

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, OFFICE OF REGULATORY AFFAIRS,
AND COLLABORATIVE ACTION TRIBAL CONSULTATION FOR:
RE-PETITIONING FOR FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT AS AN AMERICAN
INDIAN TRIBE (25 CFR PART 83)

Nationwide

COURT REPORTING

LEGAL VIDEOGRAPHY

REMOTE DEPOSITIONS

TRIAL PRESENTATION

LEGAL TRANSCRIPTION

COPYING AND SCANNING

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS

TRANSCRIPT OF REMOTE TRIBAL CONSULTING MEETING

HELD VIA ZOOM ON MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2024 3:01 P.M.

WASHINGTON, D.C.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, OFFICE OF REGULATORY AFFAIRS,

AND COLLABORATIVE ACTION TRIBAL CONSULTATION FOR:

RE-PETITIONING FOR FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT AS AN AMERICAN

INDIAN TRIBE (25 CFR PART 83)

TRANSCRIPT OF REMOTE TRIBAL CONSULTING MEETING

HELD VIA ZOOM ON MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2024 3:01 P.M.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

1	REMOTE APPEARANCES
2	
3	J. Michael Harty, Facilitator, Kearns & West
4	Madeline Kane, Facilitator, Kearns & West
5	Ben Duncan, Facilitator, Kearns & West
6	Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs
7	(AS-IA)
8	Regina Gilbert, Regulatory Specialist, Office of Regulatory
9	Affairs and Collaborative Action, Office of the Assistant
LO	Secretary for Indian Affairs
L1	Oliver Whaley, Office of Regulatory Affairs and
L2	Collaborative Action
L3	Keely Driscoll, Department of the Interior Contractor Team
L4	K. Denise Litz, Acting Director, Office of Federal
L5	Acknowledgment
L6	Stephanie Sfiridis, Senior Counselor, Office of Assistant
L7	Secretary for Indian Affairs
L8	Sam Ennis, Assistant Solicitor, Tribal Government Services,
L9	Office of the Solicitor
20	John-Michael Partesotti, Office of Federal Acknowledgment
21	Team Lead, Tribal Government Servicer, Office of the
22	Solicitor
23	Judge Gregory Bigler
24	Kathryn Isom-Clause, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Indian
25	Affairs for Policy & Economic Development

1	REMOTE APPEARANCES				
2					
3	Chief Vincent Mann, Turtle Clan Chief, Ramapough Munsee				
4	Nation				
5	Richard Reich, Attorney for the Muckleshoot Tribe				
6	Maryanne Mohan, Attorney for the Suquamish Tribe				
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					

1	TRANSCRIPT OF REMOTE TRIBAL CONSULTING MEETING					
2	HELD VIA ZOOM ON					
3	MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2024					
4	3:01 P.M.					
5						
6	MR. HARTY: Good afternoon and welcome to today's					
7	virtual government to government consultation session on					
8	the 25 CFR Part 83 Proposed Rule on Re-Petitioning for					
9	Federal Acknowledgment as an American Indian Tribe.					
10	My name is Michael Harty and I'll be facilitating					
11	today's session. My team members, Madeline, Ben, and I,					
12	are contractors to the Department of the Interior. We're					
13	supporting the Department's team for this Part 83					
14	consultation process. Derrick Beetso and Keely Driscoll					
15	are also part of our contractor team and will be tracking					
16	all of today's input.					
17	This is the first of three opportunities to					
18	provide input virtually on the Part 83 Proposed Rule. A					
19	second consultation session is scheduled for September 3 th					
20	and a listening session is scheduled for September 5 .					
21	This information is provided in a "Dear Tribal Leader"					
22	letter dated July 12. A link to that letter can be found					
23	in the chat.					
24	As noted, the consultation sessions are closed to					
25	the press and the public.					

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A few technical items to insure you're able to participate, particularly if you can keep your phone or your listening -- your microphone on "mute", it will be very helpful. I want to make sure that everyone understands the consultation today is only open to federally recognized tribes. It's closed to non-federally recognized groups, to the public, and the press in order to protect any confidential information. We do have a court reporter today. Her name is Barbara Molina. Barbara will be preparing a transcript of all the input today and will have instructions for you later to ensure that all of your input is accurately captured. We will ask tribal leaders and elected officials and/or their representatives to provide those comments. And, again, we'll have more instructions when we get to them.

We also have closed captioning services. If you would like to use closed captioning, go to the bottom of your screen and click on the arrow next to "Closed Caption" and choose, "Show Subtitle"; or you can use the link that we'll paste into the chat box -- again, if you would like to use closed captioning.

And I think you may have heard earlier we are recording this session.

So with that I am going to turn to Bryan Newland,

2.2

Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you so much, Michael, and good afternoon, everybody. My name is Bryan Newland. I have the privilege of serving as the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs here at the Department of the Interior. And I'm glad that you have all joined us today for this government to government consultation.

Before we begin this consultation, we always try to make sure that we have these engagements done in a respectful and proper way. And so to offer us a blessing today, we've invited Judge Bigler all the way from Skogie Creek to offer us a blessing.

So, Judge Bigler, if you'll do us the honors, please?

JUDGE GREGORY BIGLER: Thank you and I'm very honored to do this and perhaps it was fortuitous as the Yuchi are not federally separately recognized but was in the Muscogee Creek Nation. So maybe many of the things that one talks about would be of interest to us, although as I said, we are within the Muscogee Creek Nation and we appreciate their help they've given us over the years.

So I will give a short prayer here in our Yuchi language and then I'll translate it for those of you who are -- or try to translate it for those of you who don't understand. So if you'll give me a moment, please.

