

From: Appel, Elizabeth
To: [Bowman, Randal](#)
Cc: [Anthony Rodman](#); [Sarah Walters](#); [Miles Janssen](#)
Subject: Re: 2 Monument review documents for review, deadline 2 pm Thursday June 8
Date: Thursday, June 08, 2017 3:47:30 PM
Attachments: [05 - Navajo Nation-Ute Mountain Ute Tribe-Ute Indian Tribe-Zuni Pueblo.pdf](#)
[06 - Pueblo of Laguna.pdf](#)
[Portland 05-25-2017.pdf](#)

Hi Randy-

Thanks for reviewing so quickly! I'm attaching the written input of the Navajo Nation and other Tribes, and of the Pueblo of Laguna, expressing their opposition to any change to Bears Ears monument.

We have also heard nearly unanimous opposition at the listening sessions. We only have one transcript to date, which I am attaching FYI.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information.

Thanks again!
Liz

On Thu, Jun 8, 2017 at 3:29 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

(b) (5) DPP



(b) (5) DPP



however,
neither SOL nor myself has been able to find this in any written comments. Do you have this from your comment site, or did they state this to Jim Cason during the May 25 meeting? I have a question in to him on this, but if you have such a statement in writing, or were at the meeting where they said it, we will go with this. It is what everyone thinks their position is, but we don't want to rely on media reports. And same question on the Bears Ears Commission.

On Thu, Jun 8, 2017 at 2:55 PM, Appel, Elizabeth <elizabeth.appel@bia.gov> wrote:

Hi Randy-

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. I am attaching suggested edits from IA.

Please let us know if you would like to discuss any of our suggestions or if we can provide any additional information.

Liz

On Thu, Jun 8, 2017 at 1:39 PM, Moore, Nikki <nmoore@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi Randy,

Please find attached our suggested edits on the two documents. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Nikki

Nikki Moore

Acting Deputy Assistant Director, National Conservation Lands and Community Partnerships

Bureau of Land Management, Washington D.C.

202.219.3180 (office)

202.740.0835 (cell)

On Wed, Jun 7, 2017 at 5:49 PM, Bowman, Randal <randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Attached are drafts of the interim report on the monument review process and the economic report on the Bears Ears monument. Please review and have any comments back to me by 3 pm tomorrow, June 8.

Due to late edits to the draft economic report there are some formatting issues there that will be corrected; no need to comment on those.

I regret the short turn-around, but that is likely to be the norm for this process.

--

Elizabeth K. Appel

Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action

Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs

(202) 273-4680 - office

(202) 738-6065 - cell

--

Elizabeth K. Appel

Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action

Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs

(202) 273-4680 - office

(202) 738-6065 - cell

**National Monument Review
Department of the Interior
1849 C St. NW
Washington, DC 20240**

**COMMENTS OF
THE HOPI TRIBE, NAVAJO NATION,
UTE MOUNTAIN UTE TRIBE.
UTE INDIAN TRIBE, AND ZUNI PUEBLO**

May 25, 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Nature and Validity of This Review of Monument Designations.....	2
Bears Ears: A Tribal Homeland Since Time Immemorial.....	3
The Origins of the Monument: Defining the Boundaries of the Cultural Landscape.....	4
The Tribal Proposal.....	6
The Administration’s Extensive Public Outreach and Thorough Analysis of Legal Requirements.....	11
The Presidential Proclamation.....	14
Conclusion.....	16
Bibliography.....	19

Introduction

The creation of the Bears Ears National Monument represents a landmark in the long history of the American public lands system. It is also a notable event in our Tribal histories. Together, we five Tribes took the lead in making this Monument a reality. We conceived of this Monument, helped build overwhelming support for it locally and nationally, and carried the many justifications for it to Washington DC. We earned this Monument every step of the way. It was well worth it, but it required a huge amount of work.

For us, Bears Ears is homeland. It always has been and still is. The culture is everywhere. The canyons and forests hold many sacred sites. Family gatherings, dances, and ceremonies are held at special places within Bears Ears. People go to Bears Ears to gather roots, berries, pinon nuts, weaving materials, and medicines. We go for healing. Stone cliff-dwellings and trails, testaments to the Old People, have survived thousands of years of wear and weather. Our ancestors are buried there. We can hear the songs and prayers of our ancestors on every mesa and in every canyon.

Attempting to eliminate or reduce the boundaries of this Monument would be wrong on every count. Such action would be illegal, beyond the reach of presidential authority. Bears Ears enjoys overwhelming popularity nationally—and extensive and passionate support in the State of Utah as well. It would be a travesty to leave this landscape vulnerable to the wounds inflicted by uranium and fossil-fuel mining, and excessive off-road vehicle use. Additionally, there has been ghastly looting and grave robbing that continues to this day, which was a major impetus for the Monument status. Citizens of America and the world would lose the opportunity to enjoy the wonders of one of the most remote and wondrous landscapes found anywhere. They would lose,

as well, the opportunity for Bears Ears to become home to a world-class institute on indigenous Traditional Knowledge.

The radical idea of breaking up Bears Ears National Monument would be a slap in the face to the members of our Tribes and an affront to Indian people all across the country. We did not bring forth grievances. We brought a solution: the permanent protection of a great natural and cultural landscape. When the President of the United States created the Monument, he accepted our solution and promised that the lands within the Monument would be protected for us and the generations that come after us. Bears Ears is too precious a place, and our cultures and values too dignified and worthy, to backtrack on the promises made in the Presidential Proclamation.

The Nature and Validity of This Review of Monument Designations

On April 26, 2017, President Trump called for an unprecedented review of national monument designations made since January 1, 1996, where the designation covers more than 100,000 acres, or where the Secretary of Interior determines that the designation or expansion was made without adequate public outreach or coordination with relevant stakeholders. The review is purportedly to determine whether the designations conform to the objectives of the Antiquities Act. However, there is no statute authorizing any such review of monuments, nor statutory authority for any public comment period, and certainly no authority—statutory or otherwise—to diminish or revoke any monument. Any such presidential action would be ultra vires and unconstitutional. Therefore, although we have no choice but to respond, the public process created by this order is unauthorized and void.

Pursuant to President Trump's executive order, the Department of the Interior is reviewing monument designations and seeking comments as part of the review. 82 Fed. Reg.

22016 (May 11, 2017). As part of the review, the Secretary is purportedly considering several factors. *See* 82 Fed. Reg. 20429-20430 (May 1, 2017). We are confused by the inclusion of factors outside of the statutory text of the Antiquities Act, as they are irrelevant to whether or not Bears Ears was properly designated. As such, any recommendation by the Secretary to the President that is based on information outside the scope or authority of the Secretary or President under the Antiquities Act would be improper. The President has authority to designate national monuments, but does not have authority to eliminate, shrink, or move the boundaries of them.

As will be seen below, Bears Ears easily fits within the objectives of the Antiquities Act, and was the product of extensive public outreach, coordination with relevant stakeholders, and substantive research.

Bears Ears: A Tribal Homeland Since Time Immemorial

Our Tribes came to the Bears Ears landscape at different times. Some of us have been there forever, and some came later. We inhabited, hunted, gathered, prayed, and built civilizations. Our presence, much in evidence today, covered the whole region and is manifested in migration routes, ancient roads, great houses, villages, granaries, hogans, wickiups, sweat lodges, corrals, petroglyphs and pictographs, tipi rings, and shade houses. Bears Ears holds more than 100,000 Native American cultural sites and is widely recognized as one of the world's premier areas for archaeological resources.

By the mid-19th century, the United States became determined to open the American Southwest to homesteading. This meant moving Indian people off many traditional lands and that included Bears Ears. Utes and Navajos were force-marched to reservations. For the Navajo, this was the Long Walk to Bosque Redondo in New Mexico. In particular, the White Canyon region of Bears Ears remains a significant historical site because of its many *Nahonidzho*, or

escaping places, used by Navajos to protect themselves from the soldiers. The Zuni and Hopi were spared the violence of the forced removal because, after thousands of years of residence in Bears Ears, they had relocated to their current pueblos to the south and southeast.

For generations, federal policy required Indian people to remain on their reservations and pueblos. The sense of homeland and the ancestors, however, was too strong. People avoided their federal overseers and found ways to return to Bears Ears for hunting, gathering, and ceremonies. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as federal policy relented, the non-Indian residents of San Juan County regularly forced Native Americans out of Bears Ears, sometimes violently. Yet our people continued to find ways to return.

As Tribes became more active after World War II, we began talking about Bears Ears. The looting and grave robbing had been intensifying ever since the 1890s, causing widespread destruction. In 1968, Robert Kennedy came to the Navajo reservation during his presidential campaign. He held a meeting in Bluff and Navajo people urged him to protect the Ancient Puebloan villages and other archaeological resources.

The Origins of the Monument: Defining the Boundaries of the Cultural Landscape

The push for Bears Ears began in earnest in 2010 with the creation of the grassroots non-profit organization, Utah Diné Bikéyah (UDB). UDB was formed with a primary objective of protecting Bears Ears. Looking back, we can see that the formation of UDB was an important step on the road to the Bears Ears National Monument.

Early on, UDB set out on a project that was ambitious in the extreme. People were already discussing the possibility of creating a wilderness area, national park, national monument, or other appropriate classification. UDB defined its goal as establishing conclusively the proper boundaries, defined scientifically, culturally, and historically, necessary to protect the

Bears Ears homeland. After much deliberation, it settled upon a methodology, one which would require a prodigious amount of work. The interdisciplinary effort was based on thorough ethnographic research featuring an intensive interviewing regime; research by academic experts in ecology, biology, anthropology, archaeology, and public policy; Traditional Knowledge; extensive data on wildlife species obtained from Utah state wildlife officials; and data analysis.

The ethnographic data resulted in sophisticated and highly reliable cultural mapping. See generally Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, *Protecting the Whole Bears Ears Landscape: A Call to Honor the Full Cultural and Ecological Boundaries* (2016). Seventy cultural interviews were conducted by a Navajo traditionalist fluent in English and the Diné languages and possessing ethnographic training. The resulting ethnographic data was captured and organized on a fine scale. Maps were then prepared using that information to show why 1.9 million acres should be set aside as a cultural landscape.

This ethnographic mapping process benefited from Traditional Knowledge, which is increasingly recognized by western sciences and scholarship and used by federal agencies in land management and planning. Traditional Knowledge is derived from keen observation carried out and passed down over hundreds or thousands of years. It represents another way of knowing the social and ecological landscape. It is invaluable to scientists in places where it remains intact—places such as Bears Ears. The Presidential Proclamation rightly refers to Traditional Knowledge several times and emphasizes its critical place in future land management at the Bears Ears National Monument.

This intensive work began in 2010 and continued for 6 ½ years. It was a joined enterprise of Traditional Knowledge and western sciences. It reflected the careful, dedicated, and knowledgeable work of hundreds of Native people and dozens of academics. Their work shows

that the Bears Ears landscape is one discrete unit, bound together in numerous ways, and it blends perfectly with other protected federal and Tribal lands.

UDB released its Bears Ears proposal in April, 2013. The Proposal called for a 1.9 million acre protected area that could be designated as a national monument, wilderness area, national recreation area, or other classification under federal law. The carefully-considered, data-driven boundaries developed by UDB quickly became accepted as a serious proposal that deserved serious attention. While Utah public officials were generally noncommittal or negative, the boundaries were praised by conservation groups and many federal officials. We Indian people were inspired by the Proposal and the hard work that went into it, especially the cultural mapping that UDB developed that so fully represented Native American values.

For its part, UDB was disappointed and frustrated by the opposition or disinterest of Utah federal, state, and county politicians. In 2014, UDB turned to the Tribes to support and carry the Proposal. This was only logical. Federal Indian policy is based on the federal-tribal relationship and the Tribes would be the appropriate advocates to carry the Proposal forward. As a result, protecting Bears Ears increasingly became a major subject in the minds of the Tribes of the Southwest during 2014 and 2015.

