

**Tribal Interior Budget Council  
L'Enfant Plaza Hotel  
Washington, DC, November 7-8, 2013**

**Day 1 Minutes Contents**

Invocation/Roll Call/Approval of Minutes .....	1
Opening Remarks.....	1
Ron Allen .....	1
Kevin Washburn .....	3
Report from Tribal Caucus .....	3
Department of Interior Update.....	6
Tribal Comments .....	10
BIA Budget Update/Calendar Check.....	12
DOI Strategic Plan Update.....	19

**Afternoon Session**

**Invocation** by Jimmie Mitchell

**Tribal Co-Chairs Announcement**

Robert Shepherd and Ron Allen were elected this morning serve as tribal co-chairs.

**Roll Call**

**Approval of Minutes**

Jimmie Mitchell moved and Sam Thomas seconded the approval of the minutes. Motion carried.

**Opening Remarks**

RON ALLEN

Okay, so that brings us to opening remarks and I'll just leave mine to be against this current climate with the Budget Control Act and sequestration. All of Indian Country is very alarmed without a doubt about the very serious negative consequences to our communities. Essential services, public safety services, natural resource issues, education programs and so forth -- it's a serious setback to us. And as we get into today's and tomorrow's discussion, we really feel that all the gains that we have achieved in the Obama administration coming out of his first term have been lost already. I mean, and many of us believe based on our analysis that where we are today probably takes us back to 1996 in terms of actual current dollar values and market values for the resources that we see today.

We have emphasized over the course of our last number of meetings that we have needs and even

needs for enhancing our ability to become self reliant as governments. Those kinds of resources are simply not there in a way that helps us become more self reliant in terms of our businesses and creating jobs. So it's very alarming for us and we really believe that the administration needs to move forward in a constructive way to protect these resources. We'd like to see them get restored so that we can provide these essential programs for the benefit of our communities. We feel that the trust and treaty obligations are obvious to all of us here and as we are preparing for our meeting with the president next week and we're going to have a series of meetings and hearings on the hill with regard to the negative consequences of the budget shutdown, as well as the sequestration impacts in our various communities. So you're going to be hearing more and more stories about what kind of disastrous conditions that we are now facing.

So Kevin, we really are very hopeful that you and the secretary will be onboard. We've made cases about, we've made arguments that even in the family at the Department of Interior that Indian affairs really is not faring well over the years and we'd like to see a switch and see that Bureau of Indian Affairs get more prioritized categorically across programs.

The Ramah case is a case that we feel that is a big victory for the tribes, but it's an empty victory if we don't get, one, restoration for past shortfalls with our contract support which is essential to our contracts and compacts, and then also full funding going forward, both indirect and direct programs. So all of those issues are critically important to us and we feel that we really do need to be partners in moving this agenda forward as the administration advances a budget.

I think the last comment I'll make is that we do know there are programs that address economic and socially distressed parts of our society who were exempted from Budget Control Act and sequestration, and we definitely feel that our programs fit into that category. That as you well know, the highest unemployment rate and challenges of America's communities, the Indians are very much in that category and that we should be exempt from that Budget Control Act.

TEX HALL: I'd just like to add briefly that I certainly agree with what you were saying there and I don't know if TIBC has a unified position but we need a stronger budget from the Administration. Now I've been working our congressional delegation and I know there's the hearing from the senate committee next week, and a lot of us will be sharing those same things, but these budgets are gone beyond just cuts these are devastating and it's a matter of life and death for many people in the plains.

The Administration seems like it's negotiating with people way on the right wing and they've lost touch with the priorities for fuel assistance, for health care for just turning the lights on, let alone a job, let alone a real economy and a real job to take care of their family. But you're right, these are the treaty responsibilities but yet it seems like they're just dismissed because of negotiating with people on the far, far right. The Administration needs to just be strong and I think we need a stronger position, Kevin, to do just that, we need to ask for a larger, and we need to exempt our budgets, like you said, Chairman Allen, we need to really come together or we're going to lose this and all of the gains that we've made in the last three years are going to be shot. They're going down, we're going backwards, really fast.

So we have to come together and we have to be strong and united and these next few weeks up until the December '15, are really, really key to make our voices known and heard and I don't

know who is all going to the White House next week but we've got to carry that unified message.

#### KEVIN WASHBURN

Thank you, and thank you, Ron, for agreeing to serve as co-chair of this committee. Okay, we'd like to talk about the next day and a half and I'm looking forward to it and I'm going to be here for most of the time. I'll echo what Tex said which is we need a stronger budget; we're working on that. We also need a budget. The president proposes a budget every year and it's been years since congress has actually enacted one. And nothing changes if you just do continuing resolutions every year; we actually need a budget.

And so it almost seemed like a hollow tax, putting together this budget every year because it never gets enacted, and so I hope that, I know that you all speak to the hill and that's an important message to carry. We will try to do our part and we're here to talk about the budget, primarily the 2015 budget, although we're still working on the 2014 budget since we just got a CR that takes us until January 15<sup>th</sup>, we basically got a 3-1/2 month CR which means that we need more action by congress before this fiscal year is over.

And so it's frustrating because we didn't get a whole year even there so we can't it interferes with our ability to plan, it interferes with tribes abilities to plan because we don't know what after January 15<sup>th</sup> it's going to look like. And we'll talk a little bit more about that and Tommy will go into great depth about these issues. So we are very much looking forward to that.

A note or two about sort of the way we've been doing things at Indian Affairs. I hadn't been really traveling since sequestration hit, I basically stopped all travel and I hardly traveled at all. And there was a good reason for that, I thought if I travel it's going to take away money for the people that actually have mission related reasons to travel because if we need a law enforcement officer to be somewhere, or a social worker, that's more important than me traveling. But what I realized is I do have an important role to play here, it's to talk to tribes, and so I do need to be doing some level of travel. I traveled out to Spokane for the last TIBC meeting but I really haven't been doing much at all.

#### **Report from Tribal Caucus**

ALLEN: You know, on the report from the tribal caucus, I think the comments that you're hearing, including both Tex's and mine, gives you a sense of the urgency and the alarm by the tribes. We think of the legislation that was great achievement -- the Law and Order Act, it's legislation that empowers or recognizes the jurisdiction that's already of the tribes, but we don't have the resources to carry out those responsibilities. So when we look at the budget the issue is we really feel the administration needs to be more cognizant of it. We definitely think that OMB needs to be more aware of these responsibilities. We think that they need to be here in this room. Often we think that the people who are responsible for the complex issues that BIA is responsible for are not here and they need to know that. They need to be in the room so they can understand why the tribes are alarmed by the inadequacy of the funding to address all these different issues.

