

Tribal Leader Consultation on HUD's Housing Needs Assessment: Proceedings and Notes

Denver, Colorado, May 10, 2012

A. Proceedings

Charles (Chuck) Hanson welcomed the participants and introduced Randy Akers, the Office of Native American Programs Regional Administrator for HUD's Northern Plains Region.

Randy Akers again welcomed the participants, thanked them for coming, and introduced Doyle Pipe on Head, who delivered the invocation.

Randy Akers thanked Doyle for the invocation and introduced Rodger Boyd, Deputy Assistant Secretary for HUD's Office of Native American Programs.

Rodger Boyd: We have come here to meet and participate in a consultation process that we are fully committed to. Respected tribe members, thank you for coming. Guests today reflect that we have heard you and we are doing these consultations throughout the country in recognition of the request to do so. This needs assessment is overdue and the commitment is very revealing given that two Assistant Secretaries are here with us today. I am looking forward to today's conversation and the future of this work. A great friend both personally and to Indian Country, please welcome Sandra Henriquez, the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing. Sandra exhibits a commitment to helping to improve Indian Country and provide access to housing opportunities that is evident in her negotiation abilities, and we are deeply appreciative of her efforts.

Sandra Henriquez: It is a professional and personal privilege to be here today. My role is to listen and I apologize in advance for a brief absence during the morning. This is an opportunity to work together and it's important that we get it right. Historically, morally, legally, we are here to get it right. We are grounded throughout HUD in getting it right. Please be open and forthcoming today and if you have a question or issue following the consultation, please submit it – we are conducting consultations until July 9. The housing needs survey study is being led by PD&R and Assistant Secretary Raphael Bostic. I have worked with him since our confirmation hearing in 2009. One of our first conversations was about Native American issues; we share a mutual commitment to getting it right and making it right and trying to move a large Indian Country agenda forward. From his official bio: Raphael has served as Assistant secretary for PD&R since July 16, 2009; he is a key advisor to the Secretary on research and serves in that function across the Department. He is a Professor at USC and on and on. He does not prefer title Dr. Bostic despite his PhD; on a personal note, he is my favorite Assistant Secretary both

personally and professionally. We have a strong working relationship tackling issues together and allowing our staff to collaborate.

Raphael Bostic, Assistant Secretary for HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research: Sandi is my favorite Assistant Secretary as well. She works hard and brings a humility and down to earth attitude with tremendous passion and diligence. I am privileged to work with her. It is true that we have both from our first days viewed issues surrounding Native housing and community development as critical. She is a tireless champion for Native American Issues. You cannot have a more powerful advocate than her. This is a special time to have her working with us. It is good to be in Denver and out of Washington talking to real people with real issues and day to day considerations. That's why we are here — we know that there are tremendous needs in housing and we need the best information possible, understood and collected in a way that allows for informed conversations. The last survey for Natives was in 1996 and a lot has happened since then. Our conversation about resource allocations, and the emphasis on particular interventions and policies, is not informed by the current need, other than anecdotal stories. That hurts us and is problematic in today's environment. I want to make perfectly clear that in today's Washington, nothing is sacred, everything is a risk, and how we talk about issues goes a long way to how we preserve issues or conversely, see them disappear. As an example, during the last session, housing counseling was zeroed out. Representatives for that issue didn't lobby Washington. Your communities, though, have a more active voice. The second reason it was zeroed out is because there was no evidence on what housing counseling provided; no cost benefit analysis, no documented outcomes, etc. Therefore they couldn't justify why it was important. Later we got that information. We learned that a dollar of housing counseling translates into over \$300 in savings. Now that line item is restored. Data is critical. Findings inform resource allocation when there is competition for resources. Sizing needs in an aggregate way gives us an ability to talk nationally about why we need to devote resources to these issues. That's why I am standing here today. We have been engaged in outreach to your communities for almost two years now; a long, open and transparent process. It is a process that we heard people were not satisfied with. Therefore we are here. In truth, research activities are not covered by the law as requiring consultations. But they are important and that is why we are here. If we just swooped in and sent a few people to tribal lands to knock on doors that would be a problem. The second reason is that without your full engagement and support, our level of confidence in the results of the survey and questionnaires is lower. We need to do this; we are traveling all over the country to do this. It is important and serious. I want to emphasize one other thing — I've heard that some people may believe these exercises to be a "window dressing." I want to dispel that myth — we are here to get information and to make this survey the best possible. This is serious and real, and if it wasn't, I wouldn't be here. One other thing before I begin the slides, the goal here is to have this be a real consultation. I want to hear all of your issues, concerns and suggestions. The objective is for no one to leave here with any unanswered questions. I will stay here as long as necessary to address issues. I want direct, clear and honest conversation. There should be no regrets leaving here today.