The Tribal Proposal

We held many meetings, large and small, and made conference calls to discuss the alternatives. It became clear to us that there were two broad considerations. As a legal matter, what were the pros and cons of the different land classifications—wilderness, national monument, national recreation area, and others? At least as important, though, was the question of which would be the best forum—legislation controlled by the Utah delegation or a national monument proclamation developed by the administration and signed by President Obama?

In 2013, the Utah delegation was developing the so-called Public Lands Initiative (PLI). This was an initiative, led by Congressmen Bishop and Chaffetz, with the professed goal of reaching a consensus agreement among all stakeholders over the public lands of Eastern and Southern Utah, an area of great cultural value, beauty, and mineral potential. The general idea was that an agreement would lead to congressional legislation putting some federal lands in wilderness and other protected status and allowing multiple-use development to proceed on most of the other lands. We wanted to develop an agreement through the PLI process, but also wanted to ensure that Bears Ears was properly protected. As a result, we analyzed the options of PLI and national monument status, among others.

We were very apprehensive about entering into discussions on the PLI. Up to that time, the Utah leaders had never taken us seriously. This was in spite of the fact that we worked tirelessly on the PLI process, putting in as much or more effort than any party involved in the process. We made at least 25 presentations at PLI meetings, complete with maps, a two-page summary of the UDB proposal (the precursor to the later and more comprehensive Coalition Proposal), and substantial oral presentations. Congressional staff were present at approximately a dozen of these meetings. We also made four separate trips to Washington DC to meet with the Utah delegation; at each of those meetings, we made extensive statements complete with maps and a summary of the Proposal. At all of these meetings, both in the field and in Washington DC, we asked for comments on our proposal. It was to no avail.

In spite of our extensive and unwavering efforts, in no instance did anyone from the Utah delegation or the PLI make a single substantive comment, positively or negatively, on our proposal. Our painful experience with attempting to make an inroad into the PLI process was

epitomized by our dealings with the San Juan County Commission. Although the proponents of the PLI described the process as “open” and “ground-up,” PLI leaders said that they were relying heavily on the county commission. Indeed, we were told to present our proposal to the San Juan County Commission.

As part of the PLI process, the San Juan County Commission conducted a public comment survey on PLI in 2014 to gauge support for various land use proposals for Bears Ears. The UDB proposal was initially identified as “Alternative D” and the County Commission staff agreed to include Alternative D in the list of alternatives on the survey. Then, the staff broke that promise and refused to include Alternative D on the list for the formal comment process.

Supporters of Alternative D (Bears Ears) waged a write-in campaign. Despite being omitted from the list, the Bears Ears proposal received 300 positive comments, 64% of the 467 total comments received in the County. The Commission then completely rejected the results of its own survey—and the wishes of the Indian people who constitute nearly 60% of the population of San Juan County—and selected the heavy-development, low conservation “Alternative B.” Alternative B had received just two comments, one half of 1% of the total.

In spite of the extraordinary unfairness of this proceeding—the kind of raw, heavy-handed political overreaching rarely seen in America today—at no time has San Juan County, the PLI, or the Utah delegation ever seen fit to acknowledge it, much less apologize and disown it.

In 2015, the Tribes decided to hold a special meeting to decide what the strategy should be. The meeting was held in Towaoc at the Ute Mountain Ute Reservation on July 15-17, 2015. The third day, Friday, was reserved for a meeting with federal officials from Washington, D.C.

The day before, at the Thursday meeting in Towaoc, Tribal leaders had made a series of critical decisions that energized the already enthusiastic Bears Ears movement.

UDB and the Navajo Nation had always wanted this effort to be headed up by a multi-Tribal organization comprised of the Tribes that used the Bears Ears area the most. Thus, on that day at Towaoc, to unite formally in furtherance of protecting the sacred Bears Ears landscape, Tribal leaders from Hopi, Navajo, the Ute Indian Tribes, Ute Mountain Ute, and the Pueblo of Zuni agreed to create the historic Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition to protect and preserve the homeland area they all care so deeply about. All of the Tribes passed resolutions on the subject before the meeting or shortly after it. The five Tribes then adopted an MOU setting forth the mission, function, and procedures for the Coalition. (The Coalition continues to exist and is dedicated to grassroots organizing and public outreach. The Bears Ears Tribal Commission, was created by the Presidential Proclamation as a land management entity for the National Monument.)

The newly-formed Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, recognizing the significance of the creation and management of a Bears Ears National Monument, decided to craft a comprehensive, detailed proposal, to be submitted to the President by a self-imposed deadline of October 15, 2015. Submission by this date would allow the President ample time to consider, and hopefully sign, a proclamation under the Antiquities Act, before the end of his term. This would also allow time for the Bishop-Chaffetz PLI process to review our proposal and include all or part of it in its proposed legislation, if so inclined.

During the late summer of 2015, the Tribes held four more well-attended, intensive day-long meetings, hosted at the reservations of the Coalition members, to review draft proposals in depth. These meetings, combined with UDB's work since 2010, allowed us to become well-

informed in all of the issues related to achieving and carrying out a complex federal land management program.

The Proposal had many aspects to it, but two were the most fundamental to the Tribes. We strongly recommended the 1.9 million acre national monument with the boundaries developed by UDB's comprehensive, in-depth research and analysis. In addition, we discussed Collaborative Management often and in-depth, and unanimously put forth a strong version of Collaborative Management between our Tribes and the federal agencies in which Traditional Knowledge would play an essential role.

Our Proposal reflects our intimate connection with Bears Ears, a cultural landscape densely inhabited by the stories, histories, prayers, and practices of people and place over millennia. Tucked among the canyons, folds, meadows, and promontories of Bears Ears rest an estimated 100,000 archaeological sites, regarded by researchers as world-class objects of scientific inquiry. Kivas, granaries, hogans, rock art panels, graves, and many more historic and prehistoric markers—all the work of our ancestors—are found throughout this area, preserved relatively undisturbed for centuries by the Colorado Plateau's arid climate and rugged terrain.

The supplemental report, Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, *Protecting the Whole Bears Ears Landscape: A Call to Honor the Full Cultural and Ecological Boundaries* October 18, 2016, includes both maps and narrative descriptions of the importance and significance of the five geographic regions that comprise the whole of the Bears Ears National Monument: The Confluence, White Canyon, Indian Creek, Headwaters, and Cedar Mesa. *Id.* Each of the Bears Ears regions stand as significant historic and cultural landscapes deserving of a national monument designation in its own right. Taken as a whole, these five regions interlace to tell a

compelling story of ancient cultures—even reaching into the present day with dwellings established as recently as the 1920s.

In all, our proposal represented the true voice of these Tribes and our determination to present to the United States a program that is workable in the real world of land management. We believed then and now that our proposal, as now mostly embodied in the Presidential Proclamation, will add even more luster to the proud American system of conservation lands and, as well, bring justice to Tribes and this sacred landscape.

The Coalition submitted its comprehensive proposal to the Obama Administration on October 15, 2015 *See* Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, *Proposal to President Barack Obama for the Creation of Bears Ears National Monument* 18 (Oct. 15, 2015).

<http://www.bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Bears-Ears-Inter-Tribal-Coalition-Proposal-10-15-15.pdf>.

The Administration's Extensive Public Outreach and Thorough Analysis of Legal Requirements

The Obama Administration put in an inordinate amount of time and expertise in conducting comprehensive research, reaching out to the public, and developing its position on Bears Ears. It was a big issue. Opposition was small in numbers but very loud—although there was a magnificent outpouring of public support for the Monument, the Utah congressional delegation and various state officials all were extremely active in pressing their positions with administration officials. But, from top to bottom, the administration developed and analyzed a tremendous amount of scientific, historical, economic, cultural, and legal material. On our trips back to Washington, we never failed to be amazed by the number of dedicated administration people who actively responded to the public and were deeply familiar with all or some of the issues.

For our part, beginning with the presentation of our Proposal, we began a 14-month period in which we had numerous meetings and conference calls with officials in the Interior Department, Forest Service, and Council on Environmental Quality. Most of our people live in remote areas in the Southwest, and travel to the East Coast is grueling, but we made many, many trips to Washington DC.

We established a substantial public relations program and reached out locally and nationally through public meetings, op-ed articles, and television and radio presentations. Gradually, support for Bears Ears and our proposed collaborative management regime rose across the country. The only place where there was opposition was in the state of Utah, but public opinion polls showed that the Utah citizenry was about equally divided. Opponents blithely stated that “the people of San Juan County” oppose Bears Ears, ignoring the fact that the Native American population in the county is nearly 60%.

Virtually every major newspaper in the country supported the national monument. Especially notable is the Salt Lake City *Tribune*, with the largest circulation in Utah. The *Tribune* invested more resources in reporting on the issue than any other media outlet in the country, editorialized in favor of the Monument several times, and often exposed misinformation being released by the Utah delegation.

The Obama Administration welcomed and received the views of the public. The Antiquities Act does not require any specific procedures, other than the entry of a proclamation by the President. But the President directed that this be an open process. The administration received all manner of written opinions by letters and email. Meetings were arranged with countless organizations and individuals. Utah public officials, for example, had ongoing

meetings and communications with the President, high White House officials, the two secretaries, heads of agencies, and career staff. As late as December 21, 2016, just one week before the Proclamation was signed, the Governor of Utah's office complimented the staff to the Department of the Interior on the time and attention that they devoted to this issue.

In an exceptional display of reaching out to the public, Secretary Sally Jewell, accompanied by top Interior and Agriculture officials, traveled to Bluff, Utah and held a day-long open public hearing in which more than one hundred citizens, drawn by lot, made two-minute statements. *See* <http://bluffutah.org/secretary-jewell-to-discuss-protection-of-bears-ears-at-public-meeting>. Every perspective was represented. The overflow crowd was estimated at approximately 2,000; the largest gathering ever held in Bluff.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has documented the timeline of events that led up to the Bears Ears Proclamation. The timeline and the documentation reveal repeated contacts, meetings, coordination, and outreach by the Obama Administration with the Utah delegation, governor, and local communities prior to the Monument Proclamation. *See Documents Obtained by Oversight Committee Refute Republican Claims That Obama Administration Did Not Consult on Bears Ears Monument Designation*, Committee On Oversight and Government Reform (April 13, 2017), <https://democrats-oversight.house.gov/news/press-releases/documents-obtained-by-oversight-committee-refute-republican-claims-that-obama>. To show the extensive public outreach and coordination in the creation of the Bears Ears National Monument, we incorporate by reference the timeline and documentation of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

In addition to attending to public outreach, the President and the administration gave long and careful attention to two provisions in the Antiquities Act that were especially relevant to the

creation of this Monument. The statute allows presidents to create national monuments to protect “objects” of historic or scientific interest. While the legal definition of “objects” is very broad and calls for extensive discretion by presidents, the designation of such objects is critical to the creation of any monument. In this case, administration officials gave the matter continuing consideration. The result can be seen in the Proclamation, which identifies a great many objects and places them in context. The other provision is that, under the Antiquities Act, national monuments “shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.” While uniform case law gives very broad authority to presidents—Congress delegated authority to create national monuments to the President, “in his discretion” in the Antiquities Act—agency officials scrutinized this issue at length. State of Utah and mining company executives pressed for reducing the acreage. Finally, the Proclamation made a major reduction from the Tribes’ proposal of 1.9 million acres down to 1.35 million acres, a cut of nearly 30%. This action, which we strenuously opposed, brought the size of the Monument down nearly to the acreage allocated for protection under the Bishop-Chaffetz proposal in the PLI. Certainly, however, the current acreage is easily supported as “the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.”

The Presidential Proclamation

The Presidential Proclamation of December 28, 2016 reflects the long and hard work that the administration put into it. The new Monument is tailor-made for coverage under the Antiquities Act of 1906, which Congress passed in response to the destruction of the kind of exquisite Southwestern archaeological resources that are so abundant at Bears Ears. Every part of the Monument holds “historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic and scientific interest,” the core requirement of the Antiquities Act and the evocative

Proclamation identifies such archaeological objects in great detail. The Proclamation is equally expansive with objects that are historical, geological, anthropological, paleontological, ecological, hydrological, botanical, and biological. Proclamation No. 9558, 82 Fed. Reg. 1139-43 (Dec. 28, 2016). These objects exist everywhere within the Monument.

