got more than 50 percent, 51 of the interest people to agree. As such compensation proposals will always be paid to landowners whose whereabouts are unknown and who makes mistakes. Will the BIA waive compensation for their mistakes?

Right now in the community we have a lot of agricultural leases, and there are IM accounts already set up for those folks that are not findable. So that's
already taken care of. It simply doesn't make sense to a landowner to pay rent on land that you own. And I know that the community members that are here want to say that. This is anticultural, anti who we are as tribal people.

No. 5. The community of all current landowners who are paying rent at every homesite within our boundary -- I'm going to talk about the administrative nightmare. Salt River will be processing over 55,000 annual lease checks simply for land rental. 55,000. Who's going to do that? Is the Bureau? We're self-governance, and that creates a whole other area of concern for our self-governance, and the self-governance status of every other tribe, the tribes in the country, they are all self-governance. Does the BIA have the funds and the resources to manage the substantial increase in IM accounts?

The third largest concern that we have are the eviction or trespass actions against Indian families proposed when there is a default on the homesite lease. You see that in Section 162 (point something). Homeowner pay rental compensation to all nonconsenting landowners for the life of the lease. We've got 65 years, 50 years. Is the Bureau required to evict Indian families when rental payments lapse? Is the BIA prepared to evict

Indian people, elders and children, when rental payments lapse? Who's going to do that? Is the Bureau going to say, "Salt River, you are self-governance. You do it"? I'm not going to do it, and I don't think any tribal leader in this country is going to do it. You mentioned earlier the appeal process. Those appeal processes can take a long time. I'm telling you, we're going to use as much appeal time as possible. So we're all going to be faced with huge nightmarish appeal processes and deadlines, so on and so on, administratively.

If an Indian homeowner defaults on these payments at some point during the life of the lease, then will the BIA and the self-governance be responsible for assuming the default of the lease, the back rents, and the eviction of the family? Unconscionable comes to mind. This is unconscionable.

No. 4, the unreasonable five-year rental adjustments provided for. Per the proposed regulations, every five years there will be a periodic adjustment to rental valuation. This provision is not reasonable for a number of reasons. First, it requires rental adjustments. The presumption is that homesite leases are similar to for-profit commercial leases, because that's what you do when you have businesses. Everybody knows that. Homesite leases are not commercial economic
endeavors. Reevaluation of land rents is completely inappropriate in a homesite setting. Home settings are providing adequate and safe housing to tribal families and are not commercial ventures.

Second, does the BIA and Office of Special Trust have the budgetary or staff resources to provide appraisal services ten times through the life of a 50 -year lease, or even have self-governance tribes do that? That's creating an administrative nightmare for us.
5. Impractical bonding and insurance requirements. Moreover, the requirement of performance rental and reclamation bonds is another huge obstacle for Indian housing. These requirements alone will destroy the ability of allotted landowners, us, to build new housing on our families' land. Again, the presumption seems to be that homesite leases are commercial in nature when they are not. Homes-site leases are not for-profit ventures.

Our staff has called bonding companies, and I know that our staff here will describe that. Frankly, families do not have the credit requirements or financial resources to provide these types of loans. For example, suppose you are lucky enough to have a house or homesite valued at $\$ 250,000$. This is just an example. The rental
bond, the cost on that, will be $\$ 7,000$ a year. \$7,000 a year. Who has that money?

A performance bond for this home will require $\$ 150,000$ worth of liquid assets. Did the drafters contact bonding companies and see if these requirements were even feasible for Indian families? We were told that remediation and restoration bonds would be improbable for Indian families on trust land. By requiring insurance placed on homesite leases as best practice is simply not practicable. Families with limited money will ensure and have focus on putting food on the table for our children and our families and clothes on their backs before all else. Did the Bureau contact insurance companies to even find out if requiring insurance was feasible for allotted landowner families?

No. 6. The proposed regulations place financial compensation before long-standing cultural practice and values. The community believes that monetary value and liability should not be the sole factors that the Secretary determines whether a homesite lease is in the landowner's best interest. Other considerations of secondary changes that should be taken into account are: No. 1, the cultural and traditional values of the Pima-Maricopa people and tell them that the Maricopa people at Salt River and the other tribal people
nationally. No. 2, the desperate need for safe and adequate housing in Indian Country. No. 3, that rental compensation also should be taken into consideration. That rental compensation may make building more unavailable or repairs unobtainable for poor or elderly tribal members.

Then, the overall desire of Indian people that have not had an opportunity to have a home, their ability to come home and to build a stable -- contribute to a strong and stable tribal community will be affected or prohibited.

MR. NEWLAND: President Enos, I know that we're going to have a lot of discussion this morning, a lot of comments, and I know we have your written comments. We want to make sure that everybody else has an opportunity to -- I'm not sure -- I don't want to cut you off, and we'll get to all of your comments. I want to make sure everybody has an opportunity to bring up their remarks.

MS. ENOS: Let me finish up.
MR. NEWLAND: Sure.
MS. ENOS: I'm getting to the end.
MR. NEWLAND: Okay.
MS. ENOS: No. 7. You asked for what is it we're suggesting or recommending. Right now there's 400 -plus homes and families that don't have a valid lease
where we thought we had one. They have to be grandfathered in. We met the requirements. Let's partnership and go back and do what we can to grandfather in those 400-plus homes at Salt River. They were built to what the BIA required at the time in good faith. So let's work constructively to do that. All the same points that $I$ am making apply to those. We should be given every opportunity to follow the regulations that were in place at the time.

I want to conclude and ask time for my members here, but the proposed regulations will bring homesite building repairs to a standstill at Salt River. Like every other family in this country and in this world, we need to have safe housing, safe, clean, stable housing. The proposed regulations on homesite leases are a huge step in the wrong direction, and these regulations must be withdrawn from implementation.

The Department of Interior does not have the budgetary or staff resources to implement these homesite regulations, nor do Indian families, nor do we have the financial resources to provide rental compensation adjustments, performance, or reclamation bonding.

You asked earlier under Page 9 for suggestions on the -- where we can't meet 100 percent consent requirements. Our suggestion here is that the Bureau use
the best interest analysis in those situations and consider hardship in that analysis; but also under the Cobal Settlement, there were large sums of money to address fractionated land and its problems. I would urge that the tribe in its trust responsibility -- and I appreciate what you said earlier about trust and responsibility to all those absent or even the unwilling members of a family or allotment. The Bureau ought to use that money and administrator that and not put that burden on the community since it's something that the Bureau's creating.

So those are our comments. Thanks for hearing me out. I have a lot more to say, and I'm going to continue to visit you. Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, President Enos. I appreciate your comments. I do want to note a few items in response. I don't want to turn this forum into necessarily a debate, rather a guideline.
I'm not -- I don't think any of us are going to sit here and pretend that these regulations are going to cure all the problems in Indian Country with respect to fractionated lands. Quite honestly, it's a problem that's beyond our reach with these regulations, and it's a problem that's been, you know, well over a hundred years in the making. What we've set out to do is what I
mentioned earlier is to restore Indian control over Indian land ownership. And I recognize how difficult that is where you have dozens and in some instances hundreds of Indian landowners.

In response to your comments about the lack of notice to Indian Country, the Department has consulted on leasing regulations numerous times over the last decade. We have issued notices in the Federal Register, public comments, letters to tribal leaders, the President, the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, Deputy Assistant Director, Bureau Director, the Solicitor, Deputy Solicitor. All the regional directors have all been discussing this for years; and, you know, if there's another way you can think of that we can reach Indian Country, please let us know because we will use it. We have certainly taken our very best interest to get all the public notice out there.

I know that the appraisal process is a pain. You know, there's no two ways about that. You know, we are very open-minded when it comes to figuring out creative ways to value lands to ensure that rental amount is determined. And I do want to just note two other things with respect to the need to obtain a lease or consent to lease your own lands. Again, this is a problem that's borne out of fractionated lands. That is
something that's already in place under the current regulations. What the proposed rule does not say is that you have to have a lease. It says you have to have consent. All the other Indian landowners can consent to possession of individually-owned allotment without drawing up a lease, and that is in the proposed regulations.

With respect to getting the consent of 100 percent of the landowners to waive fair market rental, you don't need to get 100 percent of the landowners to consent to that waiver. If you own 10 percent of the interest in an allotment and you want your cousin or your sister or your brother to be able to develop a house on that allotment, you can waive your right to receive 10 percent of the fair market rental of that parcel. You don't have to go to every other rental and get their consent. I understand that allotments -there are too many people. We've been working with your team to try to figure out ways to make that process come more quickly. And I'm not pretending that we have all the answers, but your comments are very well taken, and we are wrestling with them.

So thank you for your comments, and I look forward to more discussions with you about this.

MR. SIMPSON: And to follow up on what Bryan
said, from the Solicitor's Office' point of view, we welcome further discussion, as well; and we've actually made a request of your tribal lawyer, which is that -Theresa, if you can come up with -- if you could submit to us some proposed planning for trying to grandfather those homesites in, I would appreciate it, because I don't know enough about the actual -- I'm sure Gloria probably does, but $I$ don't know enough about the actual situation, how all those worked, to be able to craft the language for that. But if you can propose some, I would certainly be happy to look at that and work with it. MR. NEWLAND: Next comment or question? MS. CHAVEZ: Good morning. My name is Mary Chavez. I'm also from the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. We have several tribal members here, as you can see. And we have come together as fellow members of this tribe, because we are very concerned with everything that is going on here. So as a rural community within Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, we feel that the proposed regulations are detrimental to the future of our families. We feel that it's going to severely affect the ability for families to build and maintain homes for their current and future generations, as our President Enos has mentioned. I thoroughly agree with the comments that she's made. So I
will be making reference to some of the comments that she's already talked on.

But we implore the Bureau of Indian Affairs to hold off on approval of homesite leases and regulations until further research has been made as to the impact that is really going to be detrimental to our community and our community members on behalf of the community and our tribal government. Our tribal government has, as I understand, submitted comments on April 18, 2011, expounding the negative impacts that these and other sections of the rulings are going to be on our community. We just hope that you take into consideration all the impacts that it will affect on the many, many families.

As she mentioned, there are over 400 families that are sitting without a place, you know, and with their homesite lease just up in the air, you know. I, too, am one of those people where we also have been living on our property now since -- I don't remember what year -- probably 1954, you know. And then to find out that we don't have the paperwork to actually say that we are supposed to be there. And then to hear that I'm supposed to start all over by finding all these other people. Like she said, many have gone, and there are others in their place. Then I have to go out and look for these people to try and sign paperwork just to say
that I can legally be there?
The homesite leases are there for raising
families. You know, it's way different from a business. So we're not there for profit. We're there to raise our families and keep them together. Our community is struggling just like the whole country is with unemployment and a lot of other things. And so it's hard to find a job. I'm fortunate to have a job. But, still, it's hard to make ends meet. Like she mentioned, we can't make any improvements. I have a mobile home that I have on my property at this time. The plumbing doesn't work. Electricity doesn't work. It's an old mobile home, and everything is going bad on it. I can't do anything with it. We all should have the right to be able to make improvements on our houses without having to go to every single person and look for people. That would take months on end, if not years, you know, to do this.