The goal of the survey is to get an aggregate tally of national level estimate of tribal needs in terms of their nature and how acute they are. This is not about the formula – the formula splits the pie. We are trying to figure out how big the pie should be to begin with. This survey cannot be successful without tribal involvement and engagement. I don't view it as a HUD survey or government survey, but rather a shared survey. It was congressionally mandated so we are obligated but we should be doing this regardless; it is long overdue. My last point is important – this is not a census, so we are not going to talk to every tribe. But if tribes want to engage with their own survey efforts, we want to be as supportive as possible. That includes providing training, survey instruments, etc. We will help to ensure good information is obtained.

The process consists of three phases: design; implementation; and analysis and report. We are in the design phase now. The timeframes indicate that this is an extended process. We are trying to compress these consultations so that we can get this survey further underway to begin to use the information.

Input matters and is important. We want you to leave here today confident and comfortable in the survey tools and approach and agree that they make sense and will yield something of value that you support. It is truly a privilege to work on this. Tribal housing and community issues are important, the Federal Government's history on them has not been sterling, and there is an obligation to do whatever we can to make things right so that when faced with decisions regarding resource use, you are armed with the best information.

Chuck Hanson provided an overview of the day's agenda.

Jennifer Stoloff, Study Manager for HUD's Office of Policy Development & Research: Thank you to everyone for coming and especially the Assistant Secretaries. This consultation is a follow up to last year's listening sessions and they have influenced our design process. Reminder, sign up for the E-list if you have not done so and wish to be notified of any updates. The study mandate, from Congress, authorized us to do this study.

Jennifer Stoloff then provided an overview of the study, noted the members of the study team, and provided a rundown of the materials in the packets the participants received.

Tom Kingsley, Principal Investigator, Urban Institute: The 1996 study was conducted in partnership with tribes and talked not only about the scope but also the characteristics of tribal housing. It predated NAHASDA and made a strong case for self-determination. This story needs to be told again. This study team includes the Urban Institute, NORC, a firm with superb technical capabilities and competency in working with Indian Country, as well as Econometrica and SSI, a Native owned firm.

The main research topics are as follows: housing conditions and needs; demographic, social, and economic conditions; housing policies and programs; assessment of native Hawaiian housing needs and programs. The sources of data include an analysis of census and other secondary data;

the household survey; other primary data collection in tribal areas; and site visits, interviews and case studies to examine Native Americans in urban areas. The sample selection is based on tribal areas and aims for a nationally representative sample. The main point of the household survey is to get at housing conditions and how people feel about them.

Chuck Hanson led the attendees in introducing themselves and then provided the ground rules for the open discussion period. Questions and comments from elders and tribal leaders were elicited first.

B. Questions and Answers

Lori Bear: With respect to national policy, how often does that change? When we discuss the problems on reservations, such as ours where we are too small to obtain funds, when or how can we change the policy to utilize more HUD funds?