So having all the right people in the room is critical. We know you're here, Larry's here, Tommy's here and the directors are all here, that's great, but you guys deal with this every day with us, it's

the other people who need to be more aware of it. We talked about trying to get some key congressional staff here to basically understand the complexities of these issues and why these are essential functions for the tribes as our governments are trying to get stronger and better stabilized, if you will, but also the fact that these programs serve our community in a very important way.

So those are issues that are important to us. OMB we know has a bit of a revolving door, and so we're constantly having to educate. So I know Pam Haze is supposed to be coming over, I think you said she's coming and that is great, too. We also think that it would be great if the secretary could come in and provide her assurances that she is hearing it.

So we understand you have a good relationship with her, but quite frankly, the tribal leadership wants to see her too. And we understand her time is precious but we're here in DC, this is her backyard, too.

WASHBURN: Let me just say, and she's out of town right now, we have raised the idea of her coming over to TIBC at some point and meeting with you and we'd like her to do that and I think she'd like to do that. But she's out of town this week so she's on travel and so she couldn't do it this time. But I fully intend to try to get her over to such a meeting.

But I also want you to look at just the 2015 budget when it comes out. We're still negotiating but we think you'll see that she's heard you and that she wants to do better. And let me just say something overall about the budget because I know the administration doesn't always satisfy people with our budgets, but the budget that we proposed for 2014 is \$200 million higher than the one that the house has passed, \$200 million just for Indian affairs. Two-hundred million dollars is a lot of money. And so keep that in mind.

One of the things their budget does is it cuts law enforcement by \$60 million and there is nowhere in Indian Country is law enforcement not important. It's pretty dang important everywhere. And some places don't have it yet. But it's law enforcement is hugely important and I mean they just don't have the space to take \$60 million out of our law enforcement budget.

So we want to do better. The administration wants to support you in all the ways that you need, but we also, we need cooperation from congress. Right now the house and senate are negotiating, that committee's got good people on it, Tom Cole is on that committee, Senator Murray from Washington is on that committee and they are negotiating. They're supposed to have a proposed, I'm not sure if it's a budget or if it's a process for working out the budget, but by mid December. I'm not sure exactly what it is they're going to propose, and they've got to figure that out.

ALLEN: Whether sequestration is affected.

WASHBURN: That's right, yeah. So we're anxious to see how that comes out. And they've got to do something again because we've got to have another budget by January 15<sup>th</sup>, we've got to have more budget work at least, they've got to pass something by January 15<sup>th</sup> or we potentially face another government shutdown. And I don't think they want to do that. But we've only got three and a half months of a budget for this year, so we've got a long ways to go, but we hear you.

And we do have good people over at OMB, we've got a new analyst that's just starting named

Melanie Stansbury who is very interested in our issues and very good on our issues. And so it feels like a revolving door right now but we are getting them educated up and we're very, I think we've got good staff over there.

ALLEN: One last point I would raise is CRs are very difficult for tribes. Tribes who have contracts and grants, if you will, the issue is, is that the money always comes after the fact and I know last week at self governance we reminded you that we have to often borrow money if you even have the capacity to borrow money to be able to operate these federal programs. And so getting the money out to the tribes timely is an important agenda, we know you have a new financial system that's supposed to improve the streamlining of that process, but that is, the CRs, they're just very, very difficult.

Tribes who have calendar year contracts or grants, they have a bit of an advantage, but quite frankly, as you said, it could be another CR, short-term CR and that process, which we've had, as Tommy's reported to us, that it's been going on now for 20 years, is very, very difficult for the tribes to carry out these federal functions.

And then there is another point, the budget shutdown, it stopped everything. Lending the trust, which is an important process, getting that geared back up, that success is important, acquiring those lands into trust and reservation status is really important for tribes along with the other programs and services.

So I'll conclude my remarks there and turn the mic back over to our chair, so put Robert back in the hot seat.

HANVEY: Last week we had after the Self-Governance Advisory Committee meeting, we had Sharee Freeman hosted a Self-Governance 2.0 and we had officials from Treasury as well as the State Department make some presentations and we had some good dialog with them. And some of the things that came out of that that I took away as comparison with some of the foreign assistance that they do was, first of all, they mentioned that Afghanistan, which we had sent billions of dollars to in the world system of government, is known as the most corrupt government in the world. They're very corrupt and yet we give billions of dollars to Afghanistan. On top of that, the United States also had many OIG staff just to monitor that particular those transactions, so who knows how much that on top of the funding that we provide to them.

Some of the interesting things to me though was that if you compared the amount of funding that went to Israel alone, it was more than all of the tribes in the United States put together. Also, the assistance, they actually have a program to, and I can't remember, I don't have my notes in front of me, but they have an assistance program where say that if a tribe wants to go into self-governance and there's criteria that a tribe has to meet. They have to have three years clean audits and so forth. There's no much assistance that BIA can provide that tribe to. Now Sharee does her part and people try to assist, but there is not an actual funding or something for those tribes to go to assist them to become eligible. However, with the foreign countries, there's a pot of money set aside to help these different foreign countries to become eligible to meet the criteria to participate in those programs.

Another thing that I wanted to mention was currently we were looking at well what if we could tap

into some of those resources to assist tribes; however, the authorization that allows them to operate those programs are only for foreign countries. So there is no authorization currently for us to tap into that. But I wanted to mention that because it's something that we were looking into with self-governance 2.0 and it was very interesting to me just to look at some of the comparisons. And I think that in moving forward that we need to look at some of the statistics between some of those programs and at least make our case, if you will.

WASHBURN: Thank you, Vickie, and I was really thrilled that Sharee put together that discussion because I think that that was an important discussion, this discussion on Self-Governance 2.0. What might that look like. I came here, I'm obviously all about self-governance, it's one of the things that is close to my heart, and so my thought was sort of when I first got here was what does Self-Governance 2.0 look like, how do we take this to the next level.