The Proclamation recognizes the “[a]bundant rock art, ancient cliff dwellings, ceremonial sites, and countless other artifacts [that] provide an extraordinary archaeological and cultural record.” While the area is important to all Americans, the Proclamation recognizes that “the land is profoundly sacred to many Native American Tribes, including the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah Ouray, Hopi Nation, and [Pueblo of] Zuni.”

The Proclamation notes that the earliest Native people—from the Clovis to the Ancestral Puebloans—utilized the Bears Ears region for millennia. *Id.* “The remains of single family dwellings, granaries, kivas, towers, and large villages, and roads linking them together, reveal a complex cultural history. ‘Moki steps,’ hand and toe holds carved into steep canyon walls by the Ancestral Puebloans, illustrate the early people’s ingenuity and perseverance and are still used today to access dwellings along cliff walls.”

The “petroglyphs and pictographs capture the imagination with images dating back at least 5,000 years and spanning a range of styles and traditions. From life-size ghostlike figures that defy categorization, to the more literal depictions of bighorn sheep, birds, and lizards, these drawings enable us to feel the humanity of these ancient artists.”

We were disappointed by the Obama Administration’s reduction of the Monument from our proposal of 1.9 million acres down to 1.35 million acres. Virtually all of the changes were made to accommodate mining interests. We were saddened because those areas are all culturally

important to us and now may well be developed in disruptive ways that detract from the values of the Monument lands themselves.

But, otherwise, the Proclamation achieved our goals. The provisions for collaborative management vary somewhat from our proposal but the end result is truly exciting in that it calls for deep involvement—not just “consultation” or “advice”—of our tribal Commission as a “partner” in management of the Monument. The Proclamation leaves no doubt about the central importance of our Traditional Knowledge in management of this Monument: “The traditional ecological knowledge amassed by the Native Americans whose ancestors inhabited this region, passed down from generation to generation, offers critical insight into the historic and scientific significance of the area. Such knowledge is, itself, a resource to be protected and used in understanding and managing this landscape sustainably for generations to come.” 82 Fed Reg. at 1140.


As an overarching matter, the Proclamation alludes to, and honors, Indian people in the way we would wish. It describes our cultural practices in terms that are accurate, neither demeaning nor romantic. The Proclamation is not locked in the past: it acknowledges contributions of both our ancestors and Native Americans today. Traditional Knowledge, for example, is correctly recognized as being possessed by us both historically and contemporarily. In the past, monument proclamations made only passing references to Native Americans. In this case, about one-quarter of the text is dedicated to our people and our relationship to all that is the Bears Ears landscape. In reading the Proclamation, one can see—and it means a great deal to us—that President Obama created the Bears Ears National Monument to honor Indian Tribes (both past and present), the land, and the relationship between the Tribes and the land.

Conclusion

As can be seen from these comments, there was extensive public outreach and coordination with relevant stakeholders and the Bears Ears National Monument easily conforms to the objectives of the Antiquities Act. Under the Antiquities Act, presidents have authority to create new national monuments, but not to extinguish or diminish existing monuments. An attempt to do either one would be struck down by the courts as executive overreaching. We are attaching a short, recent article in which distinguished scholars address this matter entitled, .

Leaving the Monument fully intact is also the correct result as a matter of right and wrong. The wonderful Bears Ears National Monument is a gift to the citizens of the United States and the world. Once experienced, the physical beauty of the red-rock terrain and the cultural power of the Old People stay with visitors forever. As for us, we personally have received a great gift also, but most of all we think of our ancestors. They gave us everything we have and this Monument honors them, their wisdom, and their way of life. As President Theodore Roosevelt said in proclaiming the 800,000-acre Grand Canyon National Monument under the Antiquities Act, "Leave it just as it is. You cannot improve upon it."

THE NAVAJO NATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Russell Begaye". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Russell" and last name "Begaye" clearly distinguishable.

Russell Begaye, *President*

Bibliography

- Abel, A. H. (1915). *The Official Correspondence of James S. Calhoun: While Indian Agent at Santa Fe and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Adams, W. Y. (1959). Navajo and Anglo Reconstruction of Prehistoric Sites in Southeastern Utah. *American Antiquity* , 25 (2), 269-272.
- Adams, W. Y., & Adams, N. K. (1959). An Inventory of Prehistoric Sites on the Lower San Juan River, Utah. *Museum of Northern Arizona, Bulletin* , 31 (Glen Canyon Series, No. 1).
- Adams, W. Y., Lindsay Jr., A. J., & Turner II, C. G. (1961). Survey and Excavations In Lower Glen Canyon, 1952-1958. *Museum of Northern Arizona: Bulletin* , 36 (Glen Canyon Series No. 3).
- Aton, J. M., & McPherson, R. S. (2000). *River Flowing From The Sunrise: An Environmental History Of The Lower San Juan*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Benally, C. (1982). *Dinéjį Nákéé Nááhane': A Utah Navajo History*. Monticello, UT: San Juan School District.
- Brugge, D. M. (2012). Emergence of the Navajo People. In D. J. Seymour (Ed.), *From the Land of Ever Winter to the American Southwest: Athapaskan Migrations, Mobility, and Ethnogenesis*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Brugge, D. M. (1996). Navajo Archaeology, A Promising Past. In R. H. Towner (Ed.), *The Archaeology of Navajo Origins* (pp. 255-271). Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Brugge, D. M. (1983). Navajo Prehistory and History to 1850. In A. Ortiz (Ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians: The Southwest* (Vol. 10, pp. 489-501). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Brugge, D. M. (1966?). *Navajo Use and Occupation of Lands North of the San Juan River in Present-Day Utah to 1935*. Unpublished.
- Brugge, D. M. (1964). Vizcarra's Navajo Campaign of 1823. *Arizona and the West* , 6 (3), 223-244.
- Bureau of Land Management. (2007). *Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* (BLM-UT-PL07-007-1610 ed.). Monticello: Monticello Field Office: Bureau of Land Management.

- Carlson, R. L. (2012). Issues in Athapaskan Prehistory. In D. J. Seymour (Ed.), *From the Land of Ever Winter to the American Southwest: Athapaskan Migrations, Mobility, and Ethnogenesis*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Correll, J. L. (1971). Navajo Frontiers in Utah and Troublous Times in Monument Valley. *Utah Historical Quarterly* , 39 (2), 145-161.
- Crampton, C. G. (1960). Historic sites in Glen Canyon, Mouth of the San Juan River to Lee's Ferry. *University of Utah, Anthropological Papers* , 46.
- Crampton, C. G. (1959). Outline History of the Glen Canyon Region, 1776-1922. *University of Utah: Anthropological Papers* , 46 (Glen Canyon Series: 9).
- Davis, E. L. (1965). Small Pressures and Cultural Drift as Explanations for Abandonment of the San Juan Area, New Mexico and Arizona. *American Antiquity* , 30 (3), 353-355.
- Day, K. C. (1964). Appendix II: Survey and Tested Sites. In F. W. Sharrock, J. D. Jennings, & C. C. Stout (Eds.), *Anthropological Papers: 1962 Excavations, Glen Canyon Area (Glen Canyon Series No. 25)* (Vol. 73, pp. 141 -152). Salt Lake City: University of Utah - Department of Anthropology.
- Doyel, D. E. (1982). Medicine Men, Ethnic Significance, and Cultural Resource Management. *American Antiquity* , 47 (3), 634-642.
- Dykeman, D. D., & Roebuck, P. (2012). Navajo Emergence in Dinétah: Social Imaginary and Archaeology. In D. J. Seymour (Ed.), *From the Land of Ever Winter to the American Southwest: Athapaskan Migrations, Mobility, and Ethnogenesis*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Pres.
- Edison, C. A. (1996). Willow Stories: An Introduction. In C. A. Edison (Ed.), *Willow Stories: Utah Navajo Baskets* (pp. 8-15). Salt Lake City: Utah Arts Council.
- Ewing, J. (2016). Geographic Sampling of Antiquities of Bears Ears. *Friends of Cedar Mesa*.
- Ewing, J (2016). Geographic Sampling of Paleontological Resources in Bears Ears. *Friends of Cedar Mesa*
- Fowler, D., Gunnerson, J., Jennings, J., Lister, R., Suhm, D., & Weller, T. (1959). The Glen Canyon Archaeological Survey, Part 2. *University of Utah, Anthropological Papers* , 39 (Glen Canyon Series, No. 6), 319-707.
- Gill, S. (1983). Navajo Views Of Their Origins. In A. Ortiz (Ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians: The Southwest* (Vol. 10, pp. 502-505). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Insitution.

- Gilmore, K. P., & Larmore, S. (2012). Looking for Lovitt in All the Wrong Places: Migration Models and the Athapaskan Diaspora as Viewed from Eastern Colorado. In D. J. Seymour (Ed.), *From the Land of Ever Winter to the American Southwest: Athapaskan Migrations, Mobility, and Ethnogenesis*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Grayeyes, W. (2013, May 5). Feedback on Literature Review Report. (G. Noyes, Pers Comm)
- Gregory, H. E. (1916). *The Navajo Country: A Geographic and Hydrographic Reconnaissance of parts of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Hester, J. J. (1971). Navajo Culture Change: From 1550 to 1960 and Beyond. In K. H. Basso, & M. E. Opler (Eds.), *Apachean Culture History and Ethnology* (pp. 51-68). Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.
- Hewett, E. L. (1906). Anthropologic Miscellanea: Origin of the Name Navaho. *American Anthropologist* , 8 (1), 192-207.
- Hobler, P. M., & Hobler, A. E. (1978). An Archeological Survey of the Upper White Canyon Area, Southeastern Utah. *Antiquities Section Selected Papers* , 5 (13).
- Huscher, B. H., & Huscher, H. A. (1942). Athapaskan Migration via the Intermontane Region. *American Antiquity* , 8 (1), 80-88.
- Janetski, J. C., Kreutzer, L., Talbot, R. K., Richens, L. D., & Baker, S. A. (2005). Life on the Edge: Archaeology in Capitol Reef National Park. *Museum of Peoples and Cultures, Occasional Papers* , 11.
- Jett, S. C. (1978). The Origins of Navajo Settlement Patterns. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* , 68 (3), 351-62.
- Jones, Kevin (2015). *Archaeological and Cultural Treasures of Bears Ears National Monument*. Utah Diné Bikéyah. Email utahdinebikeyah@gmail.com for a copy
- Kelley, K. B. (1986). *Navajo Land Use: An Ethnoarchaeological Study*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Kelley, K. B., & Whiteley, P. M. (1989). *Navajoland: Family Settlement and Land Use*. Tsailé, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.
- Kuckhorn, C., & Leighton, D. (1951). *The Navaho*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lane, L. (1999). Practical and Religious Meanings of the Navajo Hogan. In V. D. Nazarea (Ed.), *Ethnoecology: situated knowledge/located lives*. Tuscon: Universtiy of Arizon Press.