(WHEREUPON, traditional opening prayer provided 1 2 in the native Yuchi language.) 3 JUDGE GREGORY BIGLER: Creator, the One that gives us breath, today we gather to think about Indians and 4 5 those who are not Indians and how the US will act towards them. Our children who are home, You watch over them. 6 7 I ask that you help keep us -- keep them in our minds as we work and that what we do here helps quard our 8 9 Indian people and our Indian ways. Our eldest that have 10 passed on, that is why we are still here. 11 Creator, today You pour Your blessings over us 12 and I ask at this meeting that everything goes well. 13 That is all. 14 Thank you so much, Judge, for your MR. NEWLAND: 15 words of prayer as well as for you taking the time to be with us today. 16 17 So we have scheduled today this consultation for 18 90 minutes and we have a little bit of programming on the 19 front end. It shouldn't take us more than 15 or 20 minutes 20 and then we'll get to the part -- the main reason why we're 21 here, which is to hear from all of you. 22 Just one housekeeping item before we get started 23 is that I have a conflicting meeting for 15 minutes at 4:00 24 p.m. Eastern Time, so about 50 minutes from now. If we're

still going, I will duck out and our Deputy Assistant

1	Cognotany Kathryn Igom Claugo will fill in anchable much					
1	Secretary Kathryn Isom-Clause will fill in probably much					
2	more capably than me today and continue the conversation;					
3	and I will rejoin when I'm able to do that.					
4	So as I mentioned to you before, I'm Bryan					
5	Newland. I serve as Assistant Secretary and we've got an					
6	incredible team of folks here at the Department who do this					
7	work and I'm going to introduce them to you right now.					
8	That includes our Deputy Assistant Secretary Kathryn Isom-					
9	Clause; our Senior Counselor from our Office of the					
10	Assistant Secretary, Stephanie Sfiridis; the Acting					
11	Director of OFA, the Office of Federal Acknowledgment,					
12	Denise Litz.					
13	We've got some of our key team members from the					
14	Office of the Solicitor on the line, as well, including Sam					
15	Ennis, our Assistant Solicitor for Tribal Government					
16	Services; and John-Michael Partesotti, the Office of					
17	Federal Acknowledgment Team Lead and Tribal Government					
18	Services Attorney from the Office of the Solicitor.					
19	And we also have here the man behind the scenes,					
20	Oliver Whaley, who leads our Office of Regulatory Affairs					
21	and Collaborative Action, handling the slides and making					
22	sure that we're doing this consultation and promulgating					
23	this Rule according to the correct process.					
24	So, Oliver, can you go to the next slide, please?					

So today's consultation, our programming, as I

25

1	mentioned, I'm going to give a little bit of background on			
2	our federal acknowledgment regulations and how we got to			
3	this point of proposing amendments to the Part 83			
4	regulations and then we will turn it over to all of you.			
5	So, Oliver, next slide, please.			
6	Many of you know that the Department first			
7	published federal recognition regulations in 1978, which			
8	creates the process that we use to date now for groups to			
9	petition the federal government for recognition. Those			
10	regulations were amended in 1994 and then again in 2015.			
11	Once the federal government acknowledges a tribe then you			
12	go on the annual list that we publish every year, according			
13	to the 1994 List Act.			
14	Next slide, please, Oliver.			
15	Our federal recognition regulations include seven			
16	mandatory criteria for federal acknowledgment. Those are			
17	listed at 25 CFR Section 8311. They're listed here			
18	briefly. I'm not going to read them verbatim to you.			
19	Next slide, please, Oliver.			
20	So just a little bit of background on re-			
21	petitioning and the Department's prohibition on allowing			
22	groups to petition for recognition after they had			
23	previously been denied. This prohibition has been part of			
24	the Department's regulations since 1994.			

In 2014, the Department published a rule that

25

2.

would've allowed groups to re-petition; but one year later the final rule withdrew that proposal and maintained the 1994 regulation's prohibition with some of the reasoning set forth below.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

After we published the revised regulations in 2015, two petitioners, the Chinook Indian Nation and the Burt Lake Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, filed suit to challenge our decision to not include the re-petitioning language in the final rule. And in 2020, two separate courts in the Western District of Washington, as well as the District of DC, agreed with the petitioners' lawsuits and held that the 2015 final rule was arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Procedures Act because the Department did not adequately justify not including the re-petitioning language in the final rule. And they both remanded the rule back to the Department to reconsider the language.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

So since those decisions in 2020, the Department has been wrestling with this issue; and in late 2020 under the previous administration the Department announced its intent to reconsider the ban and solicited written comments. After President Biden's inauguration in 2021, the Department held a consultation with federally

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

recognized tribes and the comment period closed at that And after that the Department considered three different options, including retaining the prohibition on re-petitioning, allowing limited re-petitioning or allowing open-ended re-petitioning. Then we published a proposed rule with the first option in 2022.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

That rule -- that proposed rule in 2022 included language that would've upheld the 1994 prohibition on repetitioning with several of the arguments you see listed here.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

We published that proposed rule again in April of We held tribal consultation two years ago in that We also held a listening session with prospective summer. petitioners who were not federally recognized and we closed that comment period in July of 2022, and then worked to consider again three different options: retaining the prohibition, allowing limited re-petitioning, and allowing open-ended re-petitioning and we have now settled on the second option which is reflected in the regulations we've proposed.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

Some of the reasons that we've laid out for taking this approach include equity and fairness to

2.2

unsuccessful petitioners, especially in light of the 2015 regulations. We wanted to be responsive to the courts in both the Chinook and Burt Lake lawsuits. Advancements in technology and our ability to process these rules or these petitions, excuse me, protection from -- protection from wide ranging litigation of previously denied petitions and previously decided issues, as well as recognition of third party and departmental interests and finality.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

So under the language that we've proposed now, the Rule would append a new subpart to 25 CFR Part 83 that would condition re-petitioning on a threshold review. So to petition again for federal recognition, a group would first have to plausibly allege that the Department's previous negative determination would change to a positive on reconsideration based on one or both of the following:

The change in the regulation itself from a previous version of the Rule to the current version and/or new evidence.

Next slide, please, Oliver.

Under this language, unsuccessful petitioners would have five years to submit a new petition request and that clock would begin on either the effective date of the final rule if a previous -- if the Department had previously denied a petition longer than five years ago,

2.

you would have five days or five years from the final rule or five years from a negative final determination whichever one occurs after; and that clock would be told during any lawsuit reviewing a negative final determination.

Once you had been denied or once a group has been denied authorization to re-petition, they would not be permitted to submit a petition again unless the Department revises Part 83.

Next slide.

The new subpart at 83.50 to 83.61 would describe the procedures that we would use to evaluate every petition request and the procedure would mirror the same one that we use for processing a documented petition, so that would include publication of a notice in a federal register, posting of certain portions of a submission on our website, notification to certain third parties, and an opportunity for public comment on the request.

Next slide, please.

The proposed Rule also classifies how the Department would prioritize review of documented petitions and re-petition requests.