And I have to say, one of the things I've learned is we almost need remedial self-governance, not Self-Governance 2.0, because there's a lot of problems still, like do we get the money out fast enough. I use the word self-governance broader than just Sharee's shop because there's a lot of things we do that are self-determination, self-governance, it's not a -- it's the hard fact, that's self-governance, authorization where tribes are getting jurisdiction over non-Indians, that's self-governance. But there's just a lot of stuff that we need to do to help tribes, technical assistance to tribes along the lines you were suggesting with treasury and state, the work they do to do that, and Tommy's actually got some ideas about that, that we're not quite ready to roll out yet. But we would like to be providing more services to tribes, technical assistance.

One of the data points that came across was we had something like \$31 million in disallowed costs over a particular period of time, \$31 million, and that means that's money, we don't get it back, it just goes away. If it was misspent money it is not going to be reimbursed to the tribes so the tribes have got to figure out how to cover that loss. And it's something where they just did something wrong, they didn't spend the money in a way that was authorized, and so the bean counters say we're disallowing that, we're not going to reimburse that expense. Well we lose the money and the tribe doesn't get it, it's the worst of all worlds and so we need to provide even more technical assistance to tribes so they can prevent that sort of thing from happening.

Again, that's more of the remedial self-governance, how do we just get up to where we, so this is operating really well just as it's meant to operate. And then the next question is, yeah, how does it look, what does it look like to take it to the next step. And so we're thinking about those issues and part of it could conceivably be asking for money in a budget to set up an office like that that provides technical assistance along the lines of what Treasury and State do for foreign countries.

SHEPHERD: Okay, well next on the agenda we have Pam Haze with Department of Interior update.

### **Department of Interior Update**

PAM HAZE: So good afternoon, thank you for setting some time aside so I could come talk to you and hopefully I'll give you a little bit of insight into what's going on. Big picture on the budget on appropriations and with sequester. We haven't been sequestered yet. How's that, right? What we don't know is we don't know bad news yet. I don't know. We're all here.

So here we are talking again about challenges with the budget, not my fault, but I apologize, it's kind of a big mess these days working in the budget, used to be nice regular order. So you all experienced with us the challenges of 2013, a really tough year. You know, low levels of funding under a continuing resolution, some program reductions, across the board reductions, and then a 5 percent sequester, and then a shutdown. So it's been a really challenging year for all of us, and for you as well. So hopefully we're sharing as much information as possible and doing this collaboratively to try and help each other as much as we can.

So 2014 is shaping up to be challenging, as well. We're glad we're back at work and we have a continuing resolution through January 15<sup>th</sup>. So let's talk a little bit about where we are with the budget and sequester. So for background, the source of a lot of the challenges and disruption we're dealing with, the Budget Control Act, essentially challenged congress and asked congress to identify \$1.2 trillion in deficit reductions. Because congress did not come up with a plan for that the automatic sequester went into place in 2013.

It was originally supposed to go into place last January. Because of the second act, the American Taxpayers Relief Act of 2012, it was delayed until March, and in March the president released his sequester report and we saw how much was going to be reduced in the accounts that we have. The Taxpayers Relief Act also came up with some ways to reduce the sequester so it wasn't as big as we originally thought, we originally suspected a sequester of about 8 percent, but in reality it was 5 percent, 5 percent for appropriated and 5.1 percent for mandatory accounts.

Just to remind you, some accounts are exempt from sequestration, most are not. Many of the ones that you all care about are not exempt from sequester, and we've gone through a very robust scrub of all of our accounts to figure out which ones, before the sequester, which ones would be exempt and which ones would not, and we worked as hard as we could to identify as many exemptions as possible. They are identified in the Budget Act so it's pretty clear what is and is not.

So for 2013 the sequester applied to both the mandatory accounts and discretionary. The discretionary ones are the ones that are in the annual appropriations bill, so operation of Indian programs, the loan account, the construction account. The mandatory ones are the ones that are not subject to annual appropriation, so our revenue accounts, our fee accounts.

In 2012 and 2013 the sequester was applied in a way that separated out security and non-security. And the percentages here is what ended up happening last year. So if you were in defense you had a bigger sequester, 7.8 and 7.9 percent, for us it was 5 percent and 5.1 percent. And overall for the Department of the Interior, it was about \$865 million in reductions across all of our accounts, so a lot of money.

So that was '13, so looking forward this year in '14, when the president released a report on the sequester last spring in April, he estimated or the report estimated that the annual amount that was necessary to achieve those deficit reduction targets each year, \$109 billion. So that's the target that the sequester is trying to get to, okay. So for 2014 the sequester amount at the top line is \$109 billion. That is more than was sequestered in 2013, because as I told you, in 2013 the sequester was delayed and reduced, but that was a one time reduction.

So potentially there could be higher sequesters this year, up to we think about 7.2 percent, which

would be about 2.2 percent above -- I'm sorry, which would be an additional reduction of 2.2 percent beyond the sequester we had in 2013. Most of this is all dependent on what happens with congress and what they do by December '13.

There is a group of 29 senators and congressmen called the Conference Committee that is supposed to be putting together a plan that will lay out what the amount of money will be available for discretionary appropriations when they appropriate for the full year, and will also determine whether an additional sequester is necessary. If the conference committee is able to identify reductions, additional revenues or reductions in spending in other ways, then there will not be a sequester. If they are not successful then there will be an automatic sequester and we'll know about that by mid January, that's when the president will have to release a sequester report and then we'll see reductions.

Now most of those reductions will take place on the defense side because we took the preponderance of them in 2013. so that is kind of the big thread hanging over the congress is they really need to come to an agreement between the house and senate on how they are going to identify spending reductions or revenue increases in order to avoid large cuts to defense programs.

So what does that mean for appropriations. We have a continuing resolution through January 15<sup>th</sup> at the same level we were at in 2013, so we're at a continued level. Since we have spending authority through January 15<sup>th</sup>, that's about 29 percent of the year, so Indian Affairs is able to put out and able to, has authority to spend 29 percent of an annual amount, they don't have access to the full annual amount, so that, of course, impacts the way they are going to manage and Tommy will talk to you a little bit about that.

The Budget Control Act for discretionary appropriations has a cap in it of \$967 billion for all appropriations. That's about \$19 billion below where we are right now. So as I said, if congress doesn't come up with a plan to resolve this there will be additional reductions below where we are right now.

The house budget resolution that was passed last spring, the Ryan budget, does meet those targets. It's \$967 billion. Now you'll recall the house budget resolution that was passed was the basis for house action, the house did mark up our Interior appropriations bills and it had I think 11 percent reductions in Indian programs. So there were some pretty big cuts in that bill. So that's the level that the house budget is at and that's the level that the house is going into these negotiations advocating.