- Linford, L. D. (2000). *Navajo Places: History, Legend, Landscape*. Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.
- Littell, N. M. (1967). Finding 14: Navajo Use and Occupancy of the Northern Area North of the San Juan River. In *Proposed Findings Of Fact In Behalf Of The Navajo Tribe Of Indians In Area Of Overall Navajo Claim (Docket 229)* (Vol. 2, pp. 479-518). Window Rock: Navajo Printing Section.
- Magne, M. P. (2012). Modeling Athapaskan Migrations. In D. J. Seymour (Ed.), *From The Land of Ever Winter To the American Southwest*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Maryboy, N., & Begay, D. (2000). The Navajos. In F. S. Cuch (Ed.), *A History of Utah's American Indians* (pp. 265-314). Salt Lake City: Utah Division of Indian Affairs and Utah Division of State History.
- McGreevy, S. B. (1996). Contemporary Navajo Basket Makers. In C. A. Edison (Ed.), *Willow Stories: Utah Navajo Baskets* (pp. 22-29). Salt Lake City: Utah Arts Council.
- McPherson, R. S. (1996). A Brief History of the Utah Navajos. In *Willow Stories: Utah Navajo Baskets* (pp. 16-21). Salt Lake City: Utah Arts Council.
- McPherson, R. S. (2009). *Comb Ridge and Its People: The Ethnohistory of a Rock*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- McPherson, R. S. (2001). *Navajo Land, Navajo Culture: The Utah Experience In The Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- McPherson, R. S. (1992). *Sacred Land Sacred View*. Provo: Charles Redd Center for Western Studies, Brigham Young University.
- Newell, L. K. (1999). *A History of Piute County*. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Historical Society and Piute County Commission.
- Prudden, T. M. (1903). The Prehistoric Ruins of the San Juan Watershed in Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico. *American Anthropologist*, 5 (2), 224-288.
- Roessel, R. A. (1983). Navajo History 1850-1923. In A. Ortiz (Ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians: The Southwest* (pp. 506-523). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Schaafsma, P. (1980). *Indian Rock Art of the Southwest*. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Seymour, D. J. (2012). Isolating a Pre-differentiation Athapaskan Assemblage in the Southern Southwest: The Cerro Rojo Complex . In D. J. Seymour (Ed.), *From the Land of Ever Winter to the American Southwest: Athapaskan Migrations, Mobility, and Ethnogenesis*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Shepardson, M., & Hammond, B. (1970). *The Navajo Mountain Community*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shumway, G. L. (1980). Blanding: The Making of a Community. *Utah Historical Quarterly* , 48 (4), 390-405.

Sprangler, J. D., Yentsch, A. T., & Green, R. (2009). *Farming and Foraging on the Southwestern Frontier: An Overview of Previous Research of the Archaeological and Historical Resources of the Greater Cedar Mesa Area*. . Unpublished.


Stevens, M., Fenchel, G., & Hoag, C. (2000 йил 5-Dec). *Coyote Willow*. (USDA-NRCS, Producer) Retrieved 2013 йил 18-Feb from The PLANTS Database:
http://plants.usda.gov/plantguide/pdf/cs_saex.pdf

Stokes, M., & Smiley, T. (1963). Tree-ring Dates from the Navajo Land Claim: I. The Northern Sector. (W. J. Robinson, E. Holmsgaard, & H. C. Fritts, Eds.) *Tree-Ring Bulletin* , 25 (3-4).

Sucec, R. (2006). *Fulfilling Destinies, Sustaining Lives: The Landscape of the Waterpocket Fold: An Ethnographic Overview and Assessment of American Indian Histories and Resource Uses with Capitol Reef National Park, Utah and on Lands Surrounding It*. Denver: U.S. Department of Interior: National Park Service: Intermountain Region.

Towner, R. H. (2008). The Navajo Depopulation of Dinétah. *Journal of Anthropological Research* . 64 (4).

Worley-Hood, G. (2013). Land and Resource Use of the Utah Navajo. *Round River Conservation Studies* USGS National Gap Analysis Program. 2007. Digital Animal-Habitat Models for the Southwestern United States. Version 1.0. Center for Applied Spatial Ecology, New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, New Mexico State University



May 25, 2017

Secretary of the Department of the Interior

<http://www.regulations.gov>

DOI-2017-0002

Re: Comments to Bears Ears National Monument Review

The Pueblo of Laguna supports President Obama's designation of Bears Ears National Monument, and strongly opposes review of the designation as irresponsible and illegitimate for three reasons – (1) the designation was lawful and correct on the facts; (2) neither the President nor the Secretary have a legal basis to make any modifications, and (3) the factual basis for this review has been contrived. The Secretary should either withdraw the review, or justly conclude that the designation was appropriate.

The Secretary cannot implement the President's Executive Order 13972 (Order) "consistent with applicable law" as directed. Order at Sec. 3(b). The Order retroactively imposes constraints on prior national monument designations not authorized by the Antiquities Act of 1906 (Antiquities Act), or any other federal law. The Order sets forth a policy for future designations or expansions of national monuments under the Antiquities Act. Order at Sec. 1. The Order aspires that "[d]esignations should . . . appropriately balance the protection of landmarks, structures, and objects against appropriate use of Federal lands and the effects on surrounding lands and communities." Arguably, the President has authority to set policy for how he will treat future national monument designations. However, the President lacks authority to second-guess and modify past designations.

Absent any authority, the Order directs that "[t]he Secretary shall conduct a review" of national monuments designated after 1995 "where the Secretary determines that the designation . . . was made without adequate public outreach and coordination with relevant stakeholders." Order at Sec. 2. The Antiquities Act compelled no such criteria on national monument designations made by previous Presidents. And, the current President lacks authority to require the consideration of superimposed standards on previously-designated national monuments. The Antiquities Act "does not authorize [the President] to abolish [national monuments] after they have been established." 39 Op. Att'y Gen. 185, 185 (1938). Moreover, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) restricts the President's and the Secretary's authority over federal lands in this regard by directing that "[t]he Secretary shall not . . . modify or revoke any withdrawal creating national monuments under [the Antiquities Act]. 43 U.S.C. § 1714(j). Accordingly, the Secretary's review cannot, "consistent with applicable law," proceed as directed by the Order or as interpreted in Docket No. DOI-2017-0002, and should be withdrawn.

Notwithstanding the illegitimacy of the current review, Bears Ears National Monument designation received an enormous amount of careful consideration, including years of listening

to stakeholders. Dozens of community meetings and public discussions were held throughout 2016, including a well-attended public meeting with then-Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell in Bluff, Utah. The final monument designation boundaries are very close to what was proposed in the Utah delegation's Public Lands Initiative (PLI), and much smaller (550,000 acres) than the Tribally-led proposal. The record of "public outreach and coordination with relevant stakeholders" amply support Bears Ears National Monument were it left to this administration to designate.

Bears Ears is a sacred landscape with more than 100,000 Native American cultural sites, dozens of which were looted and desecrated between 2014 and 2015 alone. The proposal to establish it was developed by a coalition of five sovereign Tribal Governments (Hopi, Navajo, Ute Mountain Ute, Ute, and Zuni). Perhaps it is because of this unique circumstance that Bears Ears has been singled-out for fast-tracked illegal reconsideration under this administration. However, that alone was not the sole impetus for the designation. Bears Ears is also home to scientific wonders, irreplaceable wildlife and biodiversity, and recreational opportunities that form a vital base to the local economy. That is why Utah citizens, Americans across the country, and many other Indian tribes (like the Pueblo of Laguna) have all agreed it should be protected for future generations.

Most Americans support protection of public lands. According to a 2016 study from Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, more than 93 percent of respondents said that historical sites, public lands, and national parks should be protected for current and future generations. Reducing the size of Bears Ears will primarily benefit the profiteering extractive industries to the detriment of the important qualities intended for protection by the designation. Any change in the monument will benefit abusers who act as though Federal public land is their private domain, or those who neither respect nor appreciate Bears Ears' irreplaceable aspects. Any reduction in protection will cause irreparable harm and not adhere to the will of the majority, but benefit only an insignificant minority. The Pueblo of Laguna joins with a majority of Americans in Western states that support the protection that national monument status affords Bears Ears.

While Pueblo of Laguna is not opposed to sensible energy development, we believe the Bears Ears National Monument area has greater value as protected wildlife, cultural, recreational, and historical resources than any temporary economic gain from mineral resource extraction. Rather than sacrificing this incomparable place for the removal of low-quality energy and mineral resources, which exist in abundance elsewhere, the National Park-quality landscape deserves permanent protection. Thus, the unauthorized review should be withdrawn, or at a minimum should recommend National Park designation by Congress.

Respectfully,


Virgil Siow, Governor



COURT REPORTING

LEGAL VIDEOGRAPHY

VIDEOCONFERENCING


TRIAL PRESENTATION

MOCK JURY SERVICES

LEGAL TRANSCRIPTION

COPYING AND SCANNING

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS



DEPOSITION AND TRIAL



(800) 528-3335

NAEGELIUSA.COM

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

AFFILIATED TRIBES of NORTHWEST INDIANS

MID-YEAR CONVENTION 2107

TRIBAL LISTENING SESSION

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2017

3:15 P.M.

DOUBLE TREE HOTEL

1000 NORTHEAST MULTNOMAH BOULEVARD

PORTLAND, OREGON 97232

TRIBAL LISTENING SESSION**REVIEW OF DESIGNATIONS UNDER THE ANTIQUITIES ACT****MAY 25, 2017****3:15 P.M.**

MR. RODMAN: We're going to go ahead and get started with the second listening session. This listening session is regarding Executive Order 13792, which was issued on April 26, 2017. And the title is Review of Designations under the Antiquities Act.

I'm Morgan Rodman. I'm with the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs in Osage. And we have some colleagues on the panel as well, but before we get too far, I would like to ask Councilperson Valerie Switzler from Warm Springs, would you mind providing an opening for us, please

MS. SWITZLER: (Speaking Native American.)

Thank you Heavenly Father for bringing us here today. I ask that you pour down your blessing upon each and everyone. When we put you first, Lord, we will not get lost. For you, Lord, I offer this one song.

(Singing.)

1 Thank you, Lord, in your name we pray, Amen.

2 **MR. RODMAN:** Thank you so much,
3 Councilperson.

4 Why don't we go ahead and start with the
5 introductions.

6 **MS. FORTMANN:** Hi, I'm Tracy Fortmann,
7 representing the National Parks Service. And I'm
8 the Superintendent, Fort Vancouver National Historic
9 Site. I have the privilege and honor of working
10 government-to-government with 26 federally-
11 recognized tribes tied to my site, and I think this
12 is a wonderful opportunity to hear from you in this
13 listening session.

14 **MS. BLANCHARD:** Good afternoon, I'm Becky
15 Blanchard here representing the U.S. Forest Service.
16 My job is the wilderness, wild and scenic rivers and
17 congressionally-designated program -- areas Program
18 Manager for Region 6, which is Oregon and
19 Washington. I'm honored to be here with you and to
20 hear you and to carry back to the agency your input.

21 **MS. WEIL:** My name is Jody Weil. I'm the
22 Acting State Director for the Bureau of Land
23 Management, and I'm looking forward to hearing your
24 comments and concerns about all the monuments that
25 we manage across the country.

1 **MR. LOUDERMILK:** Good afternoon,
2 everybody. Some of you were in our earlier session.
3 My name is Bruce Loudermilk. I'm the Director for
4 the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I'm an enrolled
5 member of the Fort Peck Sioux Tribe, Northeastern
6 Montana.

7 **MR. AIKIN:** (Speaks Native American) My
8 name is Scott Aikin. I'm the National Native
9 American Programs Coordinator of the U.S. Fish and
10 Wildlife Service, and here to answer questions
11 regarding the alliance we have with the services
12 jurisdiction.

13 **MR. RODMAN:** Thank you, Scott.

14 So, again, this is the listening session
15 for Executive Order 13792, Review Designations under
16 the Antiquities Act. And for those that were in the
17 preceding listening session, I'm going to go into
18 kind of the logistics of how the listening session
19 will work so it may be a repeat for you, but I'll be
20 quick.

21 So we do have the Executive Order to
22 discuss today. You should have a copy of that with
23 your packet and also a handout to go with that. If
24 you don't, please let us know and we'll get that to
25 you. Regina will help with that. And we're all

1 senior-level career employees on the panel today,
2 and many of us have worked along side you for many
3 years, and we're here to listen to you and work
4 with you on your comments, your recommendations or
5 your concerns that you may have about the Executive
6 Order. For the implementation, we need your
7 guidance, your leadership and your wisdom.