So those petitions that are already under review would receive the highest priority followed by petitions awaiting review. New petitions would have priority over resubmitted or re-petitions at least initially. And OFA

2.2

would maintain a list of re-petitioning requests ready for active consideration. Any petition that's pending on that list for more than two years would have priority over any subsequently filed petition.

Next slide, please.

Within 180 days of the date that OFA notifies the petitioner that we've begun review, we would issue a decision on the re-petitioning request itself. That's that threshold question before we get into the substance of repetitioning. If we find that a petitioner meets those conditions for re-petitioning, we would grant authorization at that point. That would not be a final agency action if we authorize re-petitioning. Instead, it just simply allows a group to submit a new petition.

However, a decision that denies a request to repetition and would be considered final agency action that would allow for interested parties to go to court and seek redress.

Next slide, please.

Our proposed Rule would also give any petitioner that's currently moving under the previous version of Part 83 the choice to switch over to the 2015 process, and we believe that this promotes efficiency because without this choice petitioners currently proceeding under the previous version of Part 83 would have to await a final

25

determination, and in the event of a negative determination 1 it would then have to file a Request to Re-Petition under 2. 3 the part -- under the 2015 regulations. So this saves a lot of headache, heartache, and resources by everybody. 4 5 Next slide, please. Okay. So we are going to stop our part of this 6 7 where we speak at you and open the floor up to all of you. If you wish to comment, you can use the "Raise hand" icon 8 9 on your taskbar at the bottom of your screen. If you're 10 participating today by phone, you simply press "Star 9" on That will raise your hand and then you'll 11 your keypad. have to use -- make sure that you unmute yourself. So if 12 13 you're on phone it will be "Star 6" (sic) that will 14 identify you by the last four digits of your phone number 15 or here if you're participating by Zoom, you'll have to just unmute yourself at the bottom of your screen. 16 17 We are going to try to make sure that we're 18 responding to tribal leaders first as we see them. 19 go in order as long as we have comments or questions up 20 until our regularly scheduled time, which is about 70 21 minutes from now. 22 So with that we'll open the floor to all of you 23 and we will please also monitor the chat because we will be

providing some important information for those of you

there, including this important fact that if you have a

1	written comment you want to submit, please send it to				
2	th consultation@bia.gov by midnight on Friday, September 13 ,				
3	and it will be included in the consultation record.				
4	Do we have any participants who wish to comment				
5	or who have questions?				
6	MR. HARTY: I don't see any raised hands yet but				
7	maybe people are moving their cursors to the "Raise hand",				
8	Bryan, now.				
9	MR. NEWLAND: Yep, in my experience, Michael,				
10	folks usually don't want to be first so I'll hold I'll				
11	hold here for a few minutes. Of course, we're not going to				
12	make everybody stare awkwardly at me in their screen if				
13	nobody has comments. But we will hold for a few minutes				
14	and see if anyone wishes to comment.				
15	So I see a hand from Chief Vincent Mann.				
16	Please share your name and who you're				
17	representing today.				
18	CHIEF MANN: (Speaking in native tongue.)				
19	Hello, everyone. My name is Chief Vincent Mann.				
20	I am currently the elected Turtle Clan Chief of the				
21	Ramapough Lenape Nation. Our head sachem is Sachem Dwaine				
22	Perry of the Ramapough Lenape Nation.				
23	Our tribe petitioned for federal recognition back				
24	in I guess we began that process in 1978, during which				
25	time in 1994 our tribe was given a negative finding. Prior				

2.

to that actually being told to us, there was a senator who leaked that information two weeks prior to. There was the changes in the regulations that happened, so we were allowed to continue to move forward. And then we received another negative finding which then we had taken the BIA to federal court.

In that court proceeding, the judge at that time had asked the BIA's lawyer, you know, what was, you know, what's the problem with our federal recognition bid; and the reason why we were there is because they said we were not Indians. But pressure from the judge in 2000 actually caused the BIA's lawyer to tell the truth and stated that there has never been a question ever whether or not we were native people. And the judge proceeded to ask him, you know, so then what was the problem? And then the lawyer said, well, they didn't -- they didn't know which tribe of historic first contact from which we come from.

You know, that in itself also was not true because the Ramapough are listed on land deeds in 1680, I believe, with Chief Katonah being the sole sachem of all Ramapough Indians at that time. So the judge referenced to the BIA that he said -- excuse -- excuse his way of putting it forward, but he said it's likening this to a prepackaged loaf of bread in that you're finding something wrong with all of these things.

What the BIA did in regards to the Ramapough people was that they used impossible burden of proof instead of reasonable likelihood. It was proven as such and there was even documentation that came forward from the BIA at that time that stated that they would not do that in further recognition cases.

Since that time when we did not receive our federal recognition our people have continued to suffer. Specifically, the Turtle Clan living in a federal super fund site which has been an ongoing battle for nearly 60 years now with no help whatsoever. But they continue to live there and die.

And so in 2015 when this all came about, you know, there were many of our people just, you know, native communities in general that were super excited about the fact that they would be able to go back and to petition again. The Ramapough were also one of those peoples. We had Bud Shapard who was a part of the BIA, who actually left and came to our side and wrote how the Ramapough provided 80 percent more documentation, you know, than most federally recognized tribes at that time.

Unfortunately, if any of you are aware of our case, the former president who is also running for president at the moment, Donald Trump, was a big adversary to our people because of his casinos in New Jersey, which

he no longer has which we filed way before that was even an 1 option to native communities. So for us, the Ramapough, I 2. 3 would say that being -- being able to go back before the BIA, the federal government, to lay out, you know, before 4 5 them what happened to us and why we should be federally recognized is something that hopefully would set a 6 7 precedent in Indian country. You know, native people have been through a lot 8 9 in this country and, you know, it's not just our lands that 10 were taken or our lives, you know, but even our names that we carry. So I'm going to stop right there for now. 11 12 (Speaking in native tongue.) 13 Thank you. 14 Thank you, Chief Mann, and thank MR. NEWLAND: 15 you for sharing with us and also bringing along your good 16 boy to participate in the consultation. Dogs are always 17 welcome. 18 I just want to -- your comments are included in 19 the record. I want to make sure that reiterating and 20 emphasizing a point that we tried to raise at the top, 21 which is today's consultation is intended to be government 22 to government between the Department of Federally 23 Recognized Tribes. We do have a separate listening session 24 that is aimed to be also a part of the rulemaking process 25 and record for unrecognized groups that either are

25

working.

currently petitioning or wish to -- may wish to re-petition 1 2 the Department for federal recognition. 3 We draw this distinction because there is a -there is a bit of a difference that is important between 4 5 that formal government to government between the Department of Recognized Tribes and those seeking recognition, and we 6 will certainly account for the views in our rulemaking and 7 want to hear from you in the rulemaking if you are 8 9 representing unrecognized groups, either currently 10 petitioning or seeking re-petition. 11 But thank you again for joining us and we'll turn 12 back to our list of participants and look for raised hands. 13 So if you wish to comment, please raise your hand. 14 are on the phone, you can press "Star 9". 15 MR. HARTY: I don't see any other hands at the 16 moment, but let's give them some time. Any elected or appointed tribal representatives 17 18 or their designated representatives today for federally 19 recognized tribes? 20 MR. NEWLAND: All right. A reminder, if included in the chat that if you wish to submit written comments, 21 22 please send those to consultation@bia.gov by midnight on 23 September the 13 .

