UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

: Civil Action 96-1285 ELOUISE PEPION COBELL,

et al.

Plaintiffs

: Washington, D.C.

V. : Thursday, April 8, 2010

KEN SALAZAR, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

Defendants : 12:06 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs: KEITH HARPER

KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.

607 14th Street, N.W.

Suite 900

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 585-0053

ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.

1100 Peachtree Street

Suite 2800

Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530

(404) 815-6450

DAVID C. SMITH

KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.

1001 West Fourth Street

Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101

(336) 607-7392

For the Defendants: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR.

MICHAEL QUINN

J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN

U.S. Department of Justice

1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 307-0010

Also Present: DAVID HAYES,

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

2.0

2.5

## PROCEEDINGS

COURTROOM CLERK: This is civil action 96-1285, Elouise Cobell, et al. versus Ken Salazar, et al. Keith Harper for the plaintiffs and David Hayes for the defendants.

THE COURT: Well, David Hayes -- all right. Well, he's a lawyer. We're delighted to have Secretary Hayes with us. He's putting his lawyer's hat back on again.

We have had an in-chambers conference to discuss the status of the settlement approval that is necessary for this matter. The public is obviously interested in this, and so I want to make a short statement and then ask counsel if they want to comment on it.

After nearly 15 years of hard fought litigation, the settlement of this case was reached and announced last December. From where I sit, the settlement appears to be a win/win proposition; a win for Indian individual money accountholders, who will receive payments and who will have the assurance that their IIM account balances are correct; a win for the government, which will at least make a start on solving the terrible problem of fractionated land holdings in Indian country.

I said the settlement appears to be a win/win proposition. I have not ruled that it is fair and reasonable to members of the plaintiff class. That is a formal decision, and is yet to be determined. We must go through a process, a

3 what is known as a fairness hearing so that objectors can be

4 heard.

None of that can happen, however, if Congress does not act to assure the parties and this Court that the proposed settlement is within my jurisdiction and that funds will be appropriated or approved to pay for it. The deadline established by the settlement agreement for Congress to act has been twice extended, from the end of last year to the middle of February, and again to the middle of this month, April 16th.

The need for Congress to act is real. Until or unless Congress acts, the lawyers who have devoted themselves to this case for 15 years on both sides are on hold, and, more importantly, all of Indian country is on hold. And I don't want to be too melodramatic about this, but justice is on hold.

With my approval, plaintiffs' counsel have been in Indian country to assure the members of the plaintiff class that settlement is still alive. Last week the government filed a consented motion that would permit its representatives to do the same, and that motion is hereby granted.

But this cannot continue. Again, from where I sit, this does not look like a partisan matter. It does not seem to me that this is one of those issues that will cause gridlock. It just needs an appropriate sense of priorities. It needs to

get done.

2.0

I have consulted with the parties before coming here today, and I am hereby approving their agreement to extend the deadline again, but only for another six weeks, until the start of Congress' Memorial Day recess. If Congress has not acted by the middle of May, I will convene a public hearing on this matter. I will invite - the operative word is "invite." I will invite the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of Management and Budget, and again, by invitation, of course, appropriate members of Congress, to explain to me, to Indian country, and to the American people why the approval required by this settlement agreement has not been given.

Now, that's all I have to say. Counsel are here from both sides. Mr. Kirschman?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Interior, David Hayes, will speak for the government, with your permission.

THE COURT: Mr. Hayes certainly has my permission.

MR. HAYES: Thank you very much, Your Honor. I want to simply reiterate the Administration's commitment and interest in moving forward with this settlement.

As you know, the President, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General have all publicly stated their support for this settlement. We believe it is a historic settlement, an opportunity to turn the page on a period of

2.0

We are anxious to proceed to full notice of the class so that all of the hundreds of thousands of individual Indians who have interest in this matter will have an opportunity to learn fully about the settlement, to have an opportunity to come forward to your court and have their answers — their questions answered, have any objections heard, so that we can proceed with the judicial resolution of this matter.

I will also say that obviously, Your Honor, we will respect your request today, that we understand your interest in a timetable certain on this matter. We share a common interest in bringing this to resolution.

I will say for the record that the Administration has been working very closely with the leadership in Congress. Secretary Salazar has been personally engaged, and we will continue to do so. And now, with your instructions today, we will increase, even increase our attention to this matter, if that is possible.

And with regard to your call for a potential appearance by the Secretary of the Interior in mid-May if we do not have Congressional approval by then, I'm certain that the Secretary will be happy to participate in such a hearing, and will work with you and with the Congress towards resolution of this important matter.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Harper?

2.0

MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. First let me thank the Court for its continuing attention to this case and this matter. It is, of course, of utmost importance to our beneficiary class and the entirety of Indian country. We, of course, agree, Your Honor, with your statement that this is a win; it is a win for our trust beneficiaries, it is a win for Indian country, and it turns the page on a problematic past.

We are disappointed that we have not yet had the legislation necessary to implement this important settlement.

We continue to be in a position to work with the Administration and with Congress to try to get it done as soon as possible. We appreciate your role in trying to push this forward.

You did mention that we have been out in

Indian country. And on that note I just wanted to say that that
has confirmed our understanding with our beneficiary class that
this is something they want, this is something that the vast
majority of individuals that we've met with have supported.

Indeed, we've done some 40 meetings, and in the vast majority of
those, there is not a single dissent. Everybody has been in
support. There are a few folks here and there that have made
statements in opposition, but then, of course, there are
procedures in place to deal with those individuals to the extent
that they are not satisfied with the resolution.

1 So we want to make clear that our trips out to 2 Indian country have not been in vain, that they have 3 demonstrated conclusively that there is broad support. We are again disappointed that the legislation has not been enacted 4 5 yet, but we will too join with the Administration in redoubling 6 our efforts to try to make sure that it gets done as soon as 7 possible. 8 Thank you, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Harper. If there's nothing 10 further, I think we've said what we need to say and done what we 11 need to do today. 12 Again, the defense motion for leave to contact the --

Again, the defense motion for leave to contact the -make appropriate contact with the plaintiff class is granted,
and if there's nothing further, we're adjourned until about the
middle of May. Hopefully we don't -- hopefully we'll reconvene
for a different purpose at that time.

17

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
2	
3	I, Rebecca Stonestreet, certify that the foregoing is a
4	correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
5	above-entitled matter.
6	
7	
8	
9	
. 0	SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE
.1	
.2	
.3	
. 4	
.5	
. 6	
. 8	
.9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	