Everybody wants to live in a safe environment, and I for one am one of those. And I want my family to be safe, and I want also my grandchildren. My children, first of all, and my grandchildren to be able to grow up on the same lands that $I$ grew up on. So I just think that it's really important. Again, $I$ think that grandfathering in this information or those families that
have been on their lands for all these years is a very important part of this whole process. And I do have to say, though, I appreciate the beginning of the talk when I came in where I noticed that you have separated out the residential, business, and solar winds and solar area, because I just couldn't understand why it was all thrown into one pot. So I appreciate the separation.

I hope that people in your position and others will really try to look down deep into their hearts and their minds and feel what it feels like for other people. Have some compassion, and just do the best that they can for everybody. Because we want to live here in this country, whether we were born here, working, we're here for a reason.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much for your comments.

Next one. I think we have one over here.
MS. RIVERS: Good morning, my name is Anita Rivers, member of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. And I have also inherited land from the people before me. I have been taught about the BIA and Federal Government. My dad always talked to me about things like that when $I$ was growing up. And he taught me to respect all people. And to keep my eye and ears open
for changes that are coming, and that they're coming. And in the past 56 years since $I$ have been living, I have seen many changes.

Today I come and I bring my daughter and my grandson with me to be a part of this, to see what's coming now, the changes that are heartbreaking to our people. I am one of those people, just as President Enos has stated, that has a home and a homesite, but no paperwork behind it. I have never had any paperwork. My father built this home in 1967, and we moved in there when $I$ was about 13 or 14 . And since then my whole family has passed away. I am now living in this area, and I have no paperwork.

And now as she stated, I am very fortunate to have a job in the community, but $I$ am living with termites and all kinds -- my windows that don't have locks. They're so old, the windows don't have locks. Everything is just falling apart, as well. They kind of Band-Aided it up a little bit, but I'm living with termites.

But I want to say, as well, from my heart and from my ancestors that have gone and those that are coming, that this situation that we are going to go through, this change has to -- we ask you to please think of us as people, as yourselves. Would you want to live
with termites and field rats that have come into your house, under the floors or however they come in? And we can't do anything about it, because we don't have the homesite land papers and doing all this other stuff.

We're people like you. So I ask you to please separate this package plan that you put together, President Obama, and think of us as individuals wanting the best way of life that we can have with what we've been given. We were put on these lands, and we were told in the beginning that this is what we get. And back then, our Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, we used to go up far west of Phoenix down south across into Mexico and up north close to Flagstaff. That was the Salt River Community. But now as President Enos said, it's been pushed back smaller, and now I am here and have lived to see this, this change.

And now my family has to go through these, and I have to go through these changes in getting to abide by your new policy. I just ask, again, to listen to our president, to listen to each person here as they share. And I'm sharing with my heart from my people and those common bonds, and those that are gone on. Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much for your comments.

> I appreciate where they're coming from and the
experiences that you are conveying to us this morning, you know, with respect to listening to your president, President Enos. We have, you know -- President Enos has been a very strong advocate for your community in Washington, and we've had a number of discussions with her and your team from your community about this issue, about leasing. And I feel that on a number of the issues that have been brought to us, we have been able to make great progress together through our dialogue through a number of issues. There are some things that are still, as noted, still hanging out there.

On the grandfathering in people who have homesites, we're going to do our best to come up with a way to do that. You know, I can't guarantee you exactly, because I don't know what that language would look like, but we're going to do our best to do that. And I appreciate what you brought here today. And I ask that you please also understand that our development of what we're discussing today -- we're bringing our experiences also with us, growing up in our tribal communities, to this process, and none of us is claiming that we're getting it all right and done perfect.

So thank you very much for your comments.
MS. PADILLA: I came to say good morning to you all. All of you go clockwise. We go counterclockwise.

That was real important to us this morning. And I, too, am from the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. My name is Serena Padilla. My concern is my granddaughter's lot. She inherited my mother's lot. She is probably, that $I$ just found out this morning 400, she's probably on that list. And hear stories. When you say "grandfathered in," I think it's really important to hear, because we're visual people, and we want to see a face and hear your words when you talk to us. When you write that paper down, when you write those, all this stuff down up there, we listen to you. We listen to you. In our nation, we go for days -- I don't know about anybody else here. Our people sat down and talked for days to see how we're going to take care of the communities and nation, because we were a nation before we were a reservation. And we go by your laws. And like our sister said here, we were taught to respect you. We were taught to sit and listen to you. But sometimes your words on these papers our people don't understand. You can send papers, and papers, and you ask how's another way. Maybe it's going to take you as a young person to go out there and talk to the people, because that's what they told us. Because our language -- you know, we're trying to get our language written, but we're oral people. Our nation is an oral people. You tend or the
society tends to lump us into one way of life, as native people. We're all different. We do things different, but yet we're all one nation.

And they say there's four sacred colors: White, red, black, and yellow. And we all have to live together. For my own self, I don't understand how -- I keep going down the road and keep asking how do these -the society come in and tell us how to live our lives. We're constantly told how to be, how to do things, how to live, how to wear our clothes. We lived in mud houses. We didn't have electricity. We used wood. We used water when we got our water. I'm a product of that when no one could go into our nation that was not of the tribe.

And like her, I've seen those changes and many of us have. Most of us here grew up together. We're this generation that's going to have to make a stand. Because if we don't make a stand, who's going to do it for our children and our grandchildren and our greatgrandchildren? I have 12 greatgrandchildren I have to worry about. I am 58 years old. I have 15 grandchildren that are looking for homesites now. And I've got four children that $I$ don't even know if their homesites are legal. And it's starting a feud in our family because of people inheriting and inheriting and fractionation.

You know, I think our ancestors had sat before
like this and talked with you and pleaded with you and cried to you, because each of us come from the heart. Unless you are in that situation, you won't understand what we're talking about. But we don't give up. Time and time the prophesies have said there's going to be change, but don't forget who you are in here. And we come to you and try to send our children off to learn your language, to learn your ways. But if we have to sit here and wonder where we're going to live, who are we?

I have a daughter that lives in town. She had to buy a house in town, because no one would finish signing our paperwork. She don't have the money. She struggles. She has children. She has grandchildren.

My house is 32 years old. I can't even get -I'm just barely trying to get it renovated. So these are the changes that have come on our nation. I was perfectly happy on a mud floor, you know, with a mud floor and a bed so we can all sleep in there. No electricity. Go outside. Probably when the rain came in, rained in the house. We put pots and pans there. That's where we're at again. But they said the society is going to make it better for us. But we have bills to pay now. We have to have a job. We have to have transportation. We have to have an education. Our kids are struggling.

It's true we have a lot of tribal members, and there'll probably be a lot more. And from what we had the abundance of we have less than. And I'm sure that a lot of nations here in California have the same problems that we do. Maybe even more so than what we do. But if we could have brought vans from our community, we'd probably be sitting out there around, but would you have listened to all the people?

So I am thankful for our president to allow us to be here and to read those comments to you or what you needed on paper. And we strongly -- myself, personally, my family our parents are gone. We're next in line, and we have to speak up; because if we don't speak up, who is going to speak up for us, other than the president? Should only one person? We are a community. You put us as a community that was a nation. So I appreciate each and every one of you in this room. Just like I tell people back home. Each of us are special. We bring something good to the table.

But if I am correct, common sense will tell you there is no way in the world you are going to get 100 percent. Common sense. This education. Education that you tell us to take 100 percent. That don't make sense to me. It doesn't. I don't know how you can get 100 percent from a nation with fractionated land. Maybe

I need to go to school again; but even in school, I was told you cannot do that on fractionated land. Actually, if you have to go out and look for a person that you don't even know has died, or you don't even know who is related to anymore, or who got married to who.

Is BIA going to do that for us, track them down so we can get 100 percent? I am not talking about the persons that are grandfathered in, because if they're grandfathered in, that's good, fine, and well. They got their 51 percent. I'm talking about the future, the great-greatgrandchildren of us. Our language. Our ancestors that put us in charge of taking care of our families. So all that we say here is all food for thought. So myself I'm really thankful to be here, and I'm thankful for your time and your energy; but sometimes we think and we don't feel. Maybe it's time to think and feel. They say the longest journey is from here to your heart. That's the longest journey. And we come here, all of us, with an open mind. So we hope and pray that you have an open mind.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much.
MS. ROSER: Good morning. My name is Theresa
Roser. I'm Deputy General Counsel for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Obviously, Salt River has a lot to say on this issue.

I actually want to raise other issues than the President. She had included some of the important issues. I'll try to be brief and succinct with each of them. In 152.00, life estate dates, where there are certain cases where the Bureau doesn't need to see a lease, approve a lease. We think the assumption is that life estates are for non-Indians. We hope that's not the assumption. At the community, we use life estates for estate planning. That is how we advise Indians, landowners, to avoid three years of probate litigation and just have a life estate. Have your grandmother grant you a life estate. That's really trying to avoid bureaucracy.

So it seems to be that the assumption that it's for non-Indian spouses or whatnot, but that's actually the minority in our community. Life estates are oftentimes (inaudible) members for Indians trying to avoid probate.

Second thought, the regulations, if you don't approve this appeal under Part 2 -- I will tell you a situation where we had an appeal that pended for 12 years. I don't think that's due process. We had a leasing, a lease termination issue. The lease was quite valuable, big time commercial leasing in Salt River. So in 1998, our field office terminated the lease for
various reasons. The developer was not living up to their requirements. The Western Regional Office, it sat there for 10 years. It wasn't Gloria by any means. I can't think who it was. But I'm not lying. I'm not exaggerating. The appeal was filed in 1998; and in 2008, we got a decision on January 4th from the Western Regional Office.

MR. PARKER: Excuse me. I hate to interrupt, but could you slow down.

MS. ROSER: Sorry, Mr. Parker, I'll slow down. So the appeal had been ten years in the Western Regional Office, and went to BIA in D.C. for two years, got a final decision January 8, 2010. So I just -- when you say there's a consequence to not approving a lease in 30 days, the consequence is 10 years of litigation. It's not necessarily a true consequence. Just realize that the appeal process anywhere is never a quick process. Litigation is never a quick process.

Just to mention a few more issues. Under 162.327, this is Rental Reviews. Five-year adjustments in commercial and homesite leasing. I'm going to tell you that's really difficult. Even in a commercial setting. We've worked with developers a lot. They can't do adjustments every five years or every 10 years in a commercial setting. It's too risky. They can't get
financing. So I think we're looking for CPI adjustments. The homesite is not a for-profit. I just don't think you need rental adjustments for homesite leasing. It's not practical. I think when homeowners get mortgages, it's going to be tougher to get financing if the rent is not more -- clear what the rent is going to be, not an unknown. Very difficult for people to get financing.