MR. REICH: Yes, my "Raised hand" function isn't

1 MR. NEWLAND: Okay. 2 MR. REICH: If there are no elected tribal 3 leaders, my name is Richard Reich, tribal attorney for the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe in Washington State. 4 5 MR. NEWLAND: Yes. Go ahead, Richard. MR. REICH: The Muckleshoot Tribe -- let me turn 6 7 on my camera here, I suppose. The Muckleshoot Tribe supported the continuation 8 of the 1994 ban on re-petitioning contained in the 2015 9 10 final Rule revising Part 83. It supported the Department's 2022 proposal to maintain the ban on re-petitioning 11 12 following the Burt Lake and Chinook decisions. 13 The Muckleshoot Tribe continues to support 14 maintenance of the ban on re-petitioning for all of the 15 reasons persuasively described by the Department in the 16 2022 proposed rule. With that said, my questions today focus on the 17 standard for the threshold determination described in the 18 July 12 proposed Rule. The tribe will be submitting 19 20 written comments by the -- by the deadline to amplify its 21 support for maintenance of the ban. 22 My understanding is under the standard for 23 surviving a motion to dismiss used by the federal courts, 24 which is described in the proposed Rule, the decision maker

must accept all of the complainants' or in this case the

1	petitioners' allegations and material facts as true and
2	draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the petitioner.
3	The only question for the decision maker under the proposed
4	standard is whether the petitioner's factual allegations
5	are ultimately if ultimately proven true would entitle
6	the petitioner to the relief sought.
7	I guess my first question is: Am I correct that
8	this is the threshold standard the Department is proposing
9	and am I correct that it doesn't involve a fact finding by
10	the Department as part of the threshold determination?
11	And if I'm wrong about that, can you point me out
12	where in the proposed Rule I have misunderstood the
13	proposed Rule?
14	MR. NEWLAND: Did you have additional questions
15	you wanted to ask, Richard?
16	MR. REICH: Yeah. The additional questions are:
17	Can you explain the reasoning for proposing the proposed
18	threshold standard which appears to adopt the standard used
19	by federal courts under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
20	12v6 to assess motions to dismiss for failure to state a
21	claim?
22	Why did the Department choose that standard as
23	opposed to the standard that it proposed at the 2014
24	excuse me yes, the 2014 draft regulations?
25	And can you explain why the Department considers

this to be a narrow standard when it's clearly much broader 1 2. than the standard proposed in 2014? 3 MR. NEWLAND: Thank you, Richard. So what I -what I can say is that simply point back to the language 4 5 that's in the proposed Rule itself. I don't want to in this setting get beyond what we included in the Notice of 6 7 Proposed Rulemaking because it is extensive and we tried to lay out our rationale there. 8 9 We would, of course, welcome the tribe to comment 10 in recommendations on language. It's understood that the 11 tribe favors keeping the prohibition in place on re-12 petitioning and if you have comments on regulatory language 13 that you want to make in the alternative, we would welcome 14 that as well into the record and I will -- what I can tell 15 you is that like we do in all of the rulemaking, we actually do read your comments and a lot of these find 16 17 their way into regulatory text at the end of the day. 18 MR. REICH: Thank you. 19 MR. NEWLAND: Thank you. 20 MR. HARTY: Other commenters? 21 I see a hand from Maryanne Mohan. Go ahead, 22 Maryanne. 23 Oh, yeah; sorry, let me fix my MS. MOHAN: 24 camera. 25 Hi. I just wanted to -- I'm Maryanne Mohan,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

attorney for the Suquamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation here in Washington.

I just wanted to echo Richard's comments and provide that the Suquamish Tribe also urges the Department of Interior to maintain the ban on re-petitioning under Part 83 and that we will be submitting written comments as Thank you. well.

> Thank you, Maryanne. MR. NEWLAND:

MR. HARTY: Other comments?

I don't see any other hands.

MR. NEWLAND: While we wait for that, I just -it -- you know, going back to Richard and Maryanne and your comments, I want to emphasize for everyone the importance of getting your -- if you wish to make written comments, getting those to us before the deadline. Once in the rulemaking process -- once we close the public comment period, you know, that closes off our ability to engage with you and begins the deliberative process period where we have to look at the record in front of us. So if that's all to say if you have something important that you wish to share with us as part of this rulemaking, please be timely in submitting your comments and we will review them.

We'll hold the floor open for another minute or two; and as long as we've got folks with comments we'll stay for our designated time. If not, we will let folks

21

22

23

24

25

77346 1 go. If you're on the phone, you can press "Star 9" to 2 3 raise your hand. You can use the "Raise hand" function at the bottom of your screen. You can do that by pressing the 4 "React" button and then there's a separate one underneath 5 that that shows up that says you can raise your hand. 6 We'll do a final call for comments unless folks 7 want to keep it going. 8 MR. HARTY: I wonder if it would be helpful to 9 10 put up the -- that information you referred to a little bit earlier about the deadline for submitting comments? 11 12 MR. NEWLAND: Yep, we've done that in the chat, 13 Michael. MR. HARTY: Yeah. So you can find it in the 14 15 chat. And as also reflected in the chat, the next consultation session is September 3 at 1:00 Eastern and 16 then there is a listening session for present, former, and 17 prospective petitioners scheduled for September 5 at 3:00 18 19 p.m. Eastern Time.

MR. NEWLAND: I don't see any other hands at this point. Last call for comments during today's consultation.