8 The Executive Order, again, is 13792.
9 Today's listening session is designed primarily for
10 tribal leader input and for comments as part of the
11 nation-to-nation relationship between tribes and the
12 federal government. We're here primarily to listen
13 to your views and make sure they're considered as
14 part of the record for the Administration as it
15 moves forward. Today is not the only listening
16 session. There will be a total of four on the
17 National Monument listening sessions, and those are
18 in the packet as well.

19 Today's listening session will be recorded
20 and transcribed, and the transcriptions will be made
21 available at www.bia.gov. The transcripts and all
22 written comments that are submitted will be analyzed
23 and recommendations will be made to the Assistant
24 Secretary for Indian Affairs and to the Secretary of
25 the Interior. And the Secretary will then make

1 reports and recommendations to the White House.

2 So for the Executive Order for today's
3 listening session, it's titled Comprehensive Plan --
4 excuse me, I have the wrong one here -- Review
5 Designations under the Antiquities Act. And this

6 Executive Order was issued by President Trump
7 on April 26, 2017. And it requires that the
8 Secretary of the Interior review national monuments
9 that have been designated or expanded since January
10 1, 1996, where the designation covers more than
11 100,000 acres or where the Secretary determines that
12 the designation or expansion was made without an
13 adequate public outreach and coordination with
14 relevant stakeholders. 27 monuments have been
15 identified by DOI for review and they are listed in
16 the handouts provided. Three of those monuments are
17 in the Northwest area: The Cascade Siskiyou
18 National Monument in Oregon, the Hanford Reach
19 National Monument in Washington, and Craters of the
20 Moon National Monument in Idaho.

21 The Secretary must use several factors in
22 evaluating the national monuments to determine
23 whether each designation or expansion conforms to
24 the policy of the Executive Order. And the policy
25 is described in Section 1 of the Executive Order.

1 And the factors that the Secretary is to use are
2 also in there -- in the Executive Order and the
3 Federal Register notice.

4 There's some key deadlines that I'd like
5 to underscore. The Secretary must make
6 recommendations to the President on any Presidential
7 actions, legislative proposals or other appropriate
8 actions necessary to carry out the policy of the
9 Executive Order. The Secretary's interim report to
10 the President is due by June 10, and must make
11 recommendations on Bears Ears and other designations
12 the Secretary deems appropriate. The Secretary's
13 final report is due to the President by August 24,
14 2107, and that will summarize the findings of the
15 review and provide recommendations.

16 Written comments are also being accepted
17 for the national monument discussion. The deadline
18 for the Bears Ears comments is May 26 and for all
19 other monuments until July 10. Tribal leaders can
20 send their written comments to consultation@bia.gov
21 and tribal leaders and the general public can also
22 submit online at www.regulations.gov. And there's
23 some guidance, I think, in the handouts that have
24 been provided, too.

25 So some of the questions to help with the

1 conversation today, but not limited to these
2 question, are there any other monuments in addition
3 to the 27 being reviewed that should also be
4 reviewed because they were designated after January
5 1, 1996, without adequate public outreach and
6 coordination with the relevant stakeholders? And
7 what are your comments or views on the application
8 of the seven factors listed in the Executive Order
9 that the Secretary is to use in reviewing the 27
10 monument designations? Are there other factors that
11 should be considered?

12 So we'll have -- we'll open it up now for
13 comments and Annette will help us with microphone in
14 the back as well, so, please. And please state your
15 name and tribal affiliation when providing comments,
16 please.

17 **MR. LOUDERMILK:** This going to be a short
18 meeting.

19 **MR. SALUSKIN:** I guess I'll start out.
20 Thank you again. My name is Delano Saluskin. I'm
21 the -- I'm the Vice-Chairman for the Yakama Nation.
22 And first of all, I have a question in my mind. Why
23 is the President trying to undesignate these
24 landmarks? To the Native people all of these -- all
25 lands are sacred to us and this is just a small step

1 in helping preserve the sacredness of the lands.
2 And I don't understand what his objective is. He
3 wants to turn it over to corporations again for
4 economic development. That doesn't make sense to
5 me. I mean, we've got -- we've got to preserve
6 something for our future generations yet unborn so
7 that they have and they can understand the
8 importance of these designations.

9 Again, it's my understanding that -- I
10 don't believe the President has the authority to
11 undesignate these -- these lands, these monuments.
12 I don't think the law affords him that opportunity.
13 He can -- you know, they can be designated, but I
14 truly question whether he has that authority to do
15 away with those designations. And it just seems as
16 though that if he's going to make any issues, it
17 should be for those lands that might be considered
18 for -- those designations into the future. These
19 should be grandfathered in. They should not -- he
20 should not be messing with these lands. So we want
21 to make sure that these designations are intact and
22 we just question whether -- you know, why is he
23 trying to do this. I mean, it just seems to me that,
24 you know, our government has -- you know, as I heard
25 the other day, has been hijacked by corporations and

1 this is just another step in that direction. So
2 those are my first general comments. I may have
3 others later. Thank you.

4 **MR. RODMAN:** One thing to maybe help
5 prompt some of the thoughts out there, in the
6 Federal Register notice, there are the seven factors
7 that Secretary is supposed to consider when making
8 the determinations about the national monuments.

9 The first is the requirements and original
10 objectives of the Act, including the Act's
11 requirement -- the Antiquities Act -- including the
12 Act's requirement that reservations of land not
13 exceed "The smallest area compatible with the proper
14 care and management of the objects to be protected."

15 The second consideration is whether
16 designated lands are appropriately classified under
17 the Act as, "Historic landmarks, historic and
18 prehistoric structures or other objects of historic
19 or scientific interest."

20 The third factor is the effects of the
21 designation on the available uses of designated
22 Federal lands, including consideration of the
23 multiple-use policy of Section 102.A7 of the Federal
24 Land Policy and Management Act, as well as the
25 effects on the available use of Federal lands beyond

1 the monument boundaries.

2 The fourth is the effects of a designation
3 on the use and enjoyment of non-Federal lands within
4 or beyond monument boundaries.

5 The fifth is concerns of state, tribal and
6 local governments affected by a designation,
7 including the economic development and fiscal
8 condition of affected states, tribes and localities.

9 The sixth is the availability of Federal
10 resources to properly manage designated areas, and
11 the seventh is such other factors as the Secretary
12 deems appropriate. So that's what will be used in
13 consideration.

14 **MS. SWITZLER:** Well, I concur with my
15 elder's view on, you know, why are we looking at
16 these lands. And I look at the one that's affected
17 in Oregon, the Cascade Siskiyou, and how -- you
18 know, how many acres that there is set aside to
19 protect these natural monuments, these lands where
20 our people had once dwelled for thousands and
21 thousands of years. And, you know, at one point
22 every place had a name and every -- every formation
23 had a story that was linked to it. And so, you
24 know, although the -- some of the stories have now
25 faded away with some of the elders that are gone,

1 but there are still plenty of places where our
2 people still consider these places sacred and that
3 they can -- that they venture to, that they go to,
4 that they travel to to get in touch not only with
5 their own -- their own being, but to get in touch
6 with their creator as well.

7 And so I'm -- you know, it worries me when
8 there's just a across-the-board "we're going to look
9 at all of these places." And it worries me when
10 there is -- there isn't consideration for what these
11 things mean to our people.

12 **MR. KUTZ:** Again, for the record, my name
13 is Steven Kutz, Tribal Council Member for the
14 Cowlitz Indian Tribe in Washington State. First,
15 before I add my comments regarding the monuments
16 themselves, I would like to answer some of the
17 questions about the factors of consideration.

18 Number one, I don't like the designation
19 or the wording in there "such other factors as the
20 Secretary deems appropriate." I think that is an
21 open-ended loop that you could walk anything through
22 under -- under anybody's circumstances. So I think
23 that that means, then, that anything is possible
24 when you have that language in there.

25 Secondly, whether designated lands are

1 appropriately classified under the Act as historic
2 landmarks, historic and pre -- historic structures
3 or other objects of historic or scientific interest.
4 Who makes that determination? Do we as a tribe have
5 the ability to -- to make that determination and not
6 be overruled?

7 So we look at the constant pressure, for
8 example, that's going on up and down the Columbia
9 River. Hanford Reach is up a little bit further up
10 the Columbia River, but look at what's going on in
11 the Gorge and the -- and there's -- there's a
12 designation there in the Gorge and people are trying
13 to overwhelm that and overcome that so they can
14 encroach on that and do things that they want to do
15 from a commercial nature. And all of that is
16 detrimental to the landscape, to all of our
17 important places and to the fish and wildlife that
18 use that that are so important to us. And so whose
19 opinion? So if we -- if federal government says we
20 don't see anything and we say we do, then are we
21 going to be overridden in that?

22 Secondly, I want to go to the first one;
23 smallest area compatible with the proper care and
24 management of the objects to be protected. Mount
25 St. Helens is in one of those categories. The whole

1 perimeter of Mount St. Helens is under constant,
2 constant pressure and we're fighting that constant
3 pressure. We have Canadian interest coming down
4 wanting to open up copper mines around the perimeter
5 just outside the boundaries of that because it's not
6 within the boundaries. So in my estimation, the
7 boundary was constructed too small and so -- and so
8 what happens when you do that? Look at Butte,
9 Montana, where you have the biggest Superfund site
10 in the nation probably. Although, I don't know how
11 they could consider that worse than Hanford, where
12 you have all of the waters coming out of that open
13 mine, copper pit going into the headwaters of the
14 Clark fork, coming down into the Columbia River
15 bringing all that contamination down through there.
16 And yet, here, the Canadians want to start another
17 one right -- further down along Mount St. Helens.

18 And so -- so this -- so the thing here
19 about the smallest area compatible with the proper
20 care and management of the objects to be protected,
21 who makes that determination? Is it going to happen
22 under such other factors as the Secretary deems
23 appropriate? Should a tribal government who wants
24 to pollute the waters, pollute the air and bring all
25 of these -- these industrial activities along areas

1 that are so important, should they be allowed to
2 overcome our wishes?

3 We had some conversations today -- up and
4 down the Columbia River here there's -- there's huge
5 pressure in five or six areas and the Mayor of
6 Portland this morning, if you were in the room and
7 heard his words, what did he call it? Colonial
8 exportation or exploitation or something like that.
9 That's what it is. So -- so the availability of
10 Federal resources to properly manage a designated
11 areas, some of these areas just need to be left
12 alone or minorly managed and not -- and not taken
13 advantage of.

14 So having -- having properties in the
15 inventory of the federal government, I don't think
16 turning them over to the state is -- is sometimes
17 appropriate because -- because they can undo some of
18 the stuff that's so important.

19 So looking down through that, those are
20 just some of the comments that I have around the
21 rules because if they're allowed to go through the
22 way they're written, anything could happen.

23 The other -- the other concern that I have
24 now going back to the list is I look through that
25 list and I haven't been to all of those places, but

1 I've been to some of them. And when I -- when I go
2 to different tribes and I ask them where are your
3 important -- you know, you come there and you want
4 to go and you want to pray, and you want to go to --
5 to a place that has significance. And we, as the
6 Cowlitz Tribe, and all of the tribes here, we have
7 many of those areas that are out in the public
8 sector. They're not even -- they're not even under
9 government control. They're under -- they're under
10 the public sector control, and yet there are places
11 sacred to us. We have places that have been sacred
12 to us that have just been razed to the ground and
13 demolished historically because we've been ignored.

14 So as I -- as I look at this list, I think
15 that they ought to be left the way they are. I
16 think some of them are probably too small. I think
17 probably some of them are too small because the
18 pressure is up around the edges of those. And the
19 pressure isn't -- is to commercialize and utilize
20 all of that ground and a lot of these places are in
21 -- are in places that are irreplaceable. That's why
22 -- that's why they were placed on this list because
23 once they're gone or once they're damaged, you can
24 never repair them and we've had too much of that.