I want to turn you to 162.334. And this is again bonding, rental performance reclamation bonding. These provisions, we think, are really going to make it impractical for an average person to get a homesite lease in Indian Country. We've called bonding agencies, and it's just not feasible. You're going to pay more for administrative costs, for a performance bond than you are for actually leasing the land. That doesn't make any sense. I know there's waiver provisions that function. You are supposed to go get this. It's administratively burdensome, too costly for anybody to actually acquire. People are not going to be in compliance. They'll work around it, not follow the law.

Insurance Provisions, I thought that was very interesting. If you are acquiring insurance as the homeowner and also general liability insurance for all the landowners. Well, for the homeowner, I think it's a personal choice. There is no trust responsibility in the
personal property in that house. So that seems to be going a bit far and out of step as to how far you need to go on these regulations. It's a personal decision. If the community, the lender, is going to require mortgage insurance; but to give general liability in case someone trips and falls to protect the other co-landowners, I don't think that's feasible. It seems like we're taking the trust responsibility, you know, unfortunately, beyond where the Supreme Court says it is right now. We don't know how or why that is necessary. The president said, unconscionable. General liability insurance for all the other co-landowners, it just doesn't make sense to us.

I want to talk about 162.351. Talking about sublease. Maybe you guys know situations, but we don't ever think that will ever be used in Salt River. I don't -- sublease is really from our prospective more of a commercial venture. I don't know why we would be subleasing a homesite. Just assigning the homesite lease. You can -- it just doesn't -- it seems to overcomplicate the matter. Sorry.

Mortgages. 163.356. In the commercial setting, those regulations make sense; but in the homesite setting, I think we can draft a regulation to just say what mortgage cannot do or what its limits are. But having President Enos show all the landowners what her
mortgage is and what her financial situation is, that's not -- that's unnecessary. And so I don't think all the co-landowners need to consent to her mortgage. As long as the mortgage won't touch the fee interest, it won't go beyond the terms of the lease. Maybe mortgages did. So that is -- that's really an evasion of privacy for many people to be showing co-landowners what their mortgage is.

> I'm almost done. Couple other points.

This is in the commercial setting. 162 -- let
me see. 162.411. This is your renewal terms. Salt River and many tribes have the 99-year leasing authority. But even under these regulations, for renewal, we don't seem to have the same exception. If we had a 65-year lease, say, 50-year lease, we're capped at 25-year renewal, even though Congress has given us 99-year leasing. We think that capping renewals at 25 years doesn't work for tribes who have the ability to go up to 99 years. We think you should make it -- do a renewal up to the 99-year term.

What else. I think there's -- my last comment is I know in your comments you say you don't always need a lease. And you have the permission of others that you can, I guess, put a homesite there. It just doesn't work that way. You are not going to get financing for a home
without a lease. You are not going to get this -Arizona SRP is not going to hook up electricity. They're required to see the homesite lease. You can have somebody, in theory, put a trailer there, who gets no electricity, no sewer hookups. You need the lease for all the services to be delivered to that person. So it's not just as easy as, in this day and age, to say, yeah, you can live there. That might have worked 50 years ago; but today SRP, APS, sewer, power, water, the homesite leases are a requirement.

These are all my comments today.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much.
We're at that point in our agenda, we're going to take a short break. Everyone stretch your legs, and we'll come back here in 10 minutes at 10:30 and pick up the discussion where we just left off.
(Recess.)
MR. NEWLAND: If we can take a seat and pick this back up. One housekeeping item. So we can keep track of you at all times, just kidding, if you could please sign in at the sign-in sheet out front. It helps us, again, to make sure we have accurate records of our discussion this morning, which will facilitate and help us come to a good, final product on the regulations. Again, if you could sign, if you haven't, we'd really
appreciate it.
We had a, I felt, lot of heartfelt comments this morning. A lot of frustration evident. A lot of constructive comments. And the discussion so far has been very enlightening and helpful in this effort. And, again, $I$ want to make sure that you know that this is not just dialogue without meaning. Your comments are -every single one of these comments is read over, it's discussed, it's batted around with ideas on how it could be used to improve this proposed rule that you have before you. So I want to thank you and assure you that the comments will get read, they are heard, they are read by myself, Stephen, Liz, and others, who are not here, who are involved in this effort, as well.

So with that, we're moving forward under our agenda, and we'll move right along and take our next comment.

MR. WHITSON: I'm Rod Whitson from Oklahoma City. I'm with Bank2. Bank2 is owned by the Chickasaw Tribe. I think we're the largest community bank in the U.S. Wells Fargo -- we may be the largest. Native American lands. At least more questions than comment.

Under the Consequences that are listed for missing deadline 30 -day periods.

THE REPORTER: Could you hold the microphone
closer.
MR. WHITSON: I was asking about under the 30 -day period, consequences for the leases and all that. What are those consequences? That's the first question $I$ have.

The second question $I$ have really relates to a lot of times I think there's been mechanisms in place to attempt to move the recording of leases faster. I think there's a passive problem with BIA. So once these are enacted and they're in place in August, what's the thought for the capacity to be able to achieve these dates?

MR. SIMPSON: As far as consequences go, you will see that for most of those deadlines, except as I said earlier for the subleases and the amendments, but the most important deadline, the one you are going to be concerned with, is the lease home mortgages and the assignments. As we said earlier, they're subject to appeal under 25-C and FR-2. What that means is that, if under those provisions of the regulations, if the Bureau misses a required deadline, okay, then under 25-C/FR-2.8, the missing of that deadline can be appealed if the Superintendent missed it, the appeal will go to the regional director. If the regional director missed it, it will go to the Board of Indian Appeals.

Basically, what would then happen is you file an appeal under 2.8 claiming that that deadline was missed. What generally happens in those cases is that the officials that are hearing the appeal go back and say, okay, what happened with this can be a status report and keep moving. And the document will often be issued right then or as part of that status report, but you will at least get information and get the next highest level of officials on notice that something's happened, that something's not happening when it should be happening.

And those actually -- and, in fact, if, as Ms. Roser mentioned earlier about the appeal pending for so long, that avenue is available for that, as well. Under the Appeal Regulations, a regional director's decision is supposed to be on appeal, is supposed to be rendered within 60 days. For certain appeals under these proposed regulations we're actually changing that to 30 days. And that procedure for inaction or for missing required deadline is available for those, as well. It's really -- it's basically, you know, as I said, basically, bucking it up to the next level in the Bureau.

MR. NEWLAND: With respect to the second part of your question about capacity, as words on paper are meaningless unless you actually carry them out, that's something that we are working on. Everybody knows what
the federal budget outlook is. We are trying to use what we've got to make sure -- this is a big policy priority for this administration, reforming treaty land use. We want to match that with, you know, dollars. We want to match it with the capacity to, you know, retrain our staff to think the way that these regs are meant to be.

MR. SIMPSON: And some of that -- actually, the regulations will help some with that capacity issue. For instance, you've heard a lot about how appraisals take a very long time. Well, as you saw, for tribal land, we're basically taking out that requirement. And in our discussions with the office of management and budget, they've noted that that should actually free up some resources at the Bureau to be able to work more on the individual appraisals since there are not tribal appraisals generally being done at that point.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you for that.
Next question.
MS. ZUNI: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Denise Zuni. I'm an attorney that represents various pueblos in New Mexico, for (inaudible), Zuni, Isleta, Laguna, Esteban, Cochiti, Acoma, Nambe, and Santa Ana.

My first comment is that the proposed rule was supposed to be an improvement over the current rule. That's true in some of the cases. It's not true for many
instances. For example, giving BIA a long deadline, 60 days to approve a lease, plus 30 days to approve the leasehold, equals 90 days. That doesn't improve the leasehold profits, which is what we thought the proposed rule would do. Ready tribes are better off leasing under the current rule, because they have already worked out the coordination problems with their local BIA agency. The proposed rule adds new requirements, including new BIA reviews. This will result in delays because BIA representatives now have to engage in additional reviews.

One of the facts of the proposed rule in my area, at least, is that other attorneys are telling me that they are advising their TDHEs to enter into master leases prior to the effective date of the rule. 162.008, that's the leasing requirement. Seems to require a TDHE to obtain a lease to develop a tribal land. Contrary to what you might have been told, the (inaudible) does not require a TDHE to obtain a lease to develop.

Many pueblos when they're developing a tribal land don't obtain a lease. They simply ask the tribe to set aside the land, and they do that because they set aside some of the lots for section 184 loans or other private loans. And they merely develop the infrastructure on that site.

Can you imagine the burden if a tribe now had
to, TDHE rather, had to obtain a lease to that site? And then they wanted to give it to an individual to obtain a Section 184 loan? They would have to get the lease. They cancel the lease to allow the individual to obtain a Section 184, a residential lease. I think if that's not the intent of this section, that it needs to be made clear. And, more importantly, BIA representatives need to know this. I mean, I can just imagine the confusion now among BIA.

Okay. With respect to the 90-day timeline, because that's what it is, if you want to obtain a leasehold mortgage you have to first obtain the lease and then obtain the leasehold. Do you know BIA's response to some of the comments that this timeline was too long? Is there is no reason why you can't get the lease and leasehold mortgage submitted at the same time? That's simply not possible. And that's because no lender is going to approve a leasehold mortgage until you first have an approved lease. So I think that rule just doesn't or rather that response doesn't make sense.

Subleasing is now more onerous under the proposed rule. The current rule is so much better. It now allows TDHE to sublease without further tribal or BIA approval. It's provided for in the lease, and that's what TDHEs do. The proposed rule now requires additional
requirements. Yes, you can get -- a TDHE can sublease, but they have to first submit a development plan and a sublease form to BIA.

The problem is that development plans, as we all know, change. So that if a TDHE has maybe a plan for a 60-unit project but they had bidders that all bid over the budget, and now they have to change the plan to a 20-unit project, does that mean that the new plan has to be resubmitted? I don't know. The rule doesn't make it clear. Same with the sublease. TDHEs change their subleases regularly. Regularly meaning at least twice a year. Does that mean when they change a form, when they change any provision, or they change to a new form, those have to go to BIA? Do BIA representatives know what they will be reviewing for? I think that rule should just be deleted. The better rule is the current rule.

Under Performance Bond, a tribe now has to
request for a waiver. Does that mean that BIA now has to receive a cover letter from a tribe? Even though the rule itself doesn't change, you are now requiring the tribe to request the waiver. That's an example of adding an administrative requirement. Under the current rule, if a lease -- if a tribal proposed a lease to a TDHE and no bonding required, that's all that's necessary. That's sufficient for BIA.