Going once, going twice. Okay.

What we can do then is adjourn today's consultation session. As Michael said, we have additional opportunities for you to join us in these formal

```
consultation sessions electronically and we look forward to
 1
 2
    any written comments you wish to submit.
 3
              Thank you for joining us today and taking time.
    We know that you're all incredibly busy working on behalf
 4
    of your people, your communities, your clients, and we
 5
 6
    really appreciate you sharing some of that time with us.
              With that, we will adjourn today's consultation
 7
    session at 3:40.
 8
 9
              Thank you, Michael, Barbara, and our team.
10
              MR. HARTY:
                           Thank you.
11
              (WHEREUPON, the session was concluded at 3:40
12
    p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	77346
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Barbara Molina, do hereby certify that I reported
4	all proceedings adduced in the foregoing matter and that
5	the foregoing transcript pages constitutes a full, true
6	and accurate record of said proceedings to the best of my
7	ability.
8	
9	I further certify that I am neither related to
10	counsel or any party to the proceedings nor have any
11	interest in the outcome of the proceedings.
12	
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
14	4th day of September, 2024.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	4molins
20	Barbara Molina
21	
22	
23	
24	

Index: 12..awkwardly

7/346			index: 12awkwardiy
		accept 21:25	allege 12:14
1	4	account 20:7	allowed 10:1 17:4
12 4:22 21:19	4:00 7:23	accurately 5:12	allowing 9:21
12v6 22:20		acknowledges	11:4,19
13 16:2 20:23	5	9:11	alternative 23:13
15 7:19,23	5 4:20 25:18	acknowledgment	amended 9:10
1680 17:19	50 7:24	4:9 8:11,17 9:2, 16	amendments 9:3
180 14:6		act 7:5 9:13 10:14	American 4:9
1978 9:7 16:24	6	Acting 8:10	amplify 21:20
1994 9:10,13,24	6 15:13	action 8:21 14:12,	and/or 5:14 12:18
10:3 11:9 16:25	60 18:10	16	announced 10:22
21:9		active 14:2	annual 9:12
1:00 25:16	7	additional 22:14,	appears 22:18
2	70 15:20	16 25:24	append 12:11
	10 13.20	adequately 10:15	appointed 20:17
20 7:19	8	adjourn 25:23 26:7	approach 11:25
2000 17:11	00 40:00		April 11:13
2014 9:25 22:23, 24 23:2	80 18:20	administration 10:22	arbitrary 10:13
	83 4:8,13,18 9:3 12:11 13:8 14:22,	Administrative	arguments 11:10
2015 9:10 10:7,13 12:1 14:22 15:3	25 21:10 24:6	10:14	arrow 5:19
18:13 21:9	83.50 13:10	adopt 22:18	assess 22:20
2020 10:10,20,21	83.61 13:10	Advancements	Assistant 6:1,4
2021 10:24	8311 9:17	12:3	7:25 8:5,8,10,15
2022 11:6,8,14,17		adversary 18:24	attorney 8:18 21:3 24:1
21:11,16	9	Affairs 6:1,5 8:20	
25 4:8 9:17 12:11	9 15:10 20:14	afternoon 4:6 6:3	authorization 13:6 14:11
3	25:2	agency 14:12,16	authorize 14:13
	90 7:18	agreed 10:12	await 14:25
3 4:19 25:16		ahead 21:5 23:21	awaiting 13:24
3:00 25:18	A	aimed 19:24	aware 18:22
3:40 26:8	ability 12:4 24:17	allegations 22:1,	awkwardly 16:12
		4	
			1

			inderi Batori Company
В	16 25:4	CFR 4:8 9:17	24:16
	box 5:21	12:11	commenters
back 10:17 16:23	boy 19:16	challenge 10:9	23:20
18:16 19:3 20:12	bread 17:24	change 12:15,17	comments 5:14
23:4 24:12	breath 7:4	chat 4:23 5:21	10:24 15:19 16:13 19:18
background 9:1,	briefly 9:18	15:23 20:21 25:12,15	20:21 21:20
ban 10:23 21:9,	bringing 19:15	Chief 16:15,18,	23:12,16 24:3,6,
11,14,21 24:5	broader 23:1	19,20 17:20	9,13,14,22,24 25:7,11,21 26:2
Band 10:8	Bryan 5:25 6:3	19:14	communities
Barbara 5:10 26:9	8:4 16:8	children 7:6	18:15 19:2 26:5
based 12:16	Bud 18:18	Chinook 10:7	complainants
battle 18:10	burden 18:2	12:3 21:12	21:25
Beetso 4:14	Burt 10:8 12:3	Chippewa 10:8	condition 12:12
began 16:24	21:12	choice 14:22,24	conditions 14:11
begin 6:8 12:23	busy 26:4	choose 5:20 22:22	confidential 5:8
begins 24:18	button 25:5		conflicting 7:23
		Civil 22:19	consideration
begun 14:7	C	claim 22:21	14:2
behalf 26:4	call 25:7,21	Clan 16:20 18:9	considered 11:2
Ben 4:11	camera 21:7	classifies 13:19	14:16
BIA 17:5,22 18:1, 5,18 19:4	23:24	Clause 8:9	considers 22:25
BIA'S 17:8,12	capably 8:2	click 5:19	consultation 4:7, 14,19,24 5:5 6:7,
bid 17:9	capricious 10:14	clients 26:5	8 7:17 8:22,25
Biden's 10:24	Caption 5:19	clock 12:23 13:3	10:25 11:14 16:3
	captioning 5:17,	close 24:16	19:16,21 25:16, 21,24 26:1,7