Raphael Bostic: Your question touches a on a series of issues. What we are trying to do here is get a conversation started about general needs on tribal lands. Once we have that, there is a second conversation that comes regarding how to deploy resources to address needs in their various forms across country. That conversation is actually ongoing; it has started and will continue and includes negotiated rulemaking. The hope is that the results of this survey inform that conversation. Your question regarding how to get more resources is interesting. That is hard, given the budgets in Washington. What I want to let you know is what we emphasize in HUD which is that housing is part of a bigger social solution. For example, housing can be an education solution and transportation can be a housing solution. Thinking beyond just HUD, which is small relative to many of the federal agencies. We need creative solutions to many of these problems. For example, the FCC has resources available to make sure there is wiring to communities. It's hard to say specifically, but one hope is that this survey can be a jumping off point for the second and third conversations to address issues that deserve more engagement.

Lori Bear: We have gotten quite creative due to lack of HUD funds, which actually causes trouble as once we utilize funds there are longer term costs. Can you give more insight?

Raphael Bostic: I cannot personally give you more insight but I hope the survey will. The Census gives us data but so will the survey of TDHEs – which will give us impressions about how TDHEs feel about programs and policies. This information gathering mode includes harvesting solutions and suggestions. We know housing is terrible in many places and cases – we are trying to get to the solutions. All TDHE's can provide this input.

Jim Shakespeare: You are talking about data and what is acceptable and what is not. We have WINS data that provides needs on the reservation. The need is great.

Raphael Bostic: Thank you, I agree. We need to get in the field as quickly as possible to begin to collect that data. One potential power of the survey is its ability to provide us with some nuance

about what parts of the housing infrastructure are weakest or strongest and what we should be focusing on. Much of today's policy reflects the 1996 findings but we recognize that things have changed. It has never failed that there are unexpected findings that surprise us and those new insights are very helpful in shaping the solutions.

Doyle Pipe on Head: I have three questions about the household survey. What is the definition you are using for American Indian? What is the definition you are using for homeless in the survey? Lastly, the population surveys stated 40 sites and 1280 interviews total. Is that total across all 40 or at each site?

Raphael Bostic: There are approximately 40 surveys at 40 sites; so the total number of knock on door surveys goal is 1600. Some will be more or less depending on the tribal size. That is the frame. The goal is to be nationally representative. We take the completed surveys we receive and assign weights so it mirrors national population when blown up. In terms of homelessness, this is a challenge because in many instances particularly in places with harsher climates, people aren't homeless per se. This includes transient housing – so the surveys attempt to determine who is a general long term household member versus who may be staying there temporarily or seasonally. Regarding who counts as a Native American, our goal is persons who live on tribal land and during the survey, we ask persons if they self-identify – they must self-identify as an American Indian or Alaska Native to qualify for survey. We are asking about tribal enrollment but it is not a screener.

Doyle Pipe on Head: Regarding the homeless issue, there are a lot of nuances. We don't have people living on streets but we have people doubling or tripling up and we are glad you are working with that issue. With HUD and NAHASDA funding, a lot of that use is dependent on the definition of federally recognized enrolled members, so I don't know if that is a consideration in your data collection. With respect to Census, they used self-identified Indians this year.

Raphael Bostic: This is a sad reality of Washington in that different parties use different definitions. This is a struggle we face all of the time. I think one of the reasons we are here is because we recognize that the Census is not a standard and we want to supplement that data. I understand the concerns and we share them.

Warren Mackey: Can the tribe submit its own demographics? They may differ from formula reports, for example.

Raphael Bostic: This is a general challenge of these sorts of exercises. Just about every methodology involves some error; none count perfectly. My view on this is it would be useful to do the comparisons between tribes' internal numbers versus what we obtain from other sources—that is an important issue generally. As a statistician, though, my guess and expectation is that there is error across the board and as long as it's the same across the board, our calculations are worthwhile. If we mess up on every tribe, and the error is about the same, then in terms of proportionality on a national level, we will be ok. It may be a supplemental piece or separate

project to have tribes provide counts and compare those for later conversations. We will think about that as it has real value.