Subleasing of Office Space is covered under Business Lease. One of the responses from BIA is that a TDHE can sublease under a business lease. Well, most TDHEs, when they develop office space, they develop it under a residential lease. So I'm not sure -- it is not clear whether or not a TDHE now has to submit a sublease form to BIA for review when they want to sublease office space. Many of our clients do that. They have -- they develop community centers within their housing projects, and they sublease office space, the community center for use by different entities. So will the sublease provisions now require TDHE to sublease a form, to submit a sublease form to BIA for review, or alternatively can a TDHE treat an office sublease as a business lease? It's not clear.

Again, in the sublease form, what will BIA look for? And more importantly, will BIA representatives know what to look for in reviewing? We don't want our BIA representatives to say, "Hum, let me get back with you after I check with the superintendent." I really think these rules are going to create -- sorry for not finding a better term -- create chaos with local BIA agencies.

Permits. And I'm almost through. Under 162.004, they now require tribes to submit permits to the BIA office to make a determination that the permit is, in
fact, a permit. That's a new requirement. Additionally, it seems to allow BIA to grant permits on tribal land. And would that be without tribal approval? I think the subpart C of 162.004 is unclear. Especially when it says the lease and regulations in this part will apply.

So, thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much for your comments, and I appreciate -- I'm going to ask Steve to respond to some of the particular comments you made. But I do hope that you submit written comments, because I think what you said was very informative. We have worked with HUD and the Housing Counsel in recognition of the 184 program and (inaudible), and we want to make sure that this does not screw that up. And so your comments are very well taken. You are not the only person to have raised those issues with us, you know, since the proposed rule has gone out. So that's something we're going to look closely at.

I know Steve has some things he wanted to share.
MR. SIMPSON: Yeah, a couple things. One, on
the sublease requirements for master leases. Quite frankly, did the plan -- if you look at the same requirements or the same provision for business leases, you will find exactly the same requirements. We heard that at the last consultation, and we're hearing again
that those don't necessarily work for residential leases. And that's a very good point. If there is some way that -- because the goal here for all residential leasing, not only housing for public purposes, but also single-family residences, is, in fact, to make this easier. In recognition of this severe and critical need for housing in Indian Country.

So if there's some way that those provisions on subleases under master leases need to be tailored so that they fit better with HUD and how HUD does things, we would appreciate -- we would greatly appreciate those thoughts.

On the permit piece. Currently BIA is required under the regulations, not under a statute, but under the regulations, to approve all permits for Indian land or for Government land. What we're doing here is we're backing off of that and saying no, that we don't -- we are not requiring approval for permits on Indian land. The submittal of those permits -- and we're willing to work with that, too. As you know, this is a new piece. The submittal permits is basically so we know what's happening out there to a large extent, and also to make sure that what purports to be a permit is actually a permit.

But the BIA issuing permits is only restricted
to Government land or BIA land. What that means is under the regulations and actually defined in the regulations is land is not trust land and not restricted land. This is Government land that is owned by the BIA and used for administrative purposes. This is land that agencies are on, if they are not on trust land. This is schools.

This is the detention facilities. That kind of thing. It's basically the same sort of land that the main interior building in Washington is on where my office is. It's truly land that is owned and used by the Federal Government not in trust, not restricted.

And if $I$ got that wrong in the definition, please let me know, and I'll change it; but that's what we're intending.

MS. ZUNI: May I respond?
MR. SIMPSON: Please do.
MS. ZUNI: Actually, I like your new definition, because that --

MR. SIMPSON: Glad it's in the transcript.
MS. ZUNI: That makes it really, really clear. If $I$ can just tell you what the definition here says.

MR. SIMPSON: Please do.
MS. ZUNI: You mean any track or interest therein in which the surface estate is owned and administered by the United States, not including tribal
land that has been reserved for administrative purposes.
That tells me -- and I'm an attorney --
MR. SIMPSON: Understood.
MS. ZUNI: That, oh, okay, it must be any land that is owned and administered by the U.S., including trust land, except any tribal land that has been reserved for administrative purposes. So in my area, I'm thinking, oh, my gosh, the only land excluded from that definition is the Santa Fe Indian school, the AIPC land. I know that's not what you mean.

MR. SIMPSON: That's not what we mean, and we actually had that confusion in Seattle, too. Yes, we need to change it and make it clearer.

MR. NEWLAND: You are not the first, and you most likely will not be the last to point that out. We have red flagged it, how to clarify that definition, but I do appreciate your comment.

MS. ZUNI: Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Any other comments?
MR. FELDMAN: My name is Glenn Feldman. I'm the general counsel for the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians.

Our comments address solely the business lease provisions, and we submitted written comments in the first go-around and happy to say that most of the big issues that we addressed in those comments were addressed
in this most recent draft. But there were three or four what I would call relatively minor and what I thought would be noncontroversial comments that we made the first time around that weren't addressed in the most recent version. So I want to just take a couple minutes, because I have you here today, to just point those out to you and see if $I$ am missing something or something in these comments are controversial or incorrect.

The first one is in Section 162.459. This has to do with amendments, assignments, subleases, and mortgages. If a lease is approved, the regulations say an approved copy goes to both parties. Under 459, amendments, assignments, and mortgages, the approved document goes to the party that sent it to us and upon request to other parties. Seems to me a better practice would be, just like with the lease, if there's an assignment or amendment or some other change to the lease, both parties ought to get approved copies of the document. No one should have to request it. Just seems, as a practice, BIA ought to send an approved copy of anything relating to the lease to all the parties to the lease. So I would recommend that the last sentence in 459 be changed to provide all parties would get a copy of the approved document.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you.

MR. FELDMAN: We'll submit this in written form, as well.

Second one is Section 463 A 2i. This has to do with if there's a dispute over things. If the BIA thinks there's been a violation and the lessee is now involved with the BIA in addressing the violation. Under 463 A 2i, it says that the lessee shall send -- if the lessee believes they have cured the violation, they send a notice of that fact to the Bureau.

Again, I think a better practice would be that they should be required to send that same information to the tribe or to the lessor at the same time. The lessor isn't just a by-stander in this process. The lessor of the tribe has a very concrete interest in what's going on in terms of is there a violation? Has it been cured? So the idea -- so my suggestion, again, in that provision is that it should require that the lessee, when they send that notice to the Bureau, ought to send it to the tribe or to the lessor at the same time.

Again, I don't think it's very controversial. Just makes a better process to have the tribe involved at every step of the process so they know what the lessee is saying. The lessee may be saying things that are incorrect, and the tribe may know they're incorrect. Unless the tribe gets a copy of that information, you may
not know that it's incorrect. So, again, just seems to me a better practice to do that.
162.462 A. Under this provision, it says that the lease can contain provisions for termination. Parties can negotiate termination provisions and the Bureau may not have to be involved in that process. And that's very good. But the last sentence of 462 A, says that if that happens, if there are these negotiated provisions and if the lease is terminated as a result of those provisions, it says the parties, plural, must notify us of the termination.

Well, if the tribe has just kicked somebody off the leasehold because they violated the lease, that person probably isn't going to be very interested in cooperating and joining with the tribe to send that notice to the Bureau. I hope I'm making myself clear. It says the parties, which presumably means both parties, have to join in that letter, which probably is not going to happen in the real world. Again, instead of the parties, it should say one or both parties shall notify the Bureau so that notice to the tribe will be adequate.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you for your comments, and I agree with your assessment they seem to be relatively noncontroversial. We will flag those ones.

MR. FELDMAN: One more.

MR. NEWLAND: Okay.
MR. FELDMAN: Has to do with the same provision I was just talking about, 462 A, the parties can include termination provisions in the lease. And it says: If the parties (inaudible) BIA approval of the termination is not required and the termination is effective without BIA cancelation. That makes perfect sense.

But then if you go to 162.467 A, it says: A cancelation involving business lease will not be effective until 31 days after lessee receives a cancelation letter from us. Us being the Bureau. It's a conflict. I don't think it's intentional. On the one hand, it says tribes may agree on termination provisions. They can exercise those provisions without the Bureau's involvement. But 467 says a termination isn't effective until you get a letter from us saying that.

So I think 467 simply needs to be revised to make it clear that it involves a cancelation in which the Bureau must be involved, separate from the other provisions.

MR. SIMPSON: This is a definition problem, and it could probably be clarified. When we refer to termination, it's the parties. When we refer to cancelation, it's the BIA.

MR. FELDMAN: Oh, okay.

MR. SIMPSON: So it's just two different things, and we may need to clarify that definition.

MR. FELDMAN: Okay. But you understand the issue?

MR. SIMPSON: I do.
MR. FELDMAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate the time.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you.
Other comments or questions?
MS. ANTONE: My name Cecilia Antone with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community.

My comment today has to do with fractionation. Fortunately, I'm not part of that yet. My mother is 82 years old. She's on dialysis. And one of the things that she was taught was not to split up your land. I have five siblings, and she worked real hard not to. She gave us homesites; but she told us that, when she passes this land on down to us, she didn't want to have a homesite over here, over there in the field. So she said, whether we liked it or not, we're all going to live side by side; and that's how we live today.

And now if this is going into effect -- there's five of us. And one of the traditions, I think, with our Indian people is that, when you give your land, you give it to your children or if you raise your grandchildren,
whoever you feel is fit to have it or deserves，however it＇s put．But if this goes into effect，then all my brothers and sisters are going to have a say in who I decide to give a homesite to of my children and me of theirs．And the way that she always looked at it，that the 51 percent，that three of us siblings would all be in agreement at one point whenever somebody wanted a homesite．

And if this goes into effect，then they＇re all going to have a say．And as stated before，not all families agree or like each others children or maybe they did something，you know．But $I$ think that the way it affects us，it not only affects－－it affects our tradition as people．One of the best things about this world that we live in today，$I$ feel，is that we have the chance to come here and express all these opinions from everybody，from the lawyers，to our tribal president，to everyone that＇s here．And as Serena stated earlier，it might take days or it might take months，and we＇re asking for more time for all these comments to be taken into consideration for what is best for us．

It might be good for the Government，but what about us？And we＇re the people that actually are going to live with what happens by this decision．And it is going to affect every being，every tradition，the way
that people live. And one of the things that $I$ think that we all want here today is that everyone that lives on allotted land be able to have the kind of housing or home that they deserve as a person.

Again, the best thing that we have in this world is the freedom to have those amenities of life and that is a secure homesite, that is a decent housing to live in. And I think that -- I feel that it cannot be expressed enough that these are the needs of the Indian people today.

I thank you for letting me make these comments.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much for those comments. I really appreciate them.

MS. DONAHUE: Hello, my name is Carri Donahue also from Salt River. I just wanted to share a few words.

I agree with everyone, what they said here. Another generation. I know my grandmother left us some land that $I$ knew of, but she passed away, went into probate, held things up. I was not able to get some land. For a while, was forced to live in the city, because I had no where to go. No land. I had nothing. And then $I$ was able to lease from the tribe.