big 18:24	18,22	closed 4:24 5:6,	consultation@
Bigler 6:11,13,15 7:3	captured 5:13	17,18,19,22 11:1, 16	bia.gov 16:2
bit 7:18 9:1,20	carry 19:11	closes 24:17	20:22
20:4 25:10	case 18:23 21:25	Collaborative	contact 17:17
blessing 6:10,12	cases 18:6	8:21	contained 21:9
blessings 7:11	casinos 18:25	comment 11:1,17	continuation 21:8
bottom 5:18 15:9,	caused 17:12	13:17 15:8 16:1, 4,14 20:13 23:9	continue 8:2 17:4 18:11

continued 18:8 22:3 dismiss 21:23 emphasizing 22:20 19:20 continues 21:13 decisions 10:20 21:12 distinction 20:3 end 7:19 23:17 contractor 4:15 **deeds** 17:19 **District** 10:11,12 engage 24:17 contractors 4:12 deliberative documentation engagements 6:9 conversation 8:2 24:18 18:4.20 **Ennis** 8:15 correct 8:23 22:7, denied 9:23 12:6, documented ensure 5:12 25 13:5,6 13:13,20 Counselor 8:9 entitle 22:5 doesn't 22:9 **denies** 14:15 **country** 19:7,9 **equity** 11:25 Denise 8:12 **Dogs** 19:16 **court** 5:9 14:17 evaluate 13:11 **Donald** 18:24 **Department** 4:12 17:6.7 **event** 15:1 6:5 8:6 9:6,25 don't 6:24 16:6, **courts** 10:11 12:2 10:15,17,20,22, evidence 12:19 10 20:15 23:5 21:23 22:19 25 11:2 12:24 24:10 25:20 excited 18:15 13:7,20 19:22 creates 9:8 draft 22:24 20:2,5 21:15 excuse 12:5 **Creator** 7:3,11 22:8,10,22,25 17:22 22:24 draw 20:3 22:2 24:4 **Creek** 6:12,18,20 **experience** 16:9 Driscoll 4:14 criteria 9:16 departmental **explain** 22:17,25 duck 7:25 12:8 **current** 12:18 extensive 23:7 **Dwaine** 16:21 Department's cursors 16:7 4:13 9:21,24 F 12:14 21:10 Ε D **Deputy** 7:25 8:8 facilitating 4:10 earlier 5:23 25:11 date 9:8 12:23 Derrick 4:14 fact 15:25 18:16 Eastern 7:24 14:6 describe 13:10 22:9 25:16,19 **dated** 4:22 designated 20:18 facts 22:1 **echo** 24:3 day 23:17 24:25 factual 22:4 effective 12:23 days 13:1 14:6 determination failure 22:20 efficiency 14:23 12:15 13:2,4 15:1 **DC** 10:12 fairness 11:25 eldest 7:9 21:18 22:10 deadline 21:20 favor 22:2 elected 5:13 didn't 17:16 24:15 25:11 16:20 20:17 21:2 **favors** 23:11 **die** 18:12 **Dear** 4:21 electronically federal 4:9 8:11, difference 20:4 decided 12:7 26:1 17 9:2,7,9,11,15, **digits** 15:14 decision 10:9 16 12:13 13:14 emphasize 24:13 14:8,15 21:24 Director 8:11 16:23 17:6,9

Index: federally..issue

77346		Inde	ex: federallyissue
18:8,9 19:4 20:2		head 16:21	includes 8:8
21:23 22:19	G	headache 15:4	including 8:14
federally 5:6 6:17 10:25 11:16	gather 7:4	hear 7:21 20:8	10:15 11:3 15:25
18:21 19:5,22	general 18:15	heard 5:23	incredible 8:6
20:18	give 6:22,25 9:1	heartache 15:4	incredibly 26:4
file 15:2	14:20 20:16	held 10:13,25	Indian 4:9 6:1,5 7:9 10:7 19:7
filed 10:8 14:4	glad 6:6	11:14,15	21:4 24:1
19:1	good 4:6 6:3 19:15	helpful 5:4 25:9	Indians 7:4,5 10:8
fill 8:1		helps 7:8	17:11,21
final 10:2,10,13, 16 12:24 13:1,2,4	government 4:7 6:7 8:15,17 9:9,	highest 13:23	inferences 22:2
14:12,16,25	11 19:4,21,22	historic 17:17	information 4:21
21:10 25:7	20:5	hold 16:10,11,13 24:23	5:8 15:24 17:2 25:10
finality 12:8	grant 14:11		initially 13:25
find 14:10 23:16 25:14	GREGORY 6:15 7:3	home 7:6	input 4:16,18
finding 16:25	group 12:13 13:5	honored 6:16	5:11,12
17:5,24 22:9	14:14	honors 6:13	instructions 5:11,
fix 23:23	groups 5:7 9:8,22	housekeeping 7:22	15
floor 15:7,22	10:1 19:25 20:9		insure 5:1
24:23	guard 7:8	<u> </u>	intended 19:21
focus 21:17	guess 16:24 22:7	icon 15:8	intent 10:23
folks 8:6 16:10	Н	identify 15:14	interest 6:19
24:24,25 25:7		importance 24:13	interested 14:17
formal 20:5 25:25	hand 15:8,11	important 15:24,	interests 12:8
fortuitous 6:16	16:7,15 20:13,24 23:21 25:3,6	25 20:4 24:20	Interior 4:12 6:5 24:5
forward 17:4,23 18:4 26:1	handling 8:21	impossible 18:2	introduce 8:7
found 4:22	hands 16:6 20:12,	inauguration	invited 6:11
Friday 16:2	15 24:10 25:20	10:24	involve 22:9
front 7:19 24:19	happened 17:3	include 9:15 10:9 11:25 13:14	isn't 20:24
function 20:24	19:5	included 11:8	Isom- 8:8
25:3	Harty 4:6,10 16:6 20:15 23:20 24:9	16:3 19:18 20:20	Isom-clause 8:1
fund 18:10	25:9,14 26:10	23:6	issue 10:21 14:7
			13040 10.21 17.7
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	•	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

77340		1110	dex: issuesmotions
issues 12:7		20:12	mandatory 9:16
item 7:22	L	listed 9:17 11:10	Mann 16:15,18,19
items 5:1	laid 11:24	17:19	19:14
it's 5:6 17:23	Lake 10:8 12:3	listening 4:20 5:3 11:15 19:23	Maryanne 23:21, 22,25 24:8,12