25 Lastly, I want to talk about Hanford Reach

1 because that's right there next to Hanford and we
2 all know that. And the President just removed how
3 many millions of dollars out of -- out of the
4 cleanup there where they just had these spills and
5 continued contamination. And they're -- they're
6 already years behind in the project of cleaning that
7 up. So he has a responsibility -- and the Hanford
8 Reach is one of the few areas in the upper river
9 where the fish can go and spawn and be taken care
10 of. And, I mean, I'll defer over here to my Vice-
11 Chairman, but that's one of the few places where
12 they can go and act in a natural state for a long
13 period of time along the river and not be affected
14 by all of the dams and the things that have gone on.
15 And so it's an important place for all of us. So to
16 some people it's just a place; to us it has effects
17 on the larger landscape and I think all of these
18 really do so thank you very much.

19 **MR. DOSSETT:** Well, I'll join in if nobody
20 else is ready to go yet. Hi, my name is John
21 Dossett. I'm with the National Congress of American
22 Indians. I guess I wanted to first say that the --
23 you know, the original purpose of the Antiquities
24 Act was to protect cultural resources for Native
25 people. That was a -- it was -- you know, when they

1 opened the southwest, it was Chaco Canyon and Mesa
2 Verde. Those were the areas that were under a great
3 deal of pressure. There was a lot of looting going
4 on and President Theodore Roosevelt and others in
5 the Administration at that time thought that -- that
6 that wasn't right. That they shouldn't just be
7 looting the antiquities and historic structures and
8 cultural resources of Native people in those areas.
9 So they came up with the Antiquities Act and gave
10 the President the authority to set aside these areas
11 and protect them out of the rest of the public
12 domain. And that was -- you know, that was the
13 original -- I mean, these days, I don't think many
14 people think about that, but that is the original
15 purpose of the statute was to protect cultural
16 resources of Native people. So I think it's
17 entirely appropriate that it's still continued to
18 used that way -- to be used that way.

19 I think today is the deadline for
20 submitting comments on Bears Ears. Is that right or
21 maybe it's tomorrow? But anyway, I thought I'd at
22 least say something about Bears Ears. NCAI has a
23 resolution very much in support of Bears Ears. We
24 are submitting comments. You'll be getting them.
25 And we'll also be submitting comments on the rest of

1 the review. But, you know, Bears Ears is an area
2 that's sacred to five of the tribes in those
3 regions. Those are five tribes -- I work at NCAI --
4 those tribes don't get along with each other very
5 well most of the time, but somehow those five tribes
6 have managed to get their act together and cooperate
7 entirely on protecting the Bears Ears area because
8 it's so important to all of them. And they've come
9 up with a management plan that is not only, you
10 know, to protect the area, but involves the tribes
11 co-managing the area with the federal government.
12 And that's a -- I think a really significant step
13 forward in the -- in the program for protecting
14 Native cultural resources is to involve the tribes
15 themselves in the process. And so it's a real step
16 forward and, you know, I hope you continue to
17 protect that.

18 In addition, I think one of the things
19 that's interesting about it, it's not just looking
20 at -- at, you know, artifacts and cultural
21 resources, but also the current use of the land for
22 ongoing cultural uses and ceremonies and activities
23 of the people in that area and protecting those
24 going forward, which is also a really important
25 purpose.

1 I wanted to -- you know, one of your
2 questions was about whether -- I guess moving away
3 from Bears Ears and moving towards the other things
4 in this area, like the Hanford Reach, like the
5 Siskiyou, one of the questions in this was whether
6 these fit the criteria in the Act. It seems to me
7 that all of these are historic landmarks. I mean,
8 that's pretty straightforward, right? The -- at
9 least what we've heard from other folks that tribes
10 have known these areas as historic landmarks for --
11 for millennia. So the very first criteria is it --
12 if it's a historic landmark, it fits the criteria of
13 the Act, and that's -- and that's a pretty easy one.

14 Lastly, I just, you know, wanted to
15 mention, you know, once again, the three in this
16 area, the Hanford Reach, the Cascade Siskiyou, and
17 the Craters of the Moon in Idaho, all of them -- you
18 know, we've started summaries of all of these areas
19 and the connection to the Native people and they all
20 have very strong histories. So those are -- I've
21 got some of that written down, I'll share that with
22 you, but I thought -- I mean, on behalf of NCAI,
23 we'd like to encourage maintaining those
24 designations into the future. Thanks very much.

25 **MR. KUTZ:** This is Steve Kutz with the

1 Cowlitz Tribe again. So we have high places, and we
2 have sacred places, and places where we go for
3 ceremonies, places where some of our families go,
4 not just the whole tribe sometimes. And we
5 shouldn't have to sit and put on a point -- pinpoint
6 a GPS point on a map and say that is the specific
7 place that we use for that purpose, because we don't
8 want to do that. We don't want people to know that
9 there's a place up in the mountains that's sacred to
10 us under the Weyerhaeuser family where there was --
11 where there was an ancient medicine wheel. And old
12 man Weyerhaeuser gave a promise and said he would
13 protect it. He didn't protect it, he bulldozed it
14 when he found out about it. He bulldozed it. And
15 so we don't -- we don't want to tell everybody why
16 and where and for some of these things are so
17 important to us.

18 The other thing that I want to note on
19 this document, it says initial list. It doesn't say
20 the list. It says initial list, which means there's
21 more to come. And so there are -- there are huge
22 areas that we have in this state, whether it's
23 national -- the national forest that you're
24 responsible for that could be harmed, there's the
25 berry fields that we have up in the mountains that

1 can be harmed. If there is any kind of restrictions
2 or opening up or things allowed to happen there by
3 the general public, they still -- they still go and
4 use those places with us but there's -- there's some
5 protected areas up there.

6 And there are some of things that are very
7 important to us around the National Park systems and
8 things like that are under constant pressure for --
9 from people who have come here lately and want to
10 now re-utilize and re-purpose some of these areas,
11 and diminish our access to those, and diminish the
12 importance of those to us. And so I'm worried about
13 that initial list and so I don't know where that
14 100,000 -- that 100,000 acre factor was put in. I
15 don't really know other than you start with the
16 bigger ones and work your way down, and maybe next
17 time it's 50,000. I don't really know.

18 So that's a concern that I have that is
19 that this -- this is just going to be a continued
20 assault on places that are important to us for
21 reasons that we shouldn't have to particularly
22 identify. Thank you.

23 **MR. GUNN:** Oh, hi. Brian Gunn from the
24 Powers Law Firm on behalf of the Colville Tribe.
25 Just some comments on the Antiquities Act generally,

1 not with respect to these designations, but to the
2 extent that any kind of recommendations are going to
3 make -- the Department may come up with -- may come
4 up with are going to make recommendations to
5 Congress or others about changes to the Antiquities
6 Act.

7 I would like to, you know, communicate one
8 issue that Colville has encountered in the past few
9 years. For a number of years, there have been
10 organizations and groups that have been interested
11 in designating wilderness and parts of the Colville
12 National Forest, which were directly adjacent to the
13 northern reservation boundary. And this is an area
14 that is currently Forest Service land but was
15 previously part of the undivided reservation. The
16 tribe has a number of sacred sites as the exclusive
17 regulator of hunting and fishing in those areas.
18 And the tribe has had concerns with some of those
19 proposed designations simply because the underlying
20 laws don't provide guarantees of existing uses and
21 access, like hunting and fishing, like law
22 enforcement for fish and game, and even access to
23 sacred sites. In some cases for motorized uses if
24 you've got elders and such that aren't able to
25 access those sites.

1 So more recently, a few years ago, there
2 was some discussion about designating instead of
3 wilderness one of these areas to be a national
4 monument and I think it's something that the tribe
5 would have been maybe more interested in if there
6 were safeguards in the Antiquities Act itself that
7 safeguarded those access, those preexisting uses,
8 especially access to sacred sites because I think
9 there was just generally concern that with as open
10 ended as the law is that if folks were to agree with
11 designation, that there may not be a guarantee that
12 they would be able to continue to access those sites
13 in the manner that they currently do. So for
14 whatever that's worth, and to the extent that the
15 Department is looking at recommendations to the
16 Antiquities Act generally. Thank you.

17 **MR. LOUDERMILK:** We have up until about
18 4:50, 5:00, and I'm not sure if we have more
19 comments from folks.

20 Did anybody have anything else they wanted
21 to add that they didn't get a chance to yet?

22 Anybody have anything you want to say or -
23 - okay. Well, unless anybody is opposed, then we
24 can just -- go ahead, sir.

25 **MR. KUTZ:** So I think that -- this is,

1 again, Steve Kutz with the Cowlitz Tribe. I think
2 we need to throw our rope out a little bit further.

3 So we don't know -- in our -- in our
4 earlier discussion, some of the people talked about
5 the -- the lack of -- lack of enough fish. And you
6 start looking out at some of the Pacific remote
7 islands, the northeast canyons and sea mouths along
8 the Atlantic coast. Some of these places where --
9 where they're, like, islands where not just for --
10 not just islands of land, but islands of places
11 where fish can go propagate and live and move
12 around. And so there's a lot of places that are
13 important, we don't necessarily know where all of
14 our fish go to live and grow and those type of
15 things. And so having a place that protects them
16 also is important. And so -- so I don't necessarily
17 know that there's any Indian people out there in
18 American Samoa, but we sure know there's some
19 Samoans. We know that there's a bunch of Hawaiians
20 that married into our tribes here that are worried
21 about Hawaii and those type of things. And so I
22 just want to speak on their behalf also, because the
23 Native people there that the federal government does
24 not recognize have grave concerns about the same
25 things that we have concerns about. Thank you.

1 **MR. RODMAN:** Again, we have the online and
2 -- online option and email option for written
3 comments on this Executive Order for tribal leaders.
4 That's at consultation@bia.gov, and for the general
5 public and tribal leaders, that's regulations.gov.
6 And for Bears Ears, the comments are due tomorrow.
7 And for all other monuments, that is until July 10.

8 Thank you. I think a lot of us will be
9 maybe hanging out for a few minutes if people have
10 other questions, but thank you very much.

11 **MR. LOUDERMILK:** Thank you.

12 **(Session concluded at 3:50 p.m.)**

CERTIFICATE

I, Kimberly R. McLain, do hereby certify that the proceeding named herein was professionally transcribed on the date set forth in the certificate herein; that I transcribed all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true, and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 1st day of June, 2017.



Kimberly R. McLain

<hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 6:10 6:25 8:5 10 7:10 7:19 26:7 100,000 6:11 22:14 22:14 102.A7 10:23 13792 2:9 4:15 5:8 1996 6:10 8:5 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2017 2:3 2:9 6:7 2107 7:14 24 7:13 25 2:3 26 2:9 3:10 6:7 7:18 27 6:14 8:3 8:9 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3:15 2:4 3:50 26:12 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4:50 24:18 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 5:00 24:18 50,000 22:17 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 3:18	<hr/> A <hr/> ability 13:5 able 23:24 24:12 accepted 7:16 access 22:11 23:21 23:22 23:25 24:7 24:8 24:12 acre 22:14 acres 6:11 11:18 across 3:25 across-the- board 12:8 act 2:2 2:11 4:16 6:5 10:10 10:11 10:17 10:24 13:1 17:12 17:24 18:9 19:6 20:6 20:13 22:25 23:6 24:6 24:16 Acting 3:22 actions 7:7 7:8 activities 14:25 19:22 Act's 10:10 10:12 add 12:15 24:21	addition 8:2 19:18 adequate 6:13 8:5 adjacent 23:12 Administratio n 5:14 18:5 advantage 15:13 Affairs 2:13 4:4 5:24 affected 11:6 11:8 11:16 17:13 affiliation 8:15 affords 9:12 afternoon 3:14 4:1 agency 3:20 ago 24:1 ahead 2:6 3:4 24:24 Aikin 4:7 4:8 air 14:24 alliance 4:11 allowed 15:1 15:21 22:2 alone 15:12 already 17:6 Amen 3:1 American 2:19 4:7 4:9	17:21 25:18 analyzed 5:22 ancient 21:11 Annette 8:13 answer 4:10 12:16 antiquities 2:2 2:11 4:16 6:5 10:11 17:23 18:7 18:9 22:25 23:5 24:6 24:16 anybody 24:20 24:22 24:23 anybody's 12:22 anything 12:21 12:23 13:20 15:22 24:20 24:22 anyway 18:21 application 8:7 appropriate 7:7 7:12 11:12 12:20 14:23 15:17 18:17 appropriately 10:16 13:1 April 2:9 6:7 area 6:17 10:13 13:23 14:19 19:1 19:7 19:10 19:11
--	---	---	---