As I grew older, finished a little bit of school, got my job. Currently, I am a program director
for a nonprofit. We work in the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, and this will also affect my job and the people who benefit from it. In the last year, we were able to grant money to 11, 12 homes this past year; and we helped a lot of seniors. And how it affects my job, if this goes through, it's going to decline. Next year -- this year we're looking at granting four homes. The next year, it's going to go down to nothing, which affects my job, my living, and how I survive.

So I agree, as well, that it needs to be extended. It really does affect so many people, and it may be just in our community, maybe there's a lot more; but I think you need to look at it in the human side rather than just a Government side.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you very much.
We had a comment over here first and then come back.

MR. LOMA'OMVAYA: My name is Micah Loma'omvaya, Office of the Chairman, Executive Staff, and also have the director of our energy program, Ken Lomayestewa. We're glad to be here and glad to see the tribes in the local area involved in the discussion, and we took some time yesterday to travel, an eight-hour trip Wednesday, and got stuck in road construction along the way. Made
for a good trip. As far as today goes, we're very interested in the Hopi Tribes' land use concerns. We have at least 1.5 million acres on the main reservation. We also purchased land south of the interstate, which is about 60 miles south of our main reservation where we also want to increase economic development, land use opportunities for our tribal members, and also just wildlife management and other resources on these lands. In looking at the overview of these changes, rule making, we definitely want to see how and realize how the tribe can increase our wind and solar resource within these areas. We purchased these lands, indigenous land ways, and also take care of them, be stewards, and also make use of those lands for our tribal membership. So we look forward to engaging, working through the negotiations that are going on today; and we have in the past, to realize how tribes can be more in a controlled situation or be able to realize the nation in these efforts.

We have limited resources and limited economic development on our reservation. We see that this is an opportunity for us to increase it and to be able to negotiate the pathways that have always resulted. We want to see that these are clear pathways for us to make decisions about these developments or opportunities that
we seem to engage in on our own lands. And through that, we want to see that we can work with other tribes, of course, that are our neighbors, as well as state, county, private land holders in the area, because we all have to make the best of a situation.

We hope that this will allow that and that we look forward to engaging more and more in defining what the pathways are for us to make sure that we come into and realize those opportunities that may be available to us as a tribal nation. Thank you.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you.
MS. RODRIGUEZ: My name is Margaret Rodriguez, and I'm from the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and also here representing seven or eight of our family members. Everybody couldn't come, because they have jobs. My older sister is going through surgery as we speak, and my second older sister is disabled, and she can't travel or walk very well. So I am here representing eight families, all thrown into the situation. We lived in our homes for 18, 19, and 20 years. And $I$ just found out recently, our homes were not registered in Albuquerque, and we don't know why, because we went through the whole process at the time 19 years ago and got 51 percent signatures and followed the whole process.

Understanding and finding out that now we have to go through the whole process in getting 100 percent signatures now has really thrown us, you know. We don't have the time and the energy, not all the families members; but we try our best. We haven't been able to locate five that are part of our allotted lands. We have 25, and we could not locate five. And that's put a hold on the process going forward. And, then, in the meantime, one passed away. And my concern is that my sister may pass away, and she can't even make her will because we're just in a hole. We're stuck.

I'm here to say we as a family protest this, you know. I feel that it's very detrimental to us as individuals. It's going against, as you heard, our culture, our ancestors who left us the belief, the feeling, the heart. It's throwing it out the door. And we as families have a right to talk to one another and work things out, and $I$ was saying earlier on, what is BIA trying to do? Put us all in one so that one shoe fits all? But, then, I thought, well, okay, now I am hearing that's probably how you see it. It is one.

> But all tribes I still feel are different.

We're a self-governance tribe. We had a coordination, and I think that's still possible if between our self-governance tribe and the BIA could work to continue
to work on this and have a stronger relationship to work things out. You know, I think we have a homesite process. It's not perfect, but it's worked for us. It's been working. And I would see that -- I would like to see that continue. And you come down to our level, as community members, as community people. You are here at the consultation meeting. I've heard from the very first one, but it feels as if we're excluded. Many of our tribal members cannot afford to. We're in economic hard times; and yet you are telling us, okay, if you want a home, to live decently, to raise your families, to be safe, to be comfortable, whether you are healthy or whether you are ill, you know. You can't do that. And you have to spend money. You have to spend on getting, you know, going through your site. You have to spend money for insurance. You have to spend money for bonding, which is outrageous to an individual. And you may be talking and looking at an elder, a disabled individual, those are the future generalizations, just like this baby, who will not have that.

What will our daughters have to do, except not to go through and get into a home. They'll be forced to live with relatives, causing over crowdedness. They'll be forced to even live homelessly, in a homeless situation. And that's what I am concerned about. If I'm
having trouble as a semi-healthy individual, I'm thinking of those that can't. Our elders. Our disabled individuals. How can they afford it? How can they do it to be able to live safely?

And so, again, $I$ urge you, just as
President Enos has said, put this aside and give it time. Education is important. You're talking about education, getting the word out. We need to. We need to work in cooperation. It can be done. Instead, I feel like we are just being forced and being told what to do, what we can't do. And that goes against, again, us as native people. And, again, economic times are hard right now. And you know in Indian Country, it's even worse. We're thrown back even more so. So, again, I urge you please reconsider this. Pull it out. Let's work together. Get some education together.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: I want to thank you very much for your words.

If we could -- I really wish we could go out to every tribal community and have these type of discussions. I really do. I know that we had the top leadership from our office, from Larry EchoHawk's office, and spent a day with you, in your community, with your President Enos, traveling to your community and your
tribe.
MS. RODRIGUEZ: He had come to our place. He came to my sister's home. He visited my home, and they all looked around. They only visited a few homes. They didn't talk to anybody. Not the true representatives of the community, and they didn't say anything. It was just we'll take it into consideration, the same as you. We're taking it into consideration. But no sitting down and really talking about it. You got to take it, like as been said, with the heart. Not just with the brain, but with the heart also. And cooperation to come to a solution.

MS. MILLER: Good afternoon. My name is Claire Miller, and I'm here as a landowner and part of the landowners association, a group from Salt River.

It became a necessity for the tribal members to look at what they can do to protect their lands from things like this. It's unfortunate that the Bureau has to. As this lady said, things are supposed to be beneficial and change for the better, and not the other way around.

I just want to go back and see all of the comments that were said today, and I want to agree with all of them and really feel like you need to take that at heart. And it is very sad that today we have to protect
our land. As a former counsel person, $I$ just went into protection mode. I saw the way that the lease and landowners were starting to feel very threatened by some of these regulations that are coming out. And this is not the first one. There will be others that we have to look and protect our lands, because that's all we do have. That's what we are as Indian people. It's our land.

Now, our reservation or our community is small. We can't afford to sit back and say, oh, well, it doesn't affect us. We're boxed in by some major cities. We don't have a chance to extend our land base. What we have is finite resources. That's our land. We have that property, not as a tool to, again, gain income. A lot of landowners that were born and raised on their lands, their parents, and each generation. So it's not something that we want to necessarily profit from. We want to be able to hand that land down more and more. So this kind of movement by the Bureau is extremely concerning our people.

Right now there's a petition out. And when we do submit comments at the end of the month, you will see some of the people that are able to sign the petition. Our membership is 10,000 or around there. Half of them, as you heard, are under 18. But young people want to
sign. Young people wanted to be here today. They really did want to come when they heard what was going on.

So I urge you to, again, listen to what was brought to you today, especially as you will see in our petition, look at the comments the community has been submitting to you. It seems like you put out consultation hearings, and you don't really hear. So those comments were submitted to you, and they did reflect the Government's stance on behalf of us as landowners. So I wanted, again, to bring that to your attention.

The other thing is, as I sat -- just getting the homesite leases is one hurdle. Complying with it is another. There's some very, very damaging parts of that; and our attorney here has brought that to your attention. I hope you will, again, look at that. Especially the 100 percent requirement in the bonding. And I hope some of those things are things that can be talked about. I wish the BIA would be more flexible in working with us. I think if you're an agency and your area people would at least respond and listen to us, we feel a little more comfortable about not having to go out and rally up the troops to protect our own property.

Our people and myself included, we go to bed at night feeling we were appointed but not feeling very
secure in our homeland. We're not outsiders. We're not nomads. Our lands have been deeded forever, and we expect our people to be there. Yet now we don't know how long we're going to be there. When you say we're in violation and that somebody can come and take you out of your home, that's very, very -- causing unrest in the community.

So I wanted to say that again, and I urge you to consider what's been said. Please put those regulations on hold until you listen to more input. We just had a tribe come in and say they didn't have all the information, the considerations that we had brought forward, it's new to them. It's going to affect other people, and I think you need to understand and give them time to catch up. Because a lot of people -- again, because they're submitted with those other two parts, they ought to be taken apart from the business. This is nothing like a business lease.

Thank you. Thank you for hearing me, and I hope you will consider some of the things that were said today.

MS. ACHIN: Good morning. My name is Darayne
Achin. I am with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Born and raised there. Got a chance to travel outside of the country due to my husband's
military background. Moved back into the states. Grateful for all the experiences that it gave me. But you know what. I wanted to come home. That's when I realized that I'm a Pima girl. I am a girl of the desert. I needed the sun. I needed my people. I needed the complacency. I need security and just feeling comfort of being home where $I$ was raised. And we out in Salt River -- and I've heard this in other native communities -- no matter what we do, how much education we get, no matter how far away we move, no matter how far away we stayed, we usually come home to die. Because that's our land. That's home. I just feel like that home means something different to native people than it does to the outside world. That's our connection. That's our responsibility to keep the land, to keep it clean, to raise our children, to see our grandchildren there. That's us.

And as you heard, Salt River -- we're surrounded by urban community, and you can tell when you cross right across the street. So whether we enjoy going out shopping at Macy's or going to the theaters -- we have 13 theaters we have available. You can eat dinner in them. We can come back home, as soon as we cross that street. Pima Road, McDowell Road. We literally say, "You can breathe." You can say, "We're home."

My husband comes from Massachusetts. He's Caucasian, and he's been living out in the community for 25 years now. And even he says, "Oh, we're home. We can be who we are." And I have to say that many Caucasian people that are not even community members, once they are out in the community and are accepted, that's home. You can breathe. You can relax. You know, you're among people who love you and accept you.

But my point is this. For two years I have been trying to get a new home. My husband and I came back and retired from the military. My dad offered the land next to him, his home. And we put a mobile home there. That's what we could afford. We couldn't go to a board and gather all the signatures. We got 51 percent. So we did our job, and we got our home. And now 17 years later or actually 15 years later, when $I$ tried to get a new home, I went through the whole process again. Got 51 percent. All my family is there, but my sister is mad at me. She told her daughter not to sign. I got 51 percent, but now I am stuck. I don't know why.