19:9 23:1,10	21:12	25:17	material 22:1
I'II 4:10 6:23 16:10	land 17:19	litigation 12:6	meeting 7:12,23
l'm 6:6,15 8:3,4,7	lands 19:9	Litz 8:12	meets 14:10
9:1,18 19:11	language 6:23 7:2 10:10,16,18	live 18:12	members 4:11
22:11 23:25	11:9 12:10,21	lives 19:10	8:13
J	23:4,10,12	living 18:9	mentioned 8:4
	late 10:21	loaf 17:24	9:1
Jersey 18:25	lawsuit 13:4	long 15:19 24:24	Michael 4:10 6:2
John-michael 8:16	lawsuits 10:12 12:3	longer 12:25 19:1	16:9 25:13,24 26:9
join 25:25	lawyer 17:8,12,15	lot 15:4 19:8	microphone 5:3
joined 6:6	lay 19:4 23:8	23:16	midnight 16:2
joining 20:11	Lead 8:17	M	20:22
26:3	Leader 4:21		minds 7:8
judge 6:11,13,15	leaders 5:13	Madeline 4:11	minute 24:23
7:3,14 17:7,11, 14,21	15:18 21:3	Madison 24:1	minutes 7:18,19, 23,24 15:21
July 4:22 11:17	leads 8:20	main 7:20	16:11,13
21:19	leaked 17:2	maintain 14:1 21:11 24:5	mirror 13:12
justify 10:15	left 18:19	maintained 10:2	misunderstood
	Lenape 16:21,22	maintenance	22:12
K	letter 4:22	21:14,21	Mohan 23:21,23,
Kathryn 8:1,8	let's 20:16	make 5:4 6:9	25 Molina 5:10
Katonah 17:20	light 12:1	15:12,17 16:12 19:19 23:13	moment 6:25
Keely 4:14	likelihood 18:3	24:14	18:24 20:16
keeping 23:11	likening 17:23	maker 21:24 22:3	monitor 15:23
key 8:13	limited 11:4,19	making 8:21	motion 21:23
keypad 15:11	link 4:22 5:20	man 8:19	motions 22:20
	list 9:12,13 14:1,3		

move 17:4	OFA 8:11 13:25	Partesotti 8:16	petitioning 9:21
moving 14:21 16:7	14:6 offer 6:10,12	participants 16:4 20:12	11:10 14:10 20:1, 10 23:12
Muckleshoot 21:4,6,8,13	Office 8:9,11,14, 16,18,20	participate 5:2 19:16	petitions 12:5,6 13:20,22,23,24
Muscogee 6:18, 20	officials 5:13 Oliver 8:20,24	participating 15:10,15	phone 5:2 15:10, 13,14 20:14 25:2
mute 5:3	9:5,14,19 10:5,19 11:7,12,23 12:9,	parties 13:16 14:17	place 23:11 plausibly 12:14
N	20 ongoing 18:10	party 12:8	point 9:3 14:12 19:20 22:11 23:4
names 19:10 narrow 23:1	open 5:5 15:7,22 24:23	passed 7:10 paste 5:21	25:21 Port 24:1
Nation 6:18,20 10:7 16:21,22	open-ended 11:5,	pending 14:2 people 7:9 16:7	portions 13:15
native 7:2 16:18	opening 7:1	17:14 18:2,8,14, 25 19:8 26:5	positive 12:15 posting 13:15
17:14 18:14 19:2, 8,12	opportunities 4:17 25:25	peoples 18:17	pour 7:11
negative 12:15 13:2,4 15:1 16:25	opportunity 13:16	percent 18:20 period 11:1,17	prayer 6:22 7:1, 15
17:5 Newland 5:25	opposed 22:23	24:17,18 permitted 13:7	pre- 17:23 precedent 19:7
6:2,3 7:14 8:5 16:9 19:14 20:20	option 11:6,21 19:2	Perry 16:22	preparing 5:10
21:1,5 22:14 23:3,19 24:8,11 25:12,20	options 11:3,18 order 5:7 15:19	persuasively 21:15	present 25:17 president 10:24
non-federally 5:6	Ottawa 10:8	petition 9:9,22 12:13,22,25 13:7,	18:23,24 press 4:25 5:7
noted 4:24 notice 13:14 23:6	Р	11,13 14:2,4,14, 16 18:16	15:10 20:14 25:2 pressing 25:4
notification 13:16	p.m. 7:24 25:19	petitioned 16:23 petitioner 14:7,	pressure 17:11
notifies 14:6 number 15:14	packaged 17:24 part 4:8,13,15,18 7:20 9:3,23 12:11	10,20 22:2,6 petitioners 10:7, 12 11:16 12:1,21	previous 10:22 12:15,18,24 14:21,24
0	13:8 14:21,25 15:3,6 18:18	14:24 22:1 25:18	previously 9:23 12:6,7,25
occurs 13:3	19:24 21:10 22:10 24:6,21	petitioner's 22:4	

prior 16:25 17:2	proposing 9:3	Ramapough	18:21 19:6,23
prioritize 13:20	22:8,17	16:21,22 17:19, 21 18:1,17,19	20:6,19
priority 13:23,24 14:3	prospective 11:15 25:18	19:2	recommendation s 23:10
privilege 6:4	protect 5:8	ranging 12:6	reconsider 10:17,
problem 17:9,15	protection 12:5	rationale 23:8	23
procedure 13:12	proven 18:3 22:5	re- 9:20 11:9 14:9, 15 23:11	reconsideration 12:16
22:19 procedures 10:14	provide 4:18 5:14 24:4	re-petition 10:1 13:6,21 15:2	record 16:3 19:19,25 23:14
13:11	provided 4:21 7:1 18:20	20:1,10	24:19
proceeded 17:14	providing 15:24	re-petitioning 4:8	recording 5:24
proceeding 14:24 17:7		10:9,16 11:4,5, 19,20 12:12 14:1,	redress 14:18
	public 4:25 5:7 13:17 24:16	8,11,13 21:9,11,	referenced 17:21
process 4:14 8:23 9:8 12:4	publication 13:14	14 24:5	referred 25:10
14:22 16:24	publish 9:12	re-petitions 13:25	reflected 11:21
19:24 24:16,18	published 9:7,25	React 25:5	25:15
processing 13:13	10:6 11:5,13	read 9:18 23:16	register 13:14
programming 7:18 8:25	put 25:10	ready 14:1	regularly 15:20
	putting 17:22	reason 7:20	regulation 12:17
prohibition 9:21, 23 10:3 11:3,9,19		17:10	regulations 9:2,4,
23:11	Q	reasonable 18:3	7,10,15,24 10:6 11:21 12:2 15:3