The senate, on the other hand, went into and passed a budget resolution that was \$1.058 billion, comparable to the president's budget, so higher discretionary funding for defense and non-defense. And we saw a draft senate bill and that looked much better in terms of appropriations, more comparable with the president's budget, and certainly above the level we're at now.

So the point of this is there's a big gap between the house and the senate and the level of funding they're thinking about as they go into these discussions about discretionary spending. So about \$91 billion apart. So that's a pretty big set of negotiations they've got to do by December, by the beginning of December.



The appropriators have already asked for an early indication of how much money would be available for appropriations so they can begin their work in order to have a full year appropriation available and in place by the time the CR expires in January. So there's a lot of moving pieces here, we remain really hopeful that the house and senate are going to come to an agreement, with the threat of cuts to defense and other programs looming over them. Certainly we hope they do that before Christmas. So that's the outlook.

What we have done at the department level with all of the bureaus, so Indian Affairs as well as Park Service and everyone else, we have asked them to hold back from their allocations of mandatory funds 8 percent. So those accounts where they allocate revenues out to states or they're allocating payments and grants, we've asked them to hold back 8 percent from the annual amount in case, because those will potentially be sequestered. We asked them to be prudent and expect a sequester of 7.2 percent. So again, that's a 2.2 percent reduction below where we are now. So that's the direction we've given to Kevin and Tommy and Larry, and said you're going to need to be conservative in your spending through January 15<sup>th</sup> since we don't know the outcome of a possible sequester.

The bureaus worked with us and we're planning on about an 8 percent sequester, so where we are now and another 3 percent, and we're meeting with bureaus one on one to talk through what are the issues, what are the challenges, so what are the short-term issues in terms of being able to put out enough money in 638 contracts, what are the limitations on education funding or what have you. And we want to know those things, we're going to communicate those back up with Kevin to the secretary and make sure people understand what some of those operating challenges are.

We want to be prepared for two options, an actual appropriation bill that the house and senate could agree on, an omnibus appropriation bill, or potentially a full year CR. We do not have the latitude available to us to do transfer between accounts, that was not provided as an additional flexibility. We do have some limited ability to do reprogramming, so we're working through all of those issues.

So I wanted to give you an overview that's sort of where we are with the budget, there's a lot we don't know. We know the level we're at through January 15<sup>th</sup>, and then we're looking forward to finding out what this conference committee does by mid December and if they are able to put together an agreement that will allow us to know what our discretionary funding is and move forward to actually execute our programs early in the calendar year. So that's where we are.

So I wanted to cover that and I think the other thing I wanted to flag for all of you is at the departmental level we're in the process of working with all of our bureaus and our assistant secretaries to update our strategic plan. This is the department's strategic plan and many of you will remember four years ago we went through a very exhaustive reform of the strategic plan. We created a whole missionary for government to government, nation to nation programs that elevated the Indian issues within the strategic plan. We're now doing some reorganization and some additional priority goals.

For the most part, the structure of it will stay the same but we're working closely with Kevin. We have a bit of a short timeframe so we're asking a lot of our bureaus to sort of try and look at it, refresh it. It's got to be available by the time the budget comes out in February is the requirement

for an updated strategic plan. So this would be Secretary Jewel's first strategic plan.

So it's kind of a fast timeline but we're working on that, getting as much input as we can. And I know Tommy is going to talk a little bit more about that as well, so I won't steal his thunder.

So I'm happy to answer questions, hopefully I didn't just confuse the spit out of you on the budget stuff.

### ***Tribal Comments***

HALL: Mr. Chair, Pam, kind of bleak news, I thought it was going to be a little brighter picture, but pretty bleak. But I'm just wondering, the president had a three plan initiative that he laid out for his reelection, an all inclusive energy policy a jobs bill, getting the economy going, getting strong, and where does all that fit in? I mean how can we create jobs if we don't have the we're and energy developing tribe.

We produce more oil than the country of Syria, itself. We produce 160,000 barrels a day, Syria produces 100,000 barrels. The point I'm trying to make is that if you don't have a fully funded energy policy or energy program we can't develop that, we can't continue that kind of a development.

HAZE: We haven't seen the 2015 budget come out yet so I can't speak to what's in there. The 2014 budget, certainly for us, had some robust investments, in multiple bureaus, including in Indian Affairs, in energy development and in other economic development programs. The challenge remains we have not had an enacted appropriation for two years. The congress has not made decisions on the president's budget for two years, and we have been static, less than static, we've had across the board cuts of sequester and program cuts, so we can't get to those aspirational budget things we've put in our budgets. That is the problem.

And so it is really incumbent on us to take the kind of things you just said about how important Indian Country is to our oil and gas and the prices at the pump and communicate that to our members of congress and the public. So usually when I come up here I'm telling you how we need to get that word out and I'm going to say that again.

WASHBURN: One of the things to keep in mind which we are going to have a listening session on energy issues next week, and I am probably stepping on somebody's toes here but the Native American Affairs Council is very interested in energy issues and not just renewable energy but conventional energy, too. And so we are going to focus on these issues to some degree at that high level through the Native American Affairs Council. And obviously that is largely because of your advocacy, so thank you for that.

ALLEN: Thank you, Chair. I guess a couple of points. I do want to piggyback on Tex's point on the energy opportunities. Many tribes have opportunities but they don't have the resources in order to even explore what their options are or they don't even have the resources to secure the kind of expertise that we need in order to explore those opportunities. Whether it's wind, solar, hydro, et cetera. So I just would point out it's almost like startup, as opposed to a tribe that may have already some options, and they're already developed, which is a different agenda. Some

tribes, many tribes are just trying to get to first base on this subject matter.

But I also, yesterday I had a meeting with the Office of Comptroller for Currency, with regard to access to capital. Because economic development is such a big issue, stepping off of Tex's comments. And their comment to us was interesting because we were challenging them with regard to the regulations and the oversight of the banking industry and the bias that we feel is being experienced by tribes with regard to higher threshold or more restrictive conditions for tribes to be able to secure capital for various business or even tribal operational needs.

So what they said is well, you need to look to the BIA loan program and SBA, of course. But then I quickly said, well that BIA loan guarantee program is a great program but quite frankly, they keep reducing the number which reduces the leverage that we have. So I just want to raise that issue.