19:23	18:23	Canadian 14:3	Columbia 13:8
20:4	19:1 19:7	Canadians	13:10 14:14
20:16 23:13	20:3 26:6	14:16	15:4
areas 3:17	Becky 3:14	Canyon 18:1	Colville
11:10 14:25	behalf	canyons 25:7	22:24
15:5	20:22 22:24	care 10:14	23:8 23:11
15:11 15:11	25:22	13:23 14:20	co-managing
16:7 17:8	behind 17:6	17:9	19:11
18:2 18:8	believe 9:10	career 5:1	coming 14:3
18:10 20:10	berry 21:25	carry 3:20	14:12 14:14
20:18 21:22	beyond	7:8	comments 3:24
22:5	10:25 11:4	Cascade	5:4 5:10
22:10 23:17	bigger 22:16	6:17	5:22 7:16
24:3	biggest 14:9	11:17 20:16	7:18 7:20
aren't 23:24	bit 13:9 25:2	cases 23:23	8:7 8:13
artifacts	Blanchard	categories	8:15 10:2
19:20	3:14 3:15	13:25	12:15 15:20
aside 11:18	blessing 2:21	ceremonies	18:20 18:24
18:10	boundaries	19:22 21:3	18:25 22:25
assault 22:20	11:1 11:4	Chaco 18:1	24:19
Assistant	14:5 14:6	Chairman	26:3 26:6
2:13 5:23	boundary 14:7	17:11	commercial
Atlantic 25:8	23:13	chance 24:21	13:15
August 7:13	Brian 22:23	changes 23:5	commercialize
authority	bring 14:24	circumstances	16:19
9:10 9:14	bringing 2:20	12:22	communicate
18:10	14:15	Clark 14:14	23:7
availability	Bruce 4:3	classified	compatible
11:9 15:9	bulldozed	10:16 13:1	10:13 13:23
available	21:13 21:14	cleaning 17:6	14:19
5:21	bunch 25:19	cleanup 17:4	Comprehensive
10:21 10:25	Bureau 3:22	coast 25:8	6:3
away 9:15	4:4	colleagues	concern 15:23
11:25 20:2	Butte 14:8	2:14	22:18 24:9
<hr/>	<hr/>	Colonial 15:7	concerns 3:24
B	C		5:5 11:5
Bears 7:11			23:18 25:24
7:18			25:25
18:20 18:22			concluded

26:12	16:9 16:10	23:14 24:13	2:2 2:10
concur 11:14	conversation	<hr/>	4:15 6:5
condition	8:1	<hr/> D <hr/>	7:11 8:10
11:8	conversations	damaged 16:23	9:8 9:15
conforms 6:23	15:3	dams 17:14	9:18 9:21
Congress	cooperate	day 9:25	20:24
17:21 23:5	19:6	days 18:13	23:1 23:19
congressional	coordination	deadline 7:17	designed 5:9
ly-	6:13 8:6	18:19	determination
designated	Coordinator	deadlines 7:4	13:4 13:5
3:17	4:9	deal 18:3	14:21
connection	copper 14:4	deals 7:12	determination
20:19	14:13	11:12 12:20	s 10:8
consider 10:7	copy 4:22	14:22	determine
12:2 14:11	corporations	defer 17:10	6:22
consideration	9:3 9:25	Delano 8:20	determines
10:15 10:22	Council 12:13	demolished	6:11
11:13 12:10	Councilperson	16:13	detrimental
12:17	2:16 3:3	Department	13:16
considered	country 3:25	23:3 24:15	development
5:13 8:11	covers 6:10	described	9:4 11:7
9:17	Cowlitz 12:14	6:25	different
constant 13:7	16:6 21:1	designated	16:2
14:1 14:2	25:1	6:9 8:4	diminish
14:2 22:8	Craters	9:13	22:11 22:11
constructed	6:19 20:17	10:16 10:21	direction
14:7	creator 12:6	11:10 12:25	10:1
consultation@	criteria 20:6	15:10	directly
bia.gov	20:11 20:12	designating	23:12
7:20 26:4	cultural	23:11 24:2	Director 3:22
contamination	17:24	designation	4:3
14:15 17:5	18:8	6:10 6:12	discuss 4:22
continue	18:15 19:14	6:23	discussion
19:16 24:12	19:20 19:22	10:21	7:17 24:2
continued	current 19:21	11:2 11:6	25:4
17:5	currently	12:18 13:12	document
18:17 22:19		24:11	21:19
control		designations	

DOI 6:15	13:14	15:8	17:22 20:11
dollars 17:3	enforcement	extent 23:2	fiscal 11:7
domain 18:12	23:22	24:14	fish 4:9
Dossett 17:19	enjoyment		13:17
17:21	11:3	<hr/> F <hr/>	17:9
due 7:10 7:13	enrolled 4:4	factor	23:22
26:6	entirely	10:20 22:14	25:5
dwelled 11:20	18:17 19:7	factors	25:11 25:14
<hr/>	especially	6:21 7:1	fishing 23:17
E	24:8	8:8 8:10	23:21
earlier 4:2	estimation	10:6	fit 20:6
25:4	14:6	11:11 12:17	fits 20:12
Ears 7:11	evaluating	12:19 14:22	five 15:5
7:18	6:22	faded 11:25	19:2 19:3
18:20 18:22	everybody 4:2	families 21:3	19:5
18:23	21:15	family 21:10	folks 20:9
19:1 19:7	everyone 2:22	Father 2:20	24:10 24:19
20:3 26:6	example 13:8	federal	forest 3:15
easy 20:13	exceed 10:13	5:12 7:3	21:23 23:12
economic	exclusive	10:6	23:14
9:4 11:7	23:16	10:22 10:23	fork 14:14
edges 16:18	excuse 6:4	10:25	formation
effects 10:20	Executive 2:8	11:9	11:22
10:25	4:15 4:21	13:19 15:10	Fort 3:8 4:5
11:2 17:16	5:5 5:8 6:2	15:15 19:11	Fortmann
elders	6:6 6:24	25:23	3:6 3:6
11:25 23:24	6:25 7:2	federally	forward
elder's 11:15	7:9 8:8	3:10	3:23 5:15
else 17:20	26:3	fields 21:25	19:13 19:16
24:20	existing	fifth 11:5	19:24
email 26:2	23:20	fighting 14:2	fourth 11:2
employees 5:1	expanded 6:9	final 7:13	future 9:6
encountered	expansion	findings 7:14	9:18 20:24
23:8	6:12 6:23	Firm 22:24	<hr/>
encourage	exploitation	first 2:22	G
20:23	15:8	8:22 10:2	game 23:22
encroach	exportation	10:9	general
		12:14 13:22	7:21 10:2

22:3 26:4	17:22 20:2	Helens	6:15
generally	guidance	13:25	identify
22:25	5:7 7:23	14:1 14:17	22:22
24:9 24:16	Gunn 22:23	help 4:25	ignored 16:13
generations	22:23	7:25 8:13	I'll 4:19
9:6	<hr/>	10:4	8:19
getting 18:24	H	helping 9:1	17:10 17:19
gone 11:25	handout 4:23	he's 9:16	20:21
16:23 17:14	handouts 6:16	hi 3:6	I'm 2:12 2:12
Gorge 13:11	7:23	17:20 22:23	3:6 3:7
13:12	Hanford	high 21:1	3:14 3:19
government	6:18 13:9	hijacked 9:25	3:21 3:23
5:12 9:24	14:11 16:25	historic	4:3 4:4 4:8
13:19 14:23	17:1 17:7	3:8 10:17	4:17 8:20
15:15	20:4 20:16	10:17 10:18	8:21 12:7
16:9	hanging 26:9	13:1 13:2	17:21 22:12
19:11 25:23	happen	13:2 13:3	24:18
governments	14:21 15:22	18:7 20:7	implementatio
11:6	22:2	20:10 20:12	n 5:6
government-	happens 14:8	historically	importance
to-	harmed	16:13	9:8 22:12
government	21:24 22:1	histories	important
3:10	haven't 15:25	20:20	13:17 13:18
GPS 21:6	having	honor 3:9	15:1
grandfathered	15:14 15:14	honored 3:19	15:18
9:19	25:15	hope 19:16	16:3
grave 25:24	Hawaii 25:21	House 6:1	17:15
great 18:2	Hawaiians	huge 15:4	19:8
ground	25:19	21:21	19:24 21:17
16:12 16:20	headwaters	hunting 23:17	22:7
groups 23:10	14:13	23:21	22:20 25:13
grow 25:14	hear 3:12	<hr/>	25:16
guarantee	3:20	I	including
24:11	heard 9:24	I'd 7:4 18:21	10:10 10:11
guarantees	15:7 20:9	Idaho 6:20	10:22 11:7
23:20	hearing 3:23	20:17	Indian 2:13
guess 8:19	Heavenly 2:20	identified	4:4 5:24
			12:14 25:17
			Indians 17:22

industrial 14:25	I've 16:1 20:20	lands 8:25 9:1 9:11 9:17 9:20 10:16 10:22 10:25 11:3 11:16 11:19 12:25	22:13 listed 6:15 8:8 listen 5:3 5:12 listening 2:1 2:7 2:8 3:13 4:14 4:17 4:18 5:9 5:15 5:17 5:19 6:3
initial 21:19 21:20 22:13	<hr/> J <hr/>		
input 3:20 5:10	January 6:9 8:4		
instead 24:2	job 3:16		
intact 9:21	Jody 3:21	landscape 13:16 17:17	
interest 10:19 13:3 14:3	John 17:20	language 12:24	
interested 23:10 24:5	join 17:19	larger 17:17	little 13:9 25:2
interesting 19:19	July 7:19 26:7	Lastly 16:25 20:14	live 25:11 25:14
interim 7:9	June 7:10	lately 22:9	
Interior 5:25 6:8	jurisdiction 4:12	later 10:3	local 11:6
introductions 3:5	<hr/> K <hr/>	law 9:12 22:24 23:21 24:10	localities 11:8
inventory 15:15	key 7:4	laws 23:20	logistics 4:18
involve 19:14	known 20:10	leader 5:10	long 17:12
involves 19:10	Kutz 12:12 12:13 20:25 20:25 24:25 25:1	leaders 7:19 7:21 26:3 26:5	loop 12:21
irreplaceable 16:21	<hr/> L <hr/>	leadership 5:7	looting 18:3 18:7
islands 25:7 25:9 25:10 25:10	lack 25:5 25:5	least 18:22 20:9	Lord 2:22 2:23 3:1
isn't 12:10 16:19	land 3:22 10:12 10:24 19:21 23:14 25:10	legislative 7:7	lost 2:23
issue 23:8	landmark 20:12	limited 8:1	lot 16:20 18:3 25:12 26:8
issued 2:9 6:6	landmarks 8:24 10:17 13:2 20:7 20:10	linked 11:23	Loudermilk 4:1 4:3 8:17 24:17 26:11
issues 9:16		list 15:24 15:25 16:14 16:22 21:19 21:20 21:20	<hr/> M <hr/>
			maintaining