Jim Shakespeare: I worked previously on GIS and data processing and there are some points I'd like to add. Regarding streaming data, in the world of data, doing tabular and spatial data and making it work, regarding errors.

Raphael Bostic: Regarding the data, we have gotten a lot of questions about what happens to it after the report is out. It becomes available to be used and streamlined and projected. But as HUD our obligation and commitment is to produce the data and make it available; there is another conversation about what is done with it afterwards, including what you do with it. We are required to produce a report and submit it to Congress. But there are many things that could also be done, and those are good conversations to have. For now the focus though is on the design and ensuring you are comfortable with it.

Patrick Goggles: In terms of the use of the tribal data, in Wyoming we conducted a needs assessment survey with the University of Wyoming that is a general survey that includes housing among other items. That is one level of data. There is also data that comes from the State Finance Agency and Census. And then there is regional data from monitoring organizations. How do you plan to incorporate that data into your collection?

Raphael Bostic: The short answer is that we are not going to, for two reasons. The longer answer is that for this survey to be valid, we have to ask the same questions in every place, using the same instrument and the same training protocol so we can manage how people are engaged. This helps us maintain consistency and it is hard to use other surveys as inputs for that reason. But there are two ways those surveys are useful. One is that our team has gone around and tried to find these kinds of things to inform our instrument. To the extent that instruments already exist and there are findings on their utility and accuracy, we have considered those in developing the current instrument. The second set is a 'down the road' way. This survey will produce a bunch of items but to the extent that it is a national picture, there will be diversity. Example, we could find that on average 20% of people on high income lands have income burden. This could be driven by a 60% burden in CA and 10% everywhere else. Comparing those to studies such as you reference help us start to create these comparisons and discussions. If every state did what Wyoming is doing, we could start to have new research such as correlations, etc. and be more sophisticated. Lastly, I am glad you are working with the universities. I think that they are often underutilized across the board. These surveys can be expensive and so regular or extensive use is hard. The nice thing about universities is they have students looking to do meaningful work for lower costs provided that you take on the expertise, like building the survey upfront. The administration is then less expensive.

Patrick Goggles: In terms of results of the data that is collected and analyzed and published as a report, how valuable is that going to be to tribes? Will we be using it to use with other Federal Agencies? Will that require a MOU with those agencies?

Raphael Bostic: The data should be able to be applied to anything. It is about housing needs, not HUD needs so it is valid no matter what agency you are working with. That is a power of this study – its potential use and application beyond HUD.

Patrick Goggles: You should take a look at this national survey in ten year increments as the nation does with Census. Ideally even more frequent such as every 2 or 5 years.

Raphael Bostic: I would love a yearly increment but I understand 10 years is a reasonable increment. I don't get to decide that but to the extent that the conversation happens and continues, I support it. 16 years is too long and the data has lost touch and is not reality. Once this report comes out, we are discussing a "release party" in Washington and then conversations about what it means. HUD should be a convening force to start conversations and then tribes carry that on.

Jason Adams: With regard to the structure here, and without disrespect to tribal leaders, I come from a tribe that works hard to be a sovereign nation. In regards to that, when we have these consultation sessions, we look at this as a government to government opportunity to communicate. That previously meant the President or a delegate was sent. With respect to housing, I consider myself the Secretary of Housing in my tribe and my presence should not be discounted since my tribal leader is not present. We have a lot of tribes that as far as government structure, we have a lot in place and lot of opportunity and resources. There are other tribes that have these same kinds of structures. With discussion about data and structuring a needs assessment, we stress the issue of coming to the tribes first. I am not saying we wouldn't be here today if HUD had approached us first, but we desire the opportunity from the onset to share how we govern ourselves and accept this partnership with HUD. There is a missing piece when we take something off the shelf and blanket apply it; a lot of tribes provide programs to tribes. I am concerned about overstepping tribal governments. Because we have so many departments serving tribal members, we are building a database of information and one of the things is that we have people going door to door with this instrument and people may not have answers to programs serving them. Let's find a way to use our governments; we hoped this needs assessment would start there but it hasn't. Our tribe has information that is readily available and recent.