My understanding and Karen would know more about it than I do, she manages and monitors it, that we're performing exceptionally well. So it's almost like we're penalized for performing well and we need those guaranteed loans in order to access capital. Because the banking industry is such a conservative industry, they don't want to take risk. And it's really troubling for us tribes when we're trying to develop businesses, whether it's a ma and pa grocery store or it's a light industry project, et cetera.

HAZE: We work with the small business program, in our department we're pretty good at contracting with small businesses, and the secretary has shown a high level of interest in those programs and she has already participated in a high level discussion with the White House and some of the other secretaries to talk about additional opportunities in small business contracting and small business programs including loan programs, bonding programs.

So I think those are, your suggestions are areas we could definitely look at. If we're not going to do it ourselves how can we leverage what the small business administration does. So I think those are great ideas.

ALLEN: You know, a number of members of our team have conducted their own analysis of over the years, of the priority of the budget allocation between the agencies within the Department of Interior. And that analysis basically reveals that the bureau's budget hasn't fared well compared to the sister agencies in the department.

HAZE: So my comments about that is that analysis looked at the, I would say the outflow, right the enacted budget and the results at the end of the process when it's left our house and the secretary has made her determinations, it's gone to OMB, it's gone through OMB, it's gone through the Hill and it's gone through that whole process. So my comments about advocating for Indian programs and giving them a high priority speaks to our internal decision making process and our competition within the Department of the Interior.

We work really hard with OMB and with the Hill to try and continue that, but there's a lot of people making decisions around that process and a lot changes from the time we make our decisions till it comes out the other end from congress. So that would be my comment.

WASHBURN: Yeah, and we saw that, we've seen those graphs last week we saw those or maybe

a couple of weeks ago, and actually I think they're just updated versions of things we've seen before. But Secretary Jewel hasn't, she hasn't had a chance to weigh in on a budget yet, she, the budget the 2014 budget was baked before she arrived and like I said, it was largely baked even before I arrived. So I'd ask you just for a little bit of patience to see how the 2015 budget comes out and then it will be fair to bust her chops on that if you don't think it's better. But work with us, we're are working hard on improving things.

### **BIA Budget Update**

THOMAS THOMPSON: One of the things that is different in the consultation that we're going to do over the next three months with the preparation of the '16 that we haven't done the past few years is that we do want a regional based unmet needs or needs based listing of what projects, if you had the resources, how would you expend those. But please help us out in this process. Now if you say I need \$100 million to build 10 schools in my region help us quantify that give us a little bit more than just saying I need 10 schools, or I need these correctional facilities, or I need this much irrigation. You know, if you give us a little bit more and what we would end up doing or what we will end up doing is publishing this. It's the last item on my list, but since I had your attention at the beginning I'm going to do it like the old Sears catalog, start from the back and go forward.

So part of this is we are collecting the needs based budget and so we will ask for your support in that. It's in the instructions, but feel very free to include everything and anything that you think your region, your tribe needs in this process.

At the end of this, and for those of you that have participated on the IHS budget consultation over the years, I'm not sure about current, but there was that \$19 billion needs based budget that they kept putting out there, here's the new facilities we need, here's the clinics we need, here's the other health care providers we need it is what is the things on your particular reservation in your particular region that would change the standard of living and bring it up to the, at a minimum, the neighboring community, but the next urban area. You know, what would we need to do in the way of economic development, infrastructure, roads, but as you put those down if you would quantify them for us it helps us put a complete document together when we're done. So it's not that granular in the budget book and we will try to send some more information out to the regional directors sort of a cheat sheet so when they start putting these together.

Is it part of the overall budget process that will get submitted to congress? We cannot submit it to congress, because we are given a target at some point by OMB as to what we can submit. But we can catalog this, put it together, present it to you and to NCAI and whatever you do with it is your business at that point. But we will use it as a barometer of how we plan for some of the things projects that we may not have thought of in the budget process, it gives us some guidance to what the real effects are as to what our true unmet needs are across the country.

I don't want to raise your expectations to think because I put it on the list we're going to get it funded, but on the other side, if we don't put it on the list and don't ask for it, we never will get it funded. So it is an investment of time and we will take it as an investment of message as to how we shape the budgets going forward. And we will talk a little bit more in detail as we get down into the '16 budget and talk about the planning and how we want to shape some of the messaging

that we send forward.

Part of the discussion, let me get this screen so I'll back up and stay on track with what the agenda is. One of the things that we've talked about is this will always be presented because we have new members coming in, as to where we're at in the budget cycle. You know, when we're talking today, unfortunately we're still talking about '14, because that's what we're under the temporary CR on, we're working through embargoed information with OMB on '15, and that's the work that you did last year and we put together late summer and we're working that through the system. And then the new process that we're going to start over the next three months is for physical year '16.

And then I'm going to throw another wrinkle in here that we want to talk about a strategic plan just for Indian Affairs that would sort of be our roadmap for '17 as we go forward, and we will do this over the next 12 months as we go forward in this process.

One of the things that we see in this process is that there are regional differences, tribal differences, and we will talk about some of the complexities of our budget process in this and how can we simplify that. You know, we talked about self-governance 2.0, how do we simplify that, how do we streamline some of this.

Right now, and we will talk about this in a little bit more detail as we go through, but the complexity of our budget is somewhat amazing. And we will talk about it sort of in detail as to the magnitude. If you take, in getting the resources out to you we're looking at 566 nations or stakeholders in our budget we've got all the agencies, all the schools, and all the operating offices, the regional offices, and it's a massive undertaking to take 137 lines of funding and then make that distribution equitably and consistently in a timely manner. So we want to talk about that a little bit as well.

Ms. Haze talked about the Budget Control Act. You know, this was an act that really set all this in motion because congress could not get its act together and pass appropriation bills. So they put this bill in place that would make it so terrible if it happened it would cause everybody pain, and that's exactly what it's done.

We will look at '13 we know it was \$119 million that Indian Affairs lost. If you take that as a basis, we're probably looking at close to a trillion dollars across all of Indian Country that was lost in this process. And I think part of the dilemma that we've all been in everybody's wanting to talk about impacts, what's it doing to you, what's the effect, and because the tribes, as well as us, had a little bit of cushion in our funding because we knew this was coming, '13 didn't end with the 5 percent from Indian Affairs making or breaking the tribes. What we did see though is at the end of the year all of the carryovers were depleted and everybody was running on fumes. And then the shutdown came with sort of the perfect storm that really expanded that out. And we will talk about the '13, we'll also touch on '14 what does an additional 2.2 percent mean. It doesn't sound like much but when you talk in excess of \$50 million coming out of Indian Affairs programs and 60 percent of those funds go out to the tribes that's a direct impact in excess of \$35 million that's going to come out of tribal contracts and compacts as we go forward here.