20:23	messing 9:20	mouths 25:7	nobody 17:19
man 21:12	microphone	move 25:11	non-Federal
manage 3:25	8:13	moves 5:15	11:3
11:10 15:10	millennia	moving 20:2	northeast
managed 15:12	20:11	20:3	25:7
19:6	millions 17:3	multiple-	Northeastern
management	mind 2:17	use 10:23	4:5
3:23	8:22		northern
10:14 10:24	mine 14:13	<hr/> N <hr/>	23:13
13:24 14:20	mines 14:4	nation 8:21	Northwest
19:9	minorly 15:12	14:10	6:17
Manager 3:18	minutes 26:9	national	note 21:18
manner 24:13	Montana 4:6	3:7 3:8 4:8	notice 7:3
map 21:6	14:9	5:17 6:8	10:6
married 25:20	monument 5:17	6:18 6:19	
may 2:3	6:18 6:19	6:20 6:22	<hr/> O <hr/>
4:19 5:5	6:20 7:17	7:17 10:8	objective 9:2
7:18 10:2	8:10 11:1	17:21 21:23	objectives
23:3 23:3	11:4 24:4	21:23	10:10
24:11	monuments	22:7	objects 10:14
maybe 10:4	3:24 6:8	23:12 24:3	10:18
18:21 22:16	6:14 6:16	nation-to-	13:3
24:5 26:9	6:22 7:19	nation 5:11	13:24 14:20
Mayor 15:5	8:2 9:11	Native 2:18	offer 2:23
mean 9:5 9:23	10:8	4:7 4:8	Office 2:12
12:11 17:10	11:19 12:15	8:24	Oh 22:23
18:13	26:7	17:24	okay 24:23
20:7 20:22	Moon 6:20	18:8	old 21:11
means 12:23	20:17	18:16 19:14	ones 22:16
21:20	Morgan 2:12	20:19 25:23	ongoing 19:22
medicine	morning 15:6	natural 11:19	online 7:22
21:11	motorized	17:12	26:1 26:2
meeting 8:18	23:23	nature 13:15	open 8:12
member 4:5	Mount 13:24	NCAI 18:22	14:4
12:13	14:1 14:17	19:3 20:22	14:12 24:9
mention 20:15	mountains	necessarily	opened 18:1
Mesa 18:1	21:9 21:25	25:13 25:16	
		necessary 7:8	

open-ended 12:21	overwhelm 13:13	16:20 16:21 17:11	7:13 8:23 9:10 17:2
opening 2:17 22:2	<hr/> P <hr/>	21:1 21:2 21:2 21:3	18:4 18:10
opinion 13:19	p.m 2:4 26:12	22:4 22:20	Presidential 7:6
opportunity 3:12 9:12	Pacific 25:6	25:8 25:10 25:12	pressure 13:7 14:2 14:3
opposed 24:23	packet 4:23 5:18	plan 6:3 19:9	15:5 16:18 16:19
option 26:2 26:2	panel 2:14 5:1	please 2:17 4:24 8:14	18:3 22:8
Order 2:8 4:15 4:21	Park 22:7	8:14 8:16	pretty 20:8 20:13
5:6 5:8 6:2	Parks 3:7	plenty 12:1	previously 23:15
6:6 6:24	particularly 22:21	point 11:21 21:5 21:6	primarily 5:9 5:12
6:25 7:2	past 23:8	policy 6:24 6:24 7:8	privilege 3:9
7:9 8:8	Peck 4:5	10:23 10:24	probably 14:10 16:16
26:3	people 8:24 11:20	pollute 14:24 14:24	16:17
Oregon 3:18 6:18 11:17	12:2 12:11 13:12	Portland 15:6	process 19:15
organizations 23:10	17:16 17:25	possible 12:23	program 3:17 3:17
original 10:9 17:23 18:13	18:8 18:14 18:16	pour 2:21	19:13
18:14	19:23 20:19	Powers 22:24	Programs 4:9
Osage 2:13	21:8 22:9	pray 3:1 16:4	project 17:6
others 10:3 18:4 23:5	25:4 25:17 25:23	pre 13:2	promise 21:12
ought 16:15	26:9	preceding 4:17	prompt 10:5
outreach 6:13 8:5	perimeter 14:1 14:4	preexisting 24:7	propagate 25:11
outside 14:5	period 17:13	prehistoric 10:18	proper 10:13 13:23
overcome 13:13 15:2	pinpoint 21:5	preserve 9:1 9:5	14:19
overridden 13:21	pit 14:13	President 6:6 7:6 7:10	properly 11:10 15:10
overruled 13:6	placed 16:22		properties 15:14
	places 12:1 12:2 12:9		
	13:17 15:25		
	16:10 16:11		

proposals 7:7	26:10	7:3 10:6	19:21
proposed 23:19	quick 4:20	regulations. gov 26:5	respect 23:1
protect 11:19	<hr/> R <hr/>	regulator 23:17	responsibilit y 17:7
17:24 18:11	razed 16:12	relationship 5:11	responsible 21:24
18:15 19:10	Reach 6:18	relevant 6:14	rest 18:11
19:17 21:13	13:9	8:6	18:25
21:13	16:25	remote 25:6	restrictions 22:1
protected	17:8 20:4	removed 17:2	re-utilize 22:10
10:14 13:24	20:16	repair 16:24	review 2:2
14:20 22:5	ready 17:20	repeat 4:19	2:10 4:15
protecting	real 19:15	report 7:9	6:4 6:8
19:7	really	7:13	6:15 7:15
19:13 19:23	17:18 19:12	reports 6:1	19:1
protects	19:24 22:15	representing 3:7 3:15	reviewed 8:3 8:4
25:15	22:17	re-purpose 22:10	reviewing 8:9
provide	reasons 22:21	requirement 10:11 10:12	river 13:9
7:15 23:20	recently 24:1	requirements 10:9	13:10 14:14
provided 6:16	recognize 25:24	requires 6:7	15:4 17:8
7:24	recognized 3:11	reservation 23:13 23:15	17:13
providing	recommendatio ns 5:4 5:23	reservations 10:12	rivers 3:16
2:17 8:15	6:1 7:6	resolution 18:23	Rodman 2:6
public 6:13	7:11 7:15	resources 11:10 15:10	2:12 3:2
7:21 8:5	23:2 23:4	17:24	4:13 10:4
16:7	24:15	18:8	26:1
16:10 18:11	record 5:14	18:16 19:14	room 15:6
22:3 26:5	12:12		Roosevelt 18:4
purpose 17:23	recorded 5:19		rope 25:2
18:15 19:25	regarding 2:8		rules 15:21
21:7	4:11 12:15		<hr/> S <hr/>
<hr/> Q <hr/>	Regina 4:25		sacred 8:25
question	Region 3:18		
8:2 8:22	regions 19:3		
9:14 9:22	Register		
questions			
4:10 7:25			
12:17			
20:2 20:5			

12:2	6:25 10:23	11:17	started 2:7
16:11 16:11	sector 16:8	Siskiyous	20:18
19:2 21:2	16:10	20:5 20:16	state 3:22
21:9	seems 9:15	sit 21:5	8:14 11:5
23:16 23:23	9:23 20:6	site 3:9 3:11	12:14 15:16
24:8	send 7:20	14:9	17:12 21:22
sacredness	senior-	sites 23:16	states 11:8
9:1	level 5:1	23:23 23:25	statute 18:15
safeguarded	sense 9:4	24:8 24:12	step 8:25
24:7	Service 3:7	six 15:5	10:1
safeguards	3:15 4:10	sixth 11:9	19:12 19:15
24:6	23:14	small 8:25	Steve 20:25
Saluskin 8:19	services 4:11	14:7	25:1
8:20	session 2:1	16:16 16:17	Steven 12:13
Samoa 25:18	2:7 2:8	smallest	stories 11:24
Samoans 25:19	3:13 4:2	10:13 13:23	story 11:23
scenic 3:16	4:14 4:17	14:19	straightforwa
scientific	4:18 5:9	somehow 19:5	rd 20:8
10:19 13:3	5:16 5:19	song 2:24	strong 20:20
Scott 4:8	6:3 26:12	southwest	structures
4:13	sessions 5:17	18:1	10:18
sea 25:7	seven 8:8	spawn 17:9	13:2 18:7
second 2:7	10:6	speak 25:22	stuff 15:18
10:15	seventh 11:11	Speaking 2:18	submit 7:22
Secondly	several 6:21	Speaks 4:7	submitted
12:25 13:22	share 20:21	specific 21:6	5:22
Secretary	short 8:17	spills 17:4	submitting
2:13 5:24	significance	Springs 2:16	18:20 18:24
5:24 5:25	16:5	St 13:25 14:1	18:25
6:8 6:11	significant	14:17	summaries
6:21 7:1	19:12	stakeholders	20:18
7:5 7:12	simply 23:19	6:14 8:6	summarize
8:9 10:7	Singing 2:25	start 3:4	7:14
11:11 12:20	Sioux 4:5	8:19	Superfund
14:22	sir 24:24	14:16 22:15	14:9
Secretary's	Siskiyou 6:17	25:6	Superintenden
7:9 7:12			
Section			

t 3:8 support 18:23 supposed 10:7 sure 5:13 9:21 24:18 25:18 Switzler 2:16 2:18 11:14 systems 22:7 <hr/> T <hr/> talk 16:25 talked 25:4 thank 2:20 3:1 3:2 4:13 8:20 10:3 17:18 22:22 24:16 25:25 26:8 26:10 26:11 Thanks 20:24 themselves 12:16 19:15 Theodore 18:4 there's 7:4 7:22 12:8 13:11 13:11 15:4 15:4 21:9 21:20 21:24 22:4 22:4 25:12 25:17 25:18 25:19 they're 5:13 15:21 15:22 16:8 16:8 16:9 16:9	16:23 16:23 17:5 17:5 25:9 they've 19:8 third 10:20 thoughts 10:5 thousands 11:20 11:21 throw 25:2 tied 3:11 title 2:10 titled 6:3 today 2:21 4:22 5:1 5:15 8:1 15:3 18:19 today's 5:9 5:19 6:2 tomorrow 18:21 26:6 total 5:16 touch 12:4 12:5 towards 20:3 Tracy 3:6 transcribed 5:20 transcription s 5:20 transcripts 5:21 travel 12:4 tribal 2:1 5:10 7:19 7:21 8:15 11:5	12:13 14:23 26:3 26:5 tribe 4:5 12:14 13:4 16:6 21:1 21:4 22:24 23:16 23:18 24:4 25:1 tribes 3:11 5:11 11:8 16:2 16:6 19:2 19:3 19:4 19:5 19:10 19:14 20:9 25:20 truly 9:14 Trump 6:6 trying 8:23 9:23 13:12 turn 9:3 turning 15:16 type 25:14 25:21 <hr/> U <hr/> U.S 3:15 4:9 unborn 9:6 underlying 23:19 underscore 7:5 understand 9:2 9:7 understanding 9:9 undesignate 8:23 9:11	undivided 23:15 undo 15:17 unless 24:23 upon 2:21 upper 17:8 utilize 16:19 <hr/> V <hr/> Valerie 2:16 Vancouver 3:8 venture 12:3 Verde 18:2 Vice 17:10 Vice-Chairman 8:21 view 11:15 views 5:13 8:7 <hr/> W <hr/> walk 12:21 Warm 2:16 Washington 3:19 6:19 12:14 wasn't 18:6 waters 14:12 14:24 we'd 20:23 Weil 3:21 3:21 we'll 4:24 8:12 8:12 18:25 we're 2:6
--	--	---	---

4:25 5:3	25:20		
5:12 12:8	worries		
14:2	12:7 12:9		
we've 9:5 9:5	worse 14:11		
16:13 16:24	worth 24:14		
20:9 20:18	written		
Weyerhaeuser	5:22 7:16		
21:10 21:12	7:20		
whatever	15:22 20:21		
24:14	26:2		
wheel 21:11	wrong 6:4		
whether	www.bia.gov		
6:23 9:14	5:21		
9:22	www.		
10:15 12:25	regulations		
20:2 20:5	.gov 7:22		
21:22			
White 6:1			
whole 13:25			
21:4			
whose 13:18			
wild 3:16			
wilderness			
3:16			
23:11 24:3			
wildlife 4:10			
13:17			
wisdom 5:7			
wishes 15:2			
wonderful			
3:12			
wording 12:19			
work 4:19 5:3			
19:3 22:16			
worked 5:2			
working 3:9			
worried 22:12			