promotes 14:23	question 14:9	reasoning 10:3	17:3 22:24
promulgating	17:13 22:3,7	22:17	regulation's 10:3
8:22 proof 18:2	questions 15:19 16:5 21:17 22:14,	reasons 11:24 21:15	regulatory 8:20 23:12,17
proper 6:10	16	receive 13:23 18:7	Reich 20:24 21:2, 3,6 22:16 23:18
proposal 10:2	R	received 17:4	reiterating 19:19
proposed 4:8,18	raise 15:8,11 16:7	recognition 9:7,9,	rejoin 8:3
11:5,8,13,22	19:20 20:13 25:3,	15,22 12:7,13	relief 22:6
12:10 13:19 14:20 21:16,19,	6	16:23 17:9 18:6,8	remanded 10:17
24 22:3,12,13,17,	raised 16:6 20:12, 24	20:2,6	reminder 20:20
23 23:2,5,7	24	recognized 5:6,7 6:17 11:1,16	1011111401 20.20

reporter 5:9	rulemaking 19:24	serving 6:4	18
representatives	20:7,8 23:7,15 24:16,21	session 4:7,11,	sought 22:6
5:14 20:17,18	rules 12:4	19,20 5:24 11:15	speak 15:7
representing 16:17 20:9		19:23 25:16,17, 24 26:8	speaking 16:18
	running 18:23	sessions 4:24	19:12
request 12:22	S	26:1	Specifically 18:9
13:12,17 14:8,15 15:2		set 10:4 19:6	standard 21:18,
	sachem 16:21	setting 23:6	22 22:4,8,18,22,
requests 13:21 14:1	17:20		23 23:1,2
Reservation 24:2	Sam 8:14	settled 11:20	Star 15:10,13
	saves 15:3	Sfiridis 8:10	20:14 25:2
resources 15:4	scenes 8:19	Shapard 18:18	stare 16:12
respectful 6:10	scheduled 4:19,	share 16:16 24:21	started 7:22
responding 15:18	20 7:17 15:20	sharing 19:15	state 21:4 22:20
responsive 12:2	25:18	26:6	stated 17:12 18:5
resubmitted	screen 5:19 15:9,	short 6:22	stay 24:25
13:25	16 16:12 25:4	shouldn't 7:19	Stephanie 8:10
retaining 11:3,18	Secretary 6:1,4	Show 5:20	stop 15:6 19:11
review 12:12	8:1,5,8,10	shows 25:6	submission
13:20,22,24 14:7 24:22	Section 9:17	sic 15:13	13:15
	seek 14:17	side 18:19	submit 12:22
reviewing 13:4	seeking 20:6,10		13:7 14:14 16:1
revised 10:6	senator 17:1	simply 14:13 15:10 23:4	20:21 26:2
revises 13:8	send 16:1 20:22	site 18:10	submitting 21:19
revising 21:10	Senior 8:9	Skogie 6:11	24:6,22 25:11
Richard 21:3,5	separate 10:10		subpart 12:11
22:15 23:3 24:12	19:23 25:5	slide 8:24 9:5,14, 19 10:5,19 11:7,	13:10
Richard's 24:3	separately 6:17	12,23 12:9,20	subsequently
rule 4:8,18 8:23	September 4:19,	13:9,18 14:5,19	14:4
9:25 10:2,10,13,	20 16:2 20:23	15:5	substance 14:9
16,17 11:6,8,13 12:11,18,24 13:1,	25:16,18	slides 8:21	Subtitle 5:20
19 14:20 21:10,	serve 8:5	sole 17:20	suffer 18:8
16,19,24 22:12,	services 5:17	solicited 10:23	suit 10:8
13,19 23:5	8:16,18	Solicitor 8:14,15,	summer 11:15
		, ,	
	1	1	1

super 18:9,15 25:19 26:3,6 watch 7:6 U support 21:13,21 timely 24:21 **ways** 7:9 supported 21:8, today 5:5,9,11 **website** 13:15 ultimately 22:5 6:6,11 7:4,11,16, 10 weeks 17:2 underneath 25:5 17 8:2 15:10 supporting 4:13 Western 10:11 understand 6:25 16:17 20:18 suppose 21:7 21:17 26:3 we'll 5:15,21 understanding Suguamish 24:1, 7:20 15:18,22 21:22 today's 4:6,11,16 20:11 24:23,24 8:25 19:21 25:21, understands 5:5 25:7 23 26:7 surviving 21:23 understood we're 4:12 7:20, told 13:3 17:1 **switch** 14:22 23:10 24 8:22 15:17 **tongue** 16:18 **unmute** 15:12,16 16:11 19:12 Т unrecognized we've 6:11 8:5, **top** 19:20 19:25 20:9 13 11:21,24 taking 7:15 11:25 tracking 4:15 12:10 14:7 24:24 unsuccessful 26:3 25:12 12:1,21 traditional 7:1 talks 6:19 Whaley 8:20 upheld 11:9 transcript 5:10 taskbar 15:9 whatsoever urges 24:4 translate 6:23.24 team 4:11,13,15 18:11 8:6,13,17 26:9 **tribal** 4:21 5:13 **what's** 17:9 V 8:15,17 11:14 technical 5:1 whichever 13:2 15:18 20:17 21:2. technology 12:4 verbatim 9:18 3 **wide** 12:6 text 23:17 version 12:18 tribe 4:9 9:11 wishes 16:14 14:21,25 16:23,25 17:16 that's 14:2,8,21 withdrew 10:2 21:4,6,8,13,19 23:5 24:19 **views** 20:7 23:9,11 24:1,4 **words** 7:15 there's 25:5 Vincent 16:15,19 **tribes** 5:6 11:1 work 7:88:7 **They're** 9:17 virtual 4:7 18:21 19:23 20:6, worked 11:17 they've 6:21 19 virtually 4:18 working 20:25 things 6:18 17:25 true 17:18 22:1,5 26:4 W threshold 12:12 **Trump** 18:24 would've 10:1 14:9 21:18 22:8, truth 17:12 wait 24:11 11:9 10,18 turn 5:25 9:4 wanted 12:2 wrestling 10:21 time 7:15,24 11:2 20:11 21:6 22:15 23:25 24:3 15:20 16:25 17:7, written 10:23 **Turtle** 16:20 18:9 Washington 21 18:5,7,21 16:1 20:21 21:20 10:11 21:4 24:2 20:16 24:25 24:6,14 26:2

Index: wrong..Zoom

wrong 17:25 22:11

wrote 18:19

Υ

year 9:12 10:1

years 6:21 11:14 12:22,25 13:1,2 14:3 18:11

you'll 6:13,25 15:11,15

you're 5:1 15:9, 13,15 16:16 17:24 25:2 26:4

Yuchi 6:17,22 7:2

Ζ

Zoom 15:15