So I was just told by the reality girl that BIA is doing this new thing. Get 100 percent or pay them. I didn't know. This is how $I$ got familiar and got initiated to this process, because I wanted my new house. We can afford it now. We were going for it. I still
don't have a real home. I'm almost a judge in the community. And you know how $I$ found out about this new thing before this happened? People from the 1930s were coming into the court for probate matters for their house. They needed a legal document to show who the legal owner of that house was so that they could get a deed and start the process. I was wondering these homes in the 1950s, some weren't built by the tribe. They were hand built, like her father. There were family built. That's what we did.

I remember a burned down house when I was little, and all of my relatives came the next day, all my relatives came, and built a new house that same day, that weekend. That's what we used to do.

I just hope that you hear us. That you consider the human side. Because those of us that are here today, we're fortunate to be able to travel. A lot came out here without any kind of help. They just did it on their own. Native people are uncomfortable generally to speak out at forums in front of strange people. Heck, they're even afraid to confront other family members. But to come here and to hear all these people, you have to know that there is a big concern out there in the community, and we are representing our community. And you need to hear us.

Apparently, on discussion, we don't have a problem with your business proposal for the wind and solar energy. But we have a big concern about what we consider our homes and our lives.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you.
I want to respond to the comments that a number of the folks have raised from Salt River this morning. We have heard you on the bonding and the insurance, those provisions. And we're going to go back to the drawing board on those. We've heard it across Indian Country. 100 percent being brought up this morning, and I want to make sure that I'm clear.

These new regulations do not require 100 percent consent for a lease. They don't. They don't require 100 percent for a mortgage. ILKA sets up the consent provisions. We acknowledge ILKA. All we have said with respect to what Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community has raised to the Department is that the Department, because of its trust responsibility to individual Indian landowners, is not going to waive landowners' rights to receive compensation when the land is leased out. But you will not have to go and get 100 percent signatures to get a lease of individually owned land under these new regulations. I want to make sure we are perfectly clear
on that point.
MR. SIMPSON: And that is not a new thing.
Before Congress passed the Indian Land Consolidation Act in 2000, you did have to get 100 percent of all of the owners to lease land. Congress wanted to loosen that up. They put these percentages of interest to lease land in those amendments in 2000. When we redid the leasing regulations at that same time, there was, if you look at the beginning of the nonagricultural leasing regulations, it's the current regs. It says if these regulations conflict with the Indian Land Consolidation Amendments of 2000, those amendments control. We proposed regulations in 2004 that have those percentages in them.

MS. ENOS: Hold on. Let me be clear about something.

MR. SIMPSON: Please do.
MS. ENOS: We don't misunderstand the proposed regs. We know that there has to be an accounting for the 100 percent. You can't find something, you are supposed to set up some compensation process. If somebody says "No, I am not signing," you are supposed to set up some compensation policy.

MR. SIMPSON: That's true.
MS. ENOS: We understand that.
MR. SIMPSON: Okay.

MS. ENOS: So don't misunderstand what we're saying. I just wanted to not take up too much time. MR. SIMPSON: I appreciate that.

MR. PARKER: Good afternoon. Members,
President, other tribal members, other tribes. My name is Richard Parker. I'm from the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. I have a question on your first one you have. We have in the middle, I guess, Page 73.784, middle column, three quarters of the way up the page. Comments and Information, Collections contained in this proposed regulations are separate from those in substance of rule.

Focus comments on "substance of rule."
MR. SIMPSON: There are provisions in this regulation. There's a section in this regulation on Page -- the charts that begin -- the Paperwork Reduction Act. Begins on 73.786. Okay. And then there are charts on how long it will take to prepare various documents under the rule that was required to be submitted under the rule. Okay. Those are -- those charts and that information are required to be put in here under the Paperwork Production Act. This is the same statute by the way that prompts the IRS to say that it will take you two hours to do your taxes.

Those come -- if you have any comments on what
we're saying in that portion that you just asked about, if there are any comments on those charts, on the Paperwork Reduction Act piece on how long it will take to prepare those documents, those comments go to the Office of Management and Budget, because they're the ones that administer that statute and those requirements. Okay. The Substance of the Rule, what we're talking about there is everything else. Okay.

So comments on those Paperwork Reduction pieces, those charts that $I$ just mentioned, go to the Office of Management and Budget. Any other comments you have come to us at the address on the screen and in the packet. Does that help?

MR. PARKER: I'm still a bit confused. Seems like the rules and the comments that we have here today are separate issues and were looked into separately, it appears.

MR. NEWLAND: You want to make comments on what we're talking about today?

MR. PARKER: Well, yeah. When you get this documentation going, it shows there's two separations here. A bit confused. One's a comment, and the other one is substantive rule.

MR. NEWLAND: If you want to comment on what we're talking about today, send it to him, and it will
get to us.
MR. SIMPSON: And if you are commenting on that other stuff, okay, and you send it to us, that's fine, too. We'll make sure that they get to the right place.

Send everything to us, and we'll get it there.
MR. PARKER: The documentation that I have here is more or less doing the work for you. I don't want to really -- I want to comment on it, but not comment on it, because I am doing the work for you. But those idiosyncrasies that you have in here, as your paperwork or your documentation on this book, Page 98, 99, I mean, there's some of them, but they're outlined out. Does that mean that's no use or supposed to be underlined?

To me, it means it's crossed out and has no effect; or is it supposed to be underlined, because it all is crossed out to me.

MR. SIMPSON: I'm sorry. I don't have anything crossed out.

MR. PARKER: Let me run this up there to you. The comment is --

MR. SIMPSON: I don't want somebody to do the work for us. That's perfectly fine. We're willing to do the work.

MR. PARKER: 103 Congressional Meeting of Congress expresses our religion and all that. Customs
and courtesies will supercede, but you're forcing Christianity on it.

MR. SIMPSON: What you have here -- I see what you are talking about. I understand.

MR. NEWLAND: For those of us trying to follow, under Tab 6 in your packet. This is a red line of the proposed rule that was noticed in the Federal Register over what we consulted on last year as a draft.

MR. SIMPSON: Yeah. These are the differences between what we consulted on before and the draft and what we -- so if it is crossed out here, don't comment on it.

MR. NEWLAND: This document is intended to -it's for your reference so that you can see the changes we made based upon previous tribal consultation.

MR. SIMPSON: Right. So what you want to comment on is -- I'm sorry. I did not have this. What you want to comment on is the text under Tab 2. Okay.

MR. PARKER: Okay.
MR. SIMPSON: Thank you for pointing that out.
The red line strikeout at the end is, as Bryan noted, just the changes from the draft rule to the current one. What you want to comment on is not those changes, not that. That's only for your information. What you want to comment on is the rule under Tab 2. And
as I said, if you send comments on that rule to us, then we will consider them completely. And I can tell you that -- I can pretty well predict that the Indians that are working on this rule will do that, and I can commit for the non-Indians that we will consider them both with our heads and with our hearts. We also understand the difficulties that you are going through out there, and we take those very, very seriously.

MR. NEWLAND: Do you have a comment, sir?
MR. PARKER: Well, there's a contradictory on Page 9 on your proposed rules.

MR. NEWLAND: In the power point?
MR. PARKER: Yes. You have stated it's not 100 percent. Here we have the layout, 1 to 5, 90, you know. Should be 2 to 5. That's nit-picking. But it says where I'm -- the 20 or more, over 50 percent. Now, I forget the gentleman's name that I just talked to earlier outside discussing 51 percent. Based on individuals. Based on geographical land. 20 acres. We'll use 20 acres, because that's what I got.

Say an individual has 10 acres, one individual, and the rest by 100 people. So I get 26 people to sign off on it, or do I get two that have the majority of 51 percent of the land base, where one has ten acres and one has one acre to make the 51 percent of the majority of
the whole? So we're discussing this 51 percent is not quite clear.

We keep discussing -- we discussed it out there, and he said the percentage, what interest that individual has, so he can go proportionate either way. Where I am from, they say I have to have 51 percent of the people to agree. But if you are fractionated and it's undivided, and you get 26 people that own only 3 acres, that's not, how do I say it, proportionate to the land base, and it's not meeting 51 percent one way, but meeting 51 percent another way. Can you make that perfectly clear of how we do this 51 percent.

MR. SIMPSON: Make it as perfectly clear as it can be. I'm not saying that's perfectly clear. The way this works is, if you have the -- Indian land is generally owned in undivided joint interests. As I -- at one point, my wife volunteered to read all of these regulations and preamble language. She is not a lawyer. Doesn't work in Indian Country. I had explained to her what this meant. What I said to her was that's the way we own our house. She owns an undivided half interest, and I own an undivided half interest. That does not mean that she owns the kitchen, and I own the bedroom. It means that we each own 50 percent of the entire house. Similarly, with allotments, if you have 25 -- if you have
an allotment of, you know, where someone owns 10 percent of a 25-acre allotment, that does not mean that they own 2.5 acres. It means they own 10 percent of the whole. And that's what we're talking about here.

So it is not -- you do not need 51 percent of the people. Those percentages have nothing whatsoever to do with the number of people. They're the number -they're the interest. So if you have -- and, actually, we do mean 1 to 6. Congress said 1 to 5. And, in fact, at Salt River, there, they're single-owner allotments, but there are not very many of them across the country. But you actually have more than I thought you did out there. If you have -- so if you have 20 or more owners, okay, that does apply to the people. If you have 20 or more owners of the allotment. What you need to lease is the owners of more than 50 percent of those interests. Okay.

So if you have 20 people -- if you have 19 people, and you put all their interests together, and they have 49 percent of the interests in the land, they can't lease that piece of land without that 20 th person. If, however, you have -- if that 20 th person apparently has 51 percent, they can lease it on their own without consent of any of those other people. Okay. It's the percentages. It's the interests in the land. It's not
the number of people.
MR. PARKER: Okay. I understand that. At one point it could go either way if you had 100. Okay. 51. You know what I mean? There is a point where it can be proportionate both ways.

MR. SIMPSON: The way the law reads and the way these regulations read, it's the interest every time.

MR. PARKER: The interest of the land itself. MR. SIMPSON: Yes. Every single time.

MR. NEWLAND: Again, this chart is what Congress says we have to abide by. We cannot change it through these rules.

MR. PARKER: Well, the problem I have, I could be wrong, the people that work over there, our tribe, and they have submitted this documentation of 51 percent and had it rejected. They have been doing this -- from what I have been told and what I have seen happen, they have been giving us the documentation for the last two years trying to get 100 percent. I think they only have, like, 10 houses. Prior to that, the 51 percent, they got, like, 51 houses. I could be wrong, but that's some of the numbers going around. BIA has always, from what I hear, have been turning them down, because they did not receive the 100 percent. So I don't know who's -- it's contradictory to me. So I don't know who's doing what
where, but some of the people that did show up with us might be able to clarify.