Raphael Bostic: Thank you for that statement. I appreciate your sentiments though I don't necessarily agree. The first thing you said concerned me, that we are discounting your presence due to the structure of our agenda today. That is an incorrect perception that anything said by someone not elected is less important. A good idea can come from anyone and I don't want anyone to have the impression that this is for tribal leadership only and others with insights will

be discounted. The second thing I want to say is that today's structure is direct outreach to the tribal leadership. We have done outreach already to many tribal experts. This has been an open and transparent process and has been one that includes outreach to tribes. The materials are available online, they have been emailed upon request, and anyone can be engaged. These are serious because we want all of the information to inform what we do and make it a better process. The third thing that struck me is the notion that we took something from the shelf and are missing things. The 1996 survey instrument was designed from scratch using information and expertise; but even that tailored product wasn't considered good enough today. We have gotten input to modify that even further to make it a new custom product. A lot of work from a lot of people has shaped today's instrument. Regarding how we are engaging tribal government and this project, I don't want people to believe we are not engaging tribal governments. We have talked to them throughout this process, no one has been censored, and we err on the side of no one feeling left out. There is another aspect that we want to emphasize. When we execute these surveys on the tribal lands, once we pick the sample, the first thing we do is send a letter to the leadership of the tribe elected to engage in a conversation about the process. We will obtain consent and no survey will be undertaken without it. How we might think will be the best way may not in fact be so; we want to be informed of that beforehand. Another piece to this that is quite important is that we are not fixed or set in who actually knocks on doors and asks questions. It is my expectation that it's least valuable for an outsider to perform interview. Our general approach is to have tribal members perform the interview within each tribe's community and culture. What we have heard though is that in some tribal contexts that may be less helpful due to sensitiveness and disclosure. So the tribal government will tell us what to do and that is what we will adhere to. This should be executed as a full partnership and should have the support of the Federal government and the tribes as well. This is critical to the accuracy of our results as well. We are making every effort possible to give people opportunities to weigh in. I make no judgments about who shows up where; the website exists, there are multiple ways to contact us, and that will continue. I hope that the message that comes out is that if you have issues concerns, accolades, or anything else, there are many ways to do it and we encourage you to do so.

Jason Adams: Thank you for your comments. In regards to the tribal leadership issue, that concern is not necessarily based on today but in general. We know that tribal leaders prioritize their time, too. Again on the process, without getting into comments, the issue that comes back to the future and the next time this happens we hope that the consultations will happen first and that HUD will work on the structure of the assessment first with tribes at the table. Our hope is that in the future any needs study on tribal lands will come to tribes first to structure so it is our study.

Raphael Bostic: I hear that and I assure you that any future activity of PD&R will do this the right way. We started with a view that reaching out to housing experts would get us a lot of valuable input but perhaps we should have done the consultations first and we might have ended up with the same roster anyhow.

Jim Wagenlander: This exchange is important because not everyone is aware and the record should note that this is the second round of meetings. The frustration felt by Jason and many of us is that what was done last year in this process made for a lot of extra work by HUD and the tribes. It fundamentally does influence what ultimately is produced.

RB: How so?

Jim Wagenlander: We now have that history and it's hard to sit in the room and talk about these issues. I wanted to compliment you and Sandra for being here; that is incredible. I've been involved in HUD for 37 years and have never seen that. The effort demonstrated is appreciated; however, it cannot ultimately smooth feathers or in some cases correct the fundamentals that exist. The point Jason is making is that the prior study was taken off of the shelf and is being reused. Some of us knew about that study and it was done when there was no NAHASDA. That study had two components and part was to evaluate the performance of the public housing based Indian program. There were all kinds of other questions as well. But when it came out, it had no impact as we had NAHASDA. It did not have much influence at that time. People (e.g. Congress, HUD, and Housing Authorities) have been pleading to find a way to determine tribal housing needs. When Congress mandated this, people had high expectations that a needs assessment would be produced and the purpose would be to demonstrate how terrible the conditions are in this country. That is the goal and purpose – more money and more assistance. They don't expect to see other issues.

