

# Regional Tribal Roundtable Meeting

## May 4, 2010

### Sierra National Forest

---

Questions of Ron Pugh on Planning Rule Process.

- Collaborative vs. consultation – how are you presenting this information?
  - Who is making sure this information is being interpreted properly?
  - What information, what goal is what you want from the tribes?
  - Is this all going to be public information?
  - Pete – Federally recognized vs. Non-federally recognized, and Tribes without council, those without tribes, how will they initiate consultation?
- 

#### **What works and what doesn't work?**

How do we deal with Recognized tribes vs. Un-recognized tribes?

What does NEPA require for recognized and non-recognized?

FS needs to define what is the FS position on consultation based on NEPA? Define the rules for working with federally recognized vs. non-recognized tribes. Will that be nationwide or just each area different. National, regional and local consultation needs to be the same.

Consultation with federally recognized tribes vs. non-recognized varies from region to region.

When you define, look at the discussion.

NEPA, or planning rule process, law, or out of congress, leaves out non-federally recognized tribes. State recognized tribes fight to get the same recognition as the federally recognized tribes. California listed tribes include everyone under one heading. Get the state definition of consultation.

Equality of comments is discussed, but congress only recognizes federally recognized tribes, so how do the non-federally recognized tribes get their concerns discussed. We are being recognized as public people, but we are not on the same level. How do non-federally recognized get their comments (from the roundtable) treated the same way as the federally recognized tribes?

Better define how consultation will occur with federally recognized vs. non-federally recognized.

Who picked the scientists and why are we thrown in with the social science?

Tribes are not the public.

Topic area #9 should be tribal collaboration with tribes.

Cultural issues should stand alone. They are not a part of the social or economic dimensions. Cultural does not mean just sites. It also means resources and land use.

Second items under science forum – does this infer that the boundaries between existing forests be blurred? How do you do a landscape approach with the line (administrative boundary) on the map? How do you do collaboration with other agencies outside the FS boundaries?

The line within the forest – one ranger district gets moved to another ranger district can change the involvement of new players, desires and wants. Changing the district line can change everything. There needs to be a consistency between Ranger Districts.

Landscape – what is the definition of landscape? 5 miles? There should be a definition of measuring on the landscape level. The TCP could be a landscape level by definition.

Please simplify and use clear language. (What is a “driver”?) No acronyms.

Tribal entities input should in collaboration or consultation should have more weight over the public and scientific communities.

Climate change and watershed health go hand in hand. Restore the watershed would have an effect on climate change.

They are separate but they are the same. Climate change is worldwide, watershed is not. Caring for the watershed can help our situation now. Climate change is changing species diversity.

1, 2,3, and 4 are sometimes related but separate principles.

Restoration improves watershed health. Conservation then needs to be held up. That corresponds to species.

Consult with tribes on anything that involves sustainability of forests. Fuels, vegetation management, need the tribal perspective and tribes need to be included.

The Principles are not in a priority, but they should be prioritized:

#1 Consultation cooperation and collaboration with tribes.

#2 Watershed health

#3 Climate change

#4 Diversity of species

#5 Restoration

#6 Conservation

This process should define funding.

The language of the principles was created by the science committee. The language should be stronger and not an option. They are all important issues. It should say “will” not “could”. The language should be more direct.

#10 was an item to be included the list. Cultural, elders and spiritual leaders, and cultural practitioners, from the people with the knowledge of these items. Talk to the cultural and spiritual leaders.

Planning science should include the traditional, spiritual and cultural leaders.

How are spiritual leaders identified? How will the Forest Service identify these spiritual leaders? How would we set up guidelines for all the tribes? They should be identified through consultation, cooperation and collaboration with the local tribes. That is not for the Forest Service to establish.

Spiritual leaders are part of the tribes and should be consulted with we go into consultation.

Nationwide, tribal liaisons should be established to make sure these things happen and the tribes are getting more involved.

The tribes should establish who the spiritual leaders are.

Science and Traditional Knowledge should be together. Science is different from Traditional Knowledge. Science has a different way of thinking.

All lands approach could exclude sacred lands. There should be special guidelines, identification, and consultation for sacred lands.

Special interest areas

Emphasize confidentiality.

All lands approach needs to be defined. It could say that it must address all types of lands. It is not clear what that mean? It could be specific to a region, or an area, or what?

The word “management’ is a bad word and needs to be more inclusive. You need to work with the land.

#5 - Goods and services drive the forest service.

Species and wildlife habitat – sometimes things go overboard for T&E species. It can damage other plants or takes over and species are disappearing because of the habitat. Plants get crowded and effect native plants and wildlife. These issues can not be done at the expense of other plants and animals.

Management is what has gotten us to the point where we are now. Something is protected and there is an unanticipated domino effect based on a management decision. We can look back at management decisions and see the far reaching effects.

A lot of the things we have been bringing up have fallen on deaf ears. All land is sacred. We were taken out of our homelands. Our ancestors were left on the mountains. Everything up there is special. Overgrowth of invasive species. When are we going to be considered human beings on our landscape? Nothing is ever done. We give the FS information, and nothing gets done. When are we going to be considered human beings on our own land? As people. Look at our true needs. Our spiritual leaders had to leave things out. That’s too bad. We

need to hold on to what we have. Indian People need to get together. We need to implement laws to back up what we are saying. Otherwise it will be the same. FS works with people, but the reality is that we are being genocide every day in these mountains. Something needs to be done. The cultural and spiritual are connected. We need to have these laws to back us up. There are no laws to hold up these consultations. I don't have the papers you have. Indian people need to look at this so when we come to these meetings we have the laws in place to back us up. We need to use them.

Where are the people? Is that in the cultural? When it comes to cultural, it should not be a part of social.

Cultural should be separate from social and include ancestral. A good definition of cultural could strengthen native interests. It would cross over federally recognized and non-federally recognized.

We have laws that define these things to protect our needs. Cultural is a connection of all things in life. Everything. Wood rock, air, there is a protection for these things. It means something in our heart.

All lands mean the inclusion of all laws.

The planning rule should include and respect all laws that pertain to tribal interests.