MR. SIMPSON: President Enos has pointed it out. There's a difference between the consent on the lease itself and the consent for waiving the appraisal on a fair market value.

MR. PARKER: I'm not talking about that. I'm just trying to get -- it don't make sense to me to get a lease for my home on the interest, okay. I keep talking about the 20 acres. That's what $I$ am dealing with or 19.667, and I have 16 percent interest in an undivided section. I can't see why -- I want this corner. I'm only using what is allotted to me as it says on paper 3.33 acres. But I have to pay lease -- my interpretation, I have to pay these other people, the other 49 or 48 people, lease to compensate them for this undivided section. But $I$ ain't using anymore than -- I mean, that's mine now. But other people have interest in that land too, but I am not using anymore. I'm not using 5 or 10 acres. I am just using the allotted land that was set -- see, I'm confused -- leased to them.

That performance bond. Should I get a violation, which you have on there, kind of weird, a broad spectrum of violation, a lease violation. And if I appeal it, then I have to put up an appeals bond. I have
to put up my approval between 15 and $\$ 4,000$. You do the math. Say somebody gets minimum wage. What is it? $\$ 5.50, \$ 6.50$ or $\$ 7.50,2,080$ hours, if they don't get sick, you know. And I have to pay each of these 48 other people lease lands or monies for my section that I want that's undivided.

As I grew up, nobody's used that land, you know. When my mom grew up, I don't think anybody used that land. Nothing but desert or field there. And you are going to force me and future members and other tribe members to pay somebody for your own cut, then the other portion of irrigation and drainage $I$ have to maintain? To me it's cheaper just to get a house on the outside.

My opinion is BIA, however they did their homework or how they're doing this, is trying to put a division in our people, you know. At the beginning they couldn't kill us off. You put us on a reservation. Where we're at, they started damning up the river. Go down there by the river, you can farm, you can do this and that. And all of a sudden, (inaudible) association. Just started damning up the river. Now we have a dry riverbed. It flows every now and then. Somebody makes the decision to let the water loose. But to give us a little insight, $I$ could be wrong, you know.

Somebody mentioned that we're not nomads. Well,
we were. Until the Government, Christianity stepped in and forced us to lose our tradition. We have -- all I can say -- four districts. The mountain, the river, the desert, and the sand. We're over there by Phoenix. To give you an idea, you know, about this one gentleman, and he took a shot. And some people might know him.

Christopher Columbus, you know. A little pond. Came over here. Well, like I said, there's somebody that mentioned Flagstaff, near Yuma, near Mexico and all that. Actually, our territory is bigger than that. We had a pair of feet. There was no pond in our way. I believe we could have went up to Canada.

I don't have any ancestors back then that could tell me all, you know, that was handed down. I know, the Government put us on reservations. What's your migrating area? Prescott, White Mountains, that way toward Baja California, deep south. That's too much land for you. We'll put you over here by the river. There's two of us, tribes, people. Two of us. Pantonalou was the last chief. And for him -- it's hard for me to imagine for him, but he did, went to BIA or the President of somebody and said "Hey, can I please have a hall pass to go over to Salt River over there."
"Sure. You can go over there. We'll write up an executive order. You can go over to this little lot
of land."
So we go to this lotted land that we're supposed to govern ourselves with, but you guys have a hand on it and telling us still what to do and how to do it, you know. You say, "I know where you are coming from," and technically you don't. At least that's my opinion, you know. In a way, we put ourselves where we are right now, in a way. But BIA, the Government, one day -- I keep talking to some people. They say, "Well, we're conquered and suppressed." I don't know. We did something, didn't we? We're not dead. We're over here on this reservation. So something had to happen.

You are forcing this down on us. I don't know what language, except very little. My mom didn't want me to go through getting my hands slapped on the knuckles with a ruler for speaking her language when sent to boarding school. But BIA has -- a man had a hand full of beans. We'll give you health and education, but we will not give you the quality of health and education. That was never stipulated. So, yeah, we got health. It's not the greatest health. We have education. Forced every one of our people that we have as members to be people proficient. Well, that starts at home. That's another subject.

The BIA, the Government, in my opinion keeps
shoving it down our throat, you know. You're taking away our customs and traditions, which should supersede law. We get together and talk. Can $I$ have this place for my house? Sure. Go ahead. They all get together, put in some straw, building bricks, make our mud houses. We have no problem with that. BIA gets their hand caught in the cookie jar because somebody mismanaged the trust funds and the accounts. I see little bits and pieces of why this is being enacted.

Salt River, Wayne Hill got a mining permit from the Federal Government. Started digging a hole up there. What are they doing up on tribal lands, our land? We start suing. We lost. The Government issued them a permit for use of land. Fought with them and fought with them. I could be wrong. We ended up buying him out. But that shouldn't happen in the first place. Now you are telling us we have to pay our people monies for our own land. We have to pay other people. You know, like I said, most of our people are under the age of 18. Yeah, we want houses for them. People that do have the mud houses, stipulation of performance bonds, appeals bonds. Just wait until lunch, you know.

And the other thing you talk about is you hear us, you hear us. I don't want you to hear me. I want you to listen. Take note. Come down. You know, I
invite you to come down to our reservation. Look at the people. Yes, we do have our problems. Drugs. Alcohol. Police brutality, stuff like that. Yeah, we have problems just like everybody else. Walk a mile in my shoes.

That's the comments $I$ have. This is just too burdensome.

Thank you.
MS. CREECH: My name is Lorna. My name is Lorna Fullwilder Goodwin. Now, I am Creech. My last name is Creech now. I come from Salt River, too. I have eight brothers and sisters, $I$ have eight children, And I also am connected to the Covelo Tribe in California to the Round Valley People, Mission Indians. And so I inherited a lot of land from my elder relatives. So now we are seeing it being dismantled. So I came here because it's a long way away. My husband used to go. You need to go and be heard, because that's how I feel. I look at our land, and a lot of these relatives have said how I feel. And if it weren't for my mom, my aunties, I wouldn't have had an acre of land to live on. And now, thank God, four of my children have their own homesites. Thanks to getting all this paperwork done before this thing is coming in. I have three more sons that need homesites. So the land behind where my home is at on McDowell Road
going straight through the reservation, going to other cities and different places.

Below me there's like 20 acres. And in that 20 acres, there's 200 people or 250 people that own shares in that land. That's how fractionated it is in that section. And then further at the north end of the reservation, I have some land that I was -- somebody left to me. I don't know who it was, but somebody left me some land up there in different sections up on the north boundary. And I was trying to get it all consolidated into one, maybe about three years ago; but the tribe wouldn't do it, because it wasn't enough. I think it was going to be an acre that $I$ would get consolidated to one.

So I just came because it's getting so crazy in our own families. Because, like, my relatives have said, that our own relatives will turn against us. Even my own sister is trying to be big boss of the family, since my mom has passed away, and only our auntie that survived, her brother and her two sisters. So she's the only big holder now. But when she passes, she's got four, five kids of her own; and she's already given her grandchildren and greatgrandchildren land. And so everybody is going to have to start the process all over again, because they never put nothing on that land that she had given them.

So I think that was the reason I had to come. I had to come. I had to be here, and I had to say something. Because if $I$ didn't say anything, it would have been a waste of my time and my family's time for me not being home with them. My boys and my -- they always say, "Mom, where are you going? Where are you going?" "I have to go do something important." It might not be important to anybody else, but it's important for me to come. And my husband said, "You have to go, then." So he gave me $\$ 200$ to come with my sister here to help with the gas. And $I$ am really grateful to him for doing that. And I am really grateful to see the faces here that care about this stuff that's going on.

I know a lot. My older brother said, "What's going on?" I said, "You work for the Tribe. You should know what's going on. You should already know. I shouldn't have to tell you these things." And we had a family meeting because, like, my mom passed away a couple years ago. One of my younger brothers, he is living in her home, but there is no deed. And so we're trying to figure out what we're going to do with the brothers. I have two brothers. We have an old home, an old adobe house that's been there a hundred years. It's been redone and redone by one of my other brothers. And had a HUD home built that was built in the '60s for my mom.

And my other brother is living in it.
We're trying to figure out what are we going to do with my brothers? Because now those are -- it's undivided land again, those homes. What are we going to do with them? With us, we had a meeting of the brothers and sisters. The brothers, because there's five brothers and one sister, besides me. And, well, the next meeting in West Virginia to include everyone. Everybody has to be included. Our first cousins. So that is a real problem to take into consideration and try to rethink what you are doing to our families, the Salt River. There's a lot of stuff going on out there. And we have a lot of fields, yeah; but some of them are not -- they're just sitting there. What are you guys going to do with it, if we can't do nothing with it? What are you guys going to do with it.

That's all I ask.
MR. NEWLAND: We will take a few more comments. I know we started late so we're running a little late. We have one over here. I want to give everyone a chance to speak once before we go back.

MS. SLIPP: My name is Andrea Slipp from the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Well, I am one of the ones that -- I am one of the 400 that don't have a deed to our home. And I was in the process of
trying to go get housing, to see if $I$ could get a loan to help me redo my home. I've been in my home 1993, April. This April it will be 20 years. And I raised four children in that home, and currently raising three of my 15 grandchildren. One of whom is in a wheelchair. He has cerebral palsy. And $I$ wanted to have a room built for him and install a shower where we can roll him in there. He's seven now. I have had him since he was a year old.

I found out I don't have a deed to my house. No paperwork to my house. I couldn't do renovations to my house for my grandson. It's hard. I'm the grandma. I don't work. I get lease monies every month; but, you know, it's hard raising my own grandkids. I have had her since she was a year old. She's 14. I have tried to learn my language. What I learn, I teach them. I am a traditional singer. A lot of what is going on is not right for our families. Trying to raise my grandchildren and teach my grandchildren the good way, you know. I do a lot of traditional things. I have been learning and teaching them, you know, my little ones. They're three to five, you know.

I'm just trying to separate this housing, the housing through the business and the commercial stuff. The residential stuff, separate that, because it's not
the same. It's totally different. Yeah, some of the things that are going on in the commercial and the business leases are fine, but not with our homesites. I have been on this property for a long time. I have it through my father. And at that time, it was only five signatures that I needed to get. And all my brothers and sisters are gone except one. So now it's on the nephews and the nieces and the grandkids. Some of them have just passed. We had another death, my grandmother died. Now we have the probate stepping in.

You know, I ask that you take into consideration our tribe, and our legal is asking you to consider what we're -- what we have to go through. We have to do all this. My children are going to want homes, and it's going to be a heartache on them.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Appreciate it.
Are there any others? Hand back here in the corner first. Hasn't had a chance to comment.