Raphael Bostic: What other issues?

Jim Wagenlander: When you expand it to Indians in urban areas, Native Hawaiians, and non-housing related solutions to housing. People appreciate what the Secretary has done, what the administration has done, and the holistic integrations of fields to housing. 3.5 million dollars is a miniscule amount of money to determine need and none should be spent on issues not important as demonstrating needs. Since last year's debacle when tribes went to HUD and pleaded for input, the plea was ignored. The same complaint was registered at each meeting. There is no way HUD is going to back off of the study and now you are doing your best effort to get input and we are trying to provide input but with that history we should now talk about these fundamental issues. I would like to raise one and others can address its importance. The whole issue is need. This is to demonstrate to Congress how bad the housing issues are so there can be more assistance and funds. But there is a limitation and flaw. The limitation is 3.5 million dollars. Jennifer Stoloff is terrific at meeting and listening but as you have expressed, we are coming to understand that we aren't getting much for this amount. That's a reality. Tribes are on their own developing studies and how to create a template that can be used to bring to Congress. The flaw that I would like to raise, touched on briefly earlier, is that it appears that this needs assessment is for "Indian Lands". Along the way there may be questions about enrolled members and their needs. As you may have heard, this is a terribly important issue for tribes here. Treaty or land based tribes believe that the Federal Government has a political obligation, not race based. Not

for Indians – not for people living on a reservation – for tribal members. They would like to see this based on needs for tribal members; we know other tribes in this country don't hold to that principle. Some tribes like census based determinations because they aren't enrolled or because there are people who say they are Indian and are not recognized as federally recognized tribes. There are differences in Indian Country on those issues. They are coming more to the surface and more important to treaty based and land based tribes. The reason why it's so important is that treaty and land based tribes have the worst housing conditions in the US. Not just where they have some need – everyone has need – everyone wants better housing. The tragedy is that many tribes in this region demonstrate the worst housing and the purpose was to determine what that need is to go to Congress and that money then goes to tribes with need.

Raphael Bostic: I hear your frustration and I understand it. What issues did you not talk about when you had the opportunity to talk before? What are the things you didn't say before that you will say today? That is why I need to understand how history is going to impact this. There is a diversity of perspectives and one sign that we may be on the right track is that no one is happy. But I don't understand why you went to a listening session and didn't give us input and perspective. If you gave us your best received notion of what should happen, then why should that lead to different outcomes moving forward? Part of this conversation has to be about that. What we are trying to do is get the best input and perspectives, what people think matters. We have and continue to ask that question. We have this thing to do now and there are ideas or perspectives that have not been brought up, you have this opportunity to do that. And there will be more opportunities. I have high expectations for this survey. I will not be satisfied if no one talks about the report when it's done. We must do whatever we can to ensure report is used and inform conversations. The survey will not, by itself, change minds. But we have to figure out how to use the information to incorporate and shape the work we do to make it most beneficial and persuasive.

In terms of concerns about Hawaiians, that is mandated and must be done. Urban inclusion is less costly and in the grand scheme it is important. Others have indicated importance of including them. Other non-housing issues- I disagree directly and fundamentally that those should not be included. Housing is not an isolated asset or resource. It interacts with a host of other things. If you get those dimensions in, you can do more and get more resources. Possibilities open up. If we don't ask questions, we have no hope in finding those in a systematic way. Policy is based on information. Housing policy has been limited and narrow and has limited the trajectories of people's lives. We will never have enough housing resources to fully solve everything. If that is the hope, we should stop now. We have to find ways to be creative. Our Housing Choice Voucher program, do you know what fraction of people with serious housing needs are served by this program? That is our major housing support program and it serves less than 30% of people needing it. The notion that federal housing funds are going to solve programs completely is an unrealistic expectation.