I will try to be as straightforward as I can comparing the house, the senate and the continuing resolution. I think it's important for us to realize that these three options have stark differences in

them. If you look at the amount of resources between the president's budget, which is close to the senate's budget, I did not put a comparison in here between the president's budget and these others because it's pretty much off the table, there was very little consideration given to it on the Hill. But if you look at the difference between the senate and the house, and the senate pretty much goes along with the president's budget, the house mark was \$2.3 billion, the senate mark is \$2.5 billion. You know, \$200+ million is a tremendous difference in what we're talking about when it's 10 percent of our total budget, just the difference between those two marks, if you will. And we will talk about what those mean.

The other, as we go through this, we talk about planning and preparation. You know, I would like to have a discussion as we prepare what we assume is going to be a CR, no crystal ball, we don't know that for sure, but we can just anticipate that is probably what's going to occur. And within that, generally under a sequester we don't have a whole lot of latitude but we do have to do an operating plan as to how we are going to, if you will, finalize a budget that lines up somewhat with what the initiatives we put in the original '14 budget, how are we going to address those. And so I would like to have some or quite a bit actually, dialog from you to assist us in that process. Because at the end I don't want to make decisions totally in a vacuum, I want to be able to understand what the ground effects of those decisions are going to be if, in fact, we have a \$52 million reduction that we have to absorb in '14 as to some of the items that are important.

We'd also need to know what programs, at some point we're going to say do we really have the resources to continue to maintain that program at this level or do we have to start looking at program redesign of some of the things that we do do.

Ms. Haze talked about the DOI strategic plan update, we want to engage in that but we also want to lay the framework to go forward with an Indian Affairs strategic plan. You know, we have always been a part of the departments but we've never done the deep dive to see out at the home level what is our roads, law enforcement, education, social services, job protection we want to take a deeper dive as we put together a five year strategy that not only gives us a roadmap on how to budget for fiscal year '17 but also gives us a document that we've all concurred with as we go forward as to the direction you want this agency to go.

And that gets into the chairman's, some of the policy statements because the strategic plan is really about budgetary policy as to where we want to take the agency that gives us more of a long-term picture, so if we put investments in programs are those one year investments or five year investments how are we going to monitor those, how are we pushing it forward so that it really addresses the needs rather than taking the same 137 lines that we've got in our budget, applying 5 percent or 10 percent, some arbitrary percentage against it we really want to have that dialog as to each one of these programs I know are important in some particular regions, not so important in others.

So we want to look at a budget process that allows us to somewhat self direct by region as to what the importance is, rather than an overall national goal. We still haven't got all the details worked out, but as we go through this next year, we're looking at tribal consultation on a strategic plan and I hope we would start laying the foundation as to what we would agree upon as sort of the budget principles going forward that really gives us a more robust document that really speaks to what the issues are that we should be advocating for rather than an arbitrary number that may have been

established in 1940 that we've added percentages to or taken percentages away from. And we really haven't looked at the overall direction that we would like to go. And we'll talk about that a little bit in the budget, talking about the budget strategy goals.

And then you have the '16.

CARROL: Just an update question. At the July TIBC meeting you rolled out the fiscal year '16 budget process guidelines in draft form. During that meeting we expressed some concerns about some ambiguities and some lack of clarity in some of those processes. I don't recall seeing a revised draft or an updated draft of that fiscal year '16 process and I know that the first time parameter within that timeline was the September through December time period. So I know the clock is already ticking.

So what is the status of, two-part question, what is the status of the updating of that draft guidance and then, two, is there still an opportunity to offer further comments and suggestions on that?

THOMPSON: If you recall, my first TIBC meeting was two years ago, and the discussion there was we sent out two letters saying do your budget and we get mixed information in the two letters. So we've tried to put a process together that gives us the granularity but also the clarity in it. It does seem a little bureaucratic, but as we go across this we want to make sure that all the information is there and that when it comes back to this body we are getting budget packets that are similar in nature so that we can actually quantify those and have them have a fair shot at being a full participant in the process.

But if you would look at that and if there is additional edits that you want to, we can possibly put out some clarification memos for this year and then we could obviously, as part of the evaluation next July make sure that we get consensus on the direction that we need to go in some of those.

THOMPSON: You know, there's a lot of numbers floating around here depending on how you want to spin it, but the only number I know how to say is reality. And \$119 million taken out of these programs, and we'll talk about it a little bit in detail, those here in a second, and the effects of it is an additional \$52 million. How do we, what guidance could you give us other than doing the things that we can't do assume it's real. If I look up at Dr. Russell, he's got 183 schools and I'm taking \$57 million out of those schools and direct educational support, and I'm also taking some, well, the construction side, the O and M side is not sequestered so it's \$57 million how do we adapt the education system to absorb that kind of reduction when it was running on fumes to start with.

So I'm going to put a plug in for unmet needs if I could. I know I'm not supposed to do that, but I would hope of those 183 schools when you do the unmet needs, they come in on your unmet needs list as to what brings them up to the standard that you would like to see your children educated in. Because we do have a tremendous backlog of major construction, O and M, new facilities, modernization, how do we get the IT infrastructure in, how do we go wireless in all of our schools so they can participate in all the things that the kids in the urban areas do, how do we give them a step forward, so end to my editorial comment. But those are the types of things that I think are important as we go forward in this if we are going to do an unmet needs, let's really truly identify what those are.

Other questions of approach on how do we cover \$52 million? You know, we can't cut our way into prosperity forever. It's never going to happen. And I don't mean to depress people, I just sort of want to -- here's the difference as we go across. The sequester for '13 was 1.9, \$119 billion or million dollars. The house mark reduces that additional \$42 million. The senate sort of mirrors the president's budget and adds \$168 million to it. So if you take the delta between those they're in excess of \$200 million difference between the house and senate right now.

So how do we anticipate that the conferees are going to sit down at a table and agree on giving another \$200 million to Indian Affairs in this process? So part of the dose is reality. You know, and they both make statements that sound good on the surface but as you start pulling back the pieces of the skin on the onion, you see some of the anomalies in the process that they processed. The other is the full year CR would be a \$52 million reduction. So those are sort of the deltas of where we're at at this point.