Yes.
MS. MEDINA: Good afternoon. I'm on the staff of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. I'm the Director of Realty Services. I have a comment question. On Proposed Rule 162.445. It provides for a 30-day approval by either amendment or deed approved. The
tribe (inaudible).
THE REPORTER: Could you slow down and put the mic right up to your mouth, and I didn't hear you state your name.

MS. MEDINA: Connie Medina, Director of Realty Services, Agua Caliente.
162.445. It provides for a 30 -day approval from the BIA before the amendment is deemed approved. Has LTRO been consulted on what's deemed approved would entail? Because they can't record a document unless it has Secretary approval. And the County will not accept the document for recording unless it has the approval sheet for the Superintendent's signature. That was my comment. They should be consulted, or how are we going to know? How's this going to affect the recording?

MR. NEWLAND: This is a significant change from anything that the Department has done on leasing before, and our Bureau staff all the way down to field offices across the country, regional office, central office, have all been heavily involved in putting this together. So to answer your question, no LTROs have been involved in this yet.

MS. MEDINA: Okay. So there will be a process for the deemed approved?

MR. NEWLAND: Yes.

MS. VITOLS: Good afternoon. My name is Diane Vitols. I'm in-house counsel at Agua Caliente. I have a question about the tax provision, and you highlighted it in the power point that the tax provision was new and perhaps might be controversial. It is at Section 162. 415 C. And it says permanent improvements on lease land are free of fees, taxes, charges imposed by the state for the agency of the state.

So as an example, where a tribe was to build, say, a restaurant building and lease the land and the building to someone to come in and operate, we'll say, a Friday's Restaurant. When the state or local municipality comes along and wants to impose a possessory interest tax, they want to tax that restaurant on the value of the leasehold interest, will this section help us, or are we still having to advise the restaurant operator that possessory interest tax will be collected?

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: Thank you for that.
You know, this is something that we're trying to sharpen. I can't answer your question definitely. I do know that, you know, with the balancing tests that the courts apply for taxation on Indian lands, this is our expression of the federal interests. You know, there's the tribal interests, the state interests and the federal
interests. And the best way that we can articulate federal interest is to put it in regulations. But -yeah, go ahead.

MS. VITOLS: Let me ask the same question a different way.

MR. NEWLAND: Okay.
MS. VITOLS: Are you planning that we will be the test case for this?

MR. NEWLAND: Agua Caliente? No.
MR. SIMPSON: We don't know who will be the test case for this. The provision -- unfortunately, now they have left. The provision was suggested or requested by the Chehalis Tribe in Washington State, who is currently involved in litigation on this very issue. And they have lost at both trial court and the appellate level or at least at the appellate level. They suggested this provision to help out other tribes. As Bryan may have noted, the intent here is to sort of on the White Mountain $v$ Bracker Balancing Test to sort of put our thumb down on the federal side.

MR. NEWLAND: In favor of tribes.
MR. SIMPSON: In favor of tribes. Do we know that this provision will be upheld? No, we don't. But this is our attempt to do that. And if it can be sharpened, as Bryan noted it can be sharpened, we are
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more than happy to have comments from tribes on how we could do that.

FEMALE: (Inaudible.)
MR. NEWLAND: We have no doubt that there will be a test case at some point about this provision; and, you know, we want to button it up as tightly as we can. So ideas are welcome.

MR. PARKER: Got a question. I don't know the answer. Maybe I'll find out. On the -- it was mentioned 400-plus homeowners that don't have deeds; and this other thing, it doesn't stipulate anything about getting deeds either. But the tribe has in the past, and I've asked them, that people have gotten the 51 percent, but on the 100 percent. So you are saying you'll okay all the homesites that they have in the past got the 51 percent of the land or the interest?

MR. NEWLAND: We're going to do our best to make sure that the folks at Salt River and elsewhere, who are in a similar situation, can continue to keep their houses.

MR. PARKER: There's two parts here. The section of $400-p l u s$ people that don't have deeds that went through this process before and got the 51 percent had a house built, but they have no documentation to that, plat that. Yeah, that's their land, and that's
their house. That's one. The other one, at a certain point, they say two years, but there's a certain point where they've been trying to get BIA to okay homesites, but not reach the 100 percent, but reach the 51 percent. Are you saying that you are going to okay -- because this rule hasn't taken effect yet. So, I mean, is the BIA going to okay the homesites at 51 percent today? I'm talking for the people that aren't here.

MR. NEWLAND: That provision is effective under the law that Congress passed already, regardless of what we do with our regulations. Those percentages are in effect. If our Bureau staff is not complying with them, and we've had these discussions, they will be. They have to comply with the law.

MR. PARKER: They are saying if you haven't complied -- they've reached the 51 percent. Are you going to reject the homesites? If they don't have it, they don't have it. But if they reached the requirement of 51 percent, are you going to be okaying them? Because it seems like they want to follow this now to the 100 percent. Are you going to okay the ones that got the 51 percent?

MR. NEWLAND: If they have the 51 percent and the other lease requirements are complied with, they should be approving those leases. And we will talk with

Mr. Bochner and folks in the regional office about this. MR. PARKER: Okay. That's all I wanted to know. MR. NEWLAND: Any other comments? Let's do -everybody who wants to commit, please put your hand up. We'll get these two comments, and we'll wrap it up.

MS. ARCHER: Hello, my name is Collette Archer.
I'm with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. I am one of the members that is affected by the 400 homes, existing homes that don't have a deed to their home. I have been in my home since the 1990s. And the residential regulations is going to affect the whole community, not only as homesites and homeowners, it's going to affect the financial services, our HUD homes for the seniors, and all over. So I wanted to comment on that, and just kind of agree with my fellow community members and their comments, and for you guys to listen to all the comments and put a hold on this until we have, you know, you guys have all the comments handed to you.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: And our final comment over here.
She's going to get you that mic.
MS. ZUNI: My name is Denise Zuni, and I represent various pueblos in New Mexico. I wanted to make sure all my comments made the record.
Back to the residential leasing, 162.341,
requires all subleases to be recorded, even if BIA doesn't require their approval. Can you imagine all the subleases that would have to be sent to BIA, including amendments to subleases, and the onerous burden that would put on, especially, TDHEs that develop rental units?

MR. SIMPSON: Yes.
MS. ZUNI: Tenants vacate units very frequently. Sometimes every three to four months. And especially now that you have tribes building low-income housing tax credits. Those units have a history of being occupied for anywhere from three to six months.

I'm just worried that, you know, what happens now? We'll be at a more increased level, and that is that BIA or, what is the office, LTRO will not be able to keep up with the demand.

I think from what I've heard from the pueblos is that many pueblos, especially the small pueblos, didn't really care about the HEARTH Act passing. They really had hoped that these new improved -- that the proposed rule would be improved, and they were hoping that the HEARTH Act would not impact them. But after seeing the rule, many tribes feel more of an urgency that the HEARTH Act should pass, because, really, the HEARTH Act will mean they can enact their own leasing regulations. So I
just wanted to make that comment. I have heard -- I don't know how true this is -- that they have local agencies telling them that they're waiting for the proposed rule before they approve master leases.

MR. NEWLAND: That should not happen.
MS. ZUNI: Okay. I just wanted to make sure
that this didn't halt the process.
MR. SIMPSON: It shouldn't.
MS. ZUNI: And I don't know how true that is.
FEMALE: It's true.
FEMALE: That's true.
MR. NEWLAND: Well, to the extent that's true, for our field staff that are here today, that should not happen. Process leases under the existing regs until those regulations have changed, and we're not holding anything up. If they are holding anything up, we want to hear about it. It shouldn't happen. To the extent it is, it won't.

MS. ZUNI: My final comment is that in an attempt to bypass the length of this whole process, some pueblos have always given land assignments to their tribal members. And what we're starting to see is tribes giving land assignments to TDHEs or the Native CDFI in lieu of a leasehold mortgage. Their attempt to be creative and bypass this process, and I don't think that
was the intent of this rule. But that's what's happening. I want you to know that that's what's happening in pueblo country at least. So now what you are seeing tribes do is give land assignments, and then they're having the tribal members transfer the land assignment to the TDHE or the Native CDFI to get a loan, instead of doing the legal (inaudible). It's simpler. You don't have to go through BIA, and they're doing it using a solicitor's opinion through the northwest region. I'm just telling you, you are going to get a lot of creative solutions if this rule passes.

We also are starting to see gaming tribes
starting to use more of their gaming revenues for
housing; and what that does on the federal level is that you have some tribes not using their (inaudible) money, their grant money from the House, and now Congress is wondering why tribes aren't using their money, the unspent funds issue. That's where some of this is coming from. Because it's just simpler to use tribal money and not have to, you know, go through this process.

I just want BIA to really hear this. And that's what's happening, and I believe it's going to have a detrimental effect on federal funding.

Thank you.
MR. SIMPSON: There are tribes that have been
using tribal land assignments for residential development for quite sometime now. And just so you know, I mean, yes, there are solicitors' opinions -- in fact, I have written one or two of them -- that say that we do not have to approve tribal land assignments under tribal law. And HUD is -- in fact, $I$ have had discussions with folks at HUD, and they're willing to do 184 money for support for tribal land assignments for residential. It's under tribal law. Tribes are forced to create program.

Thank you.
MR. NEWLAND: All right. I want to thank everybody for coming out today, and many of you have traveled a long way at great difficulty to provide us comments, and we've listened. We've heard. We have heard, and we've listened to the comments today. We have heard a number of things that related to bonding and insurance with residential leasing, and we continue to hear those. And I would expect that we are going to take a very long look at what we can do to make those improvements.

We've heard some of the, you know, noncontroversial recommendations that we can make to kind of smooth the processes over. We certainly have heard from the folks in Salt River, as we have for sometime, meeting some of the challenges you face. I'm glad to see you
brought up this HEARTH Act, because I neglected to do so in my opening comments.

For those of you who don't know the HEARTH Act, the HEARTH Act is legislation that would restore tribal authority over leasing, tribes that develop their own leasing laws, and cut the Bureau out of lease approvals on tribal lands. We have testified in both houses, the House and the Senate, in strong support of this legislation. We continue to work for this legislation so that those tribes that want to, you don't have to deal with this process. You come up with your own legislation. You control your own lands. And we will work hand in hand with Indian Country pushing that legislation.

Those of you who want to submit additional comments, written comments, please send them to the addresses here. You know, if you want to send them regular mail, we will read them. It goes much quicker if you are able to e-mail them to us, but we understand that is not always an easy option for a lot of people. We've gotten several requests to extend that period. If your comment comes in a couple days late or even a week or two late, I assure you it doesn't go in the recycling bin. It gets put in, and we do read, and we consider it. That's not how we operate.
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I want to thank you all for coming out, for being part of this collaborative effort. And I look forward to reviewing the transcript and the comments that you will submit in writing with our team.

Thank you very much and safe travels.
(The meeting was concluded at 12:41 p.m.)
/ / /
/ / /
/ / /
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