This is not our first attempt to collect information or input. We are coming to the end of 2 years of getting this information. And everyone in this room has had an opportunity to provide information. We have reacted and responded to what has happened and what we heard. We made changes and continue to make changes.

The goal of this study is not as you say. You talked about the study like an advocate would, and I appreciate that. The study is designed to determine what the housing needs are. If they are bad, that will emerge. If they are not as bad, that will emerge as well. The goal is to provide a dispassionate picture of what the conditions are. Our expectation may be that they are bad, but collecting the information and analyzing it is how we will verify that. It is imperative to research that is accurate and valid that we approach this with the goal of determining the facts.

Have you sent these attempted tribal survey efforts to us?

Jim Wagenlander: Individual tribes are going and doing their own analysis and data collecting. What is more interesting is that there is an effort to try to come up with something that can be a template to be applied, if useful and successful, that is GIS and GPS based. This will count, using existing platforms, all housing units on a reservation and conduct either a survey or census for purposes as not just housing. The idea is to demonstrate that all recipients of NAHASDA funds can use this.

Raphael Bostic: Send us this. The conversation is useful but reacting to something concrete is more useful. Ideas can go around in circles but once you show something to someone, conversations can be more useful. Let me say that I want us to be in an environment where all the information is known by all parties. If we don't know what questions you have incorporated, we can't incorporate them into our work. All of us need to make sure that there is full information on all of these things so collective wisdom is informing all of our work. Please send us things.

Your description is not what I expected you to say. That tool is designed to do something different than this, at least so it seems. Specific purposes in mind require a deeper understanding of the uses of the tool. Sometimes I get concerned when a tool tries to do too many things. We have to make a collective balanced consideration of what is important and prioritize accordingly. Our survey is designed to be no more than an hour. Currently it is about 45 minutes, to minimize the issue of respondent fatigue. Since we can't ask every question, there will be useful, good and even important questions that we can't ask. This is a second best world as a reality. You are right; we can't do a census on 3.5 million dollars. We have choices and compromises to make.

Paul Ironcloud: I feel disappointed to attend this consultation. Tribal consultation to me is when tribal leaders sit around the table and communicate with the organization doing a consultation. I was in a consultation on Indian education. There were things discussed that caused hard feelings. Looking at tribes where they do self-governance, I applaud them, but you look at some of our plains tribes that are having a hard time and when you look at needs, are we really looking at

needs, when you see what our people are living under? I have 2-3 people living in one house; Census says 18,000 we have 40,000. Two to three families come to me daily looking for a place to live. To see that is very disheartening; this ties into the economic and social life of our people. When you said that this is not going to bring more housing that disturbed me. If we aren't going to make a better life for our people, I am going to go home. If I was a leader I would bring all of the plains tribes and sit down to find out what they go through daily. When NAHASDA was implemented I was a part of that and after 5 years we were supposed to come back together and analyze it. That never happened. Here we are piecing things together. NAHASDA gave us authority but no money. We have tight budgets and do some work but we can't survive under this system. That is why we do our own needs study. We are going to meet with the plains tribes and talk about that. I wasn't going to come but I did because I respect Randy Akers and Mike Boyd, I came. I see the big picture and the only thing that Indian tribes have left are our treaties. If we aren't going to do anything at least I could say we have a treaty. They are to provide for us for illegal taking of our land and life. But it's still there – the illegal taking of Black Hills, for example. There is need that I can't talk enough about.

Raphael Bostic: What do you disagree with currently?

Paul Ironcloud: Take a tour and see how our people live. When I go to Congress, I tell them to come. You don't know what the real need is.

Raphael Bostic: Secretary Donovan went to Pine Ridge. Secretary Marquez went to Pine Ridge. We have liberated some dollars. It is not fair to say that our agency has not gone out to see the needs in person. I started this by saying I was glad to be here. I have toured 5 reservations in my time and while none are in plains, I have gone