Here's sort of a deeper dive into the tribal government one. In order for us to implement the house mark as it's presented to us right now with the instructions that we've got from the legislation, they funded about 10 programs within the budget, they fully funded contract support cost and all of you have this sheet here, and let me quickly go over there and give you some.

You have this sheet. This is the complete comp table of all of our funding for '13 as we see it right now. And we talk about the complexity, there's six pages of rows of numbers and that's what we have to go through in order to make that distribution of funds. If you look at the items that are shaded in green on the right side, those are the items that the house -- Gail won't look up at me, those are the items that the house -- the green is no year funding, it means it's good forever, unless they change their mind and take it back and they've been known to do that as well. The items that are in red, in this column, under house mark, those are the things that the house funded. The reason we mark no year, they funded some programs in no year but didn't take an offset for them, and we're limited within that window to stay within no year so we have to do across the board cuts to all the other programs to fund those programs within no year. And I'm going to try to stay out of the weeds.

The other part is the other programs that they funded they sort of kicked it back over the fence and says here are the programs that are important to us, you figure out where you're going to get the resources for the rest of it. In order for us to get the resources for the rest of those programs, we have to take a 19.3 percent across the board cut to every other program on the list.

So if we look at bottom dollar you go house versus sequester it may not be that bad of a deal. You know, it's \$5 million more. But as we were looking back here, and I apologize for jumping back and forth, as we're looking just at tribal government, they did include \$37 million additional contract support cost but just within tribal government they reduced self governance compacts by \$19.7 million to pay for it, they reduced consolidated tribal grants by \$9 million, aid to tribal government by \$7 million.

So part of it is s we take a deeper dive into the numbers they are pretty critical as to the ongoing operation of a number of the programs. The other one is law enforcement. It's pretty straight cut. In order to fund those other programs that we just talked about under the house version we would take an additional \$7 million in reductions in law enforcement in order to fund the 10 or so



programs. And I did get up here and just advocate for school construction, the house did include \$50 million for the three schools remaining on the priority list for schools. So at one point, yeah, we get the \$50 million, we don't get an offset, it comes off of every other program.

So I just wanted to share that with you as some of our analysis of what we've done and how we're going to have to, if you will, live with whatever comes out. You know, these are the scenarios that we're looking at now, and none of the scenarios are good. But they are what they are and but part of the nature of us is to say we'll make it work, that's fine, we'll take our lumps and go back home and figure out what we've got to do.

This is only Indian Affairs budget. If you take the other resources that comes to the tribes the \$50 million here probably equates back to another \$500 million total or \$600 million across all of Indian country. So as we look at the house mark for our budget, I don't know how favorable it was for Indian Health Service, I didn't have a chance to look at that, I've actually been preoccupied trying to figure out what we're going to do. So there's some dramatic differences between these.

I would welcome your comments as to what approach you think we should take, and I didn't mean to depress everybody, please.

Ms. Ortiz, let's talk about general assistance, I'll put you on the spot. How do we take that reduction what does it mean to the families back home. Because general assistance is not just assisting the elderly, it is the placement of child welfare it is the foster care, it's the other, basically the bottom safety net for everybody back home that does not have any other resource to turn to.

ORTIZ: Right, it's like supplemental to other resources that might be available, and any cuts, I mean we run out of money in almost every location already, so I mean it has a significant impact if we're not able to get the funds out.

THOMPSON: If I recall the numbers correctly on the 5 percent reduction we were looking at 10,000 families being displaced for one month. We would be looking at those 10,000 plus another 5,000 being displaced and this is wild math, I need to verify it, but you're looking at 15,000 families across Indian Country that would not be served under the sequester budget.

ORTIZ: And that kind of general assistance helps families to pay the bill so they can stay in their homes and without that kind of assistance they often become homeless or suffer other serious consequences like that.

CRUZAN: You've heard about our high priority performance goal initiative where we were able to reduce just in 24 months violent crime, not crime, violent crime, assaults, sexual assaults, murders, violent crime by 35 percent in just 24 months and then in 36 months we saw a 56 percent reduction in violent crime. How we were able to do that is by increasing the number of police officers at those locations.

What this would mean to us is not virtually, but entirely eliminating any more opportunity to do that. How we were able to do that was to move from a reactive type of law enforcement to a proactive, where we had more officers, we can do more. We're already at about 40 percent funding law enforcement as it is, and so this puts us back into 1980s style policing which is you

only react to crime, there is no proactive policing, there is not getting the community, it also affects our victim services. We have now victim advocates who are now working with victims of violent crime to help, and there are story after story of victims of violent crime being helped through the system to court basically, and where offenders, violent offenders once weren't being prosecuted are now being prosecuted because we have victims that understand the judicial system and that are being witnesses, multitudes of places.

But where we've seen any improvements we're back to an old style of policing which is you wait for a call to come in, you go answer it and you kind of sit static, so dramatic effects on us.

ALLEN: Quick question, the DOJ cops monies, how does, that just goes to the tribe, right, none of that goes to the bureau?

CRUZAN: That's correct, yeah, none of the DOJ cops grants come to us but they're facing the same dire situation that we are. And so those are going to be cut back too. I can't sit here and speak real intelligently about what their budgets are going to look like. But in speaking with them, it's going to be difficult.

ALLEN: I guess the reason I raise this with regard to law enforcement needs, we're just talking about cops who are enforcing our tribal laws and we're not talking about, like incarceration facilities and any of that stuff, that's a separate category, correct?

CRUZAN: In terms of sequestration and the effect it's going to absolutely affect, all the way across our public safety ability, corrections, courts, police officers on the street, investigations, victim services, drug enforcement, everything that we do will be affected.

ALLEN: I guess, Kevin and Jackie, you guys are helping orchestrate next week's meeting, I'm a little concerned that the DOJ issues are not collaborating with DOI's and BIA's issues when it comes to public safety. So it's almost like they're in two different camps as we, we're going to articulate a lot of needs and challenges that we have including the problems with the Budget Control Act, et cetera. But in terms of actual impact to the law enforcement program how that is communicated or coordinated is going to be an important issue here. I don't know.

PATA: And I think given the shortness of the time before we hit next week with the listening session that's going to happen on Tuesday and then the budget hearing that's going to happen on Thursday, and, of course, all the messages, talking points that we've been trying to share with your DC representatives and to tribes, and we'll be able to broadcast out. I think how we'll craft that is solid on the information, the tables of the trend lines of the stuff that we have, solid on like the trend lines that you saw here today, and the impacts, and then anecdotally we'll put in the examples like the FBI, like the construction projects and the fact that we are having to steal from deferred maintenance which leaves us to having larger problems later, the infrastructure deterioration, that kind of stuff so we can give some examples of those. So if you have some good pieces that you would like, like a very specific story, because specific stories make big differences. So if you have a specific story or a specific example that you want to feed to us, email it to Amber or myself and we will try to use some of those in these talking points and our testimony will be available and other people can use that. And I think that will help us showcase, anyway, that the impact is larger than just this BIA trend line piece and the gap only in BIA.

## **DOI Strategic Plan Update**

BECK: Hello, some of you are familiar, I mean some of you, I'm sorry that I haven't seen you in three years, so because that was when the last time I was basically out and around with the department and a delegation from Indian Affairs and such. And we were looking basically at the strategic plan for the department at that time, for 2011 to 2016. And that is basically what we've been doing for the last four years is basically have been implementing that plan, and I'll mention some of the changes that we've built into that.

And I don't know to the extent that anyone here basically participated in any of the WebEx session that Indian Affairs sponsored over the last couple of weeks. Anyway, just to put it in context to bring you all up to speed is that we basically operate the departmental strategic plan, you're probably familiar with to some extent the Government Performance and Results Act. Congress updated that act in 2010, it was signed really in the early stages of 2011, but under the provisions of that act we continue to do at congress's request, we put together a strategic plan that basically specifies what's happening across the Department of the Interior, what kind of overarching goals we're trying to achieve, and we established where we're going to go and then we set targets on a year by year basis towards those multiyear goals, and then do a performance report associated with them.

And under the Modernization Act, that schedule for doing that plan or refreshing it has changed a bit, where it is more now in line with the terms, the presidential terms that come up. So whereas before it was just basically being redone on a three or four year, well it's still kind of being redone on a three or four year basis, but now what's happening is that we are asked to basically take a look at our strategic plan and update it within a year of presidential inaugurations. So we're in the process of doing that right now and this is basically across the government.

And so we're looking at the strategic plan, the one that a lot of you helped us put together back in 2010, and we're basically kind of looking at it and seeing what it is. And remember, the strategic plan establishes those goals, it basically tries to define what kind of overarching strategies we have for trying to achieve those goals, and look forward to the performance metrics that we use to track our progress.

The strategic plan establishes the path that we're taking on. There is something called an annual performance plan and report that we use to basically provide the updated information on how we're doing against those updated, that long-term plan. And for the plan that we have right now which we developed for 2011 through 2016, it's been working fairly well for the department.

What we did was is that we found that more and more folks are able to identify with it across the department. Part of the strategy for doing that, believe it or not, was that we actually made some of the goals more overarching, we decreased the number of performance metrics by 40 percent. And what's interesting is we found out that less truly is more, that the more perspective we gained in reducing the level of detail that was in it, folks started to be able to identify where they belonged in the plan and we were able to actually use it as a communication tool better with the American public and also with congress to some extent.

The other thing that's been working well with that plan is because of its overarching nature we start to try to draw connections between similar activities, and right now one of the hot things in

Washington is to basically, they think they are going to reduce waste by finding areas of duplication, fragmentation and overlap and that leads folks sometimes to silly things. Like they may kind of -- well let's put it this way, maybe this is not literally happening, but it's almost along the lines of is that folks will come along and they'll say, oh, my gosh, there's an army intelligence program, there's an air force intelligence program, there's a naval intelligence program, there must be some duplication there because we have three intelligence programs.

So we are using the strategic plan basically as a way to be able to show that these connections are being made across the department and we are starting to work these things across the board. And so folks start to see what I call these, it's basically kind of a routine cross organizational assessment of our progress and then so our stakeholders are able to see how these things are working together. And we are able to provide this accountability and transparency to the American public, at least at the department level.

And I mean Tommy mentioned some very well put which is that I mean we're doing this at the department level, sure, as there's lower levels of details that need to be worked within each of the agencies that exist across the department, that's a worthwhile thing to do, as long as it basically feeds into the strategic plan.

You know, I mentioned about the last time we were out and around doing tribal consultations for this plan, and one of the things that we did was that Pam mentioned before that we took about 18 months as far as the replanning process was concerned. The 2011 to 2016 department strategic plan is, I mean like I said, it is more overarching and it's more than just lesser number of performance measures, particularly in the area of tribal communities, the government to government relationships and such. It did become its own mission area, which gave Tribal Affairs a certain amount of visibility that it didn't have before. Tribal Affairs used to basically, was in the prior strategic plan of that it was basically combined with other areas of wild land fire and other law enforcement services that were going on across the department. So we were able to pull that out and not only did we pull it out, and basically put more emphasis on it, but as you can see from the previous plan that we used that was supposed to be from 2007 to '12 to the current plan, we also were able to expand some of these other areas that basically we picked up or confirmed for us when we did tribal consultation. That actually occurred I think in about seven locations across the country.

The other thing, too, was, when we're putting together the '11 to '16 plan, we really felt that we had advanced more into actual tribal consultation where with the previous plan what really happened was there were a couple of folks that I and members of my staff basically went out and had tribal meetings to some extent, but not to the level of tribal consultation basically that occurred back in 2010.

THOMPSON: But anyway, we put this on the agenda because it is important that we have your input, but it's also important to know that this is the department's strategic plan. And we would like to take a deeper dive and have an Indian Affairs strategic plan that we can feed into this that is meaningful, not only at the national level, but is also meaningful at the regional level.

So as part of that, we will lay out a strategy to come back to you as we move forward in March after we get through this first budget cycle and lay out a strategy over the summer where we

develop a strategic plan for Indian Affairs that we would be able to use in the 17 submissions, if you will, of the budget. So it's all laying the foundation of where we would like to take it going forward there.

SHEPHERD: Yeah, thank you, Tommy, I don't see any more questions for Tommy and that's all we have for our agenda today. I think it's important to remember we do have that Senate Committee on Indian Affairs meeting next week and that's the place that's really our last chance for this fiscal year '14 to make our cases and talk from the heart about the disparities going on back home, you know. I don't know who's all testifying, but whoever it is that's our chance to talk not numbers, but life human life. That's the message that needs to be heard, you know. They can throw charts up and talk numbers all day, but we're tribal leaders and we've got to go in there and talk about the reality of these numbers, and that's human life for us that's our tribal citizens.

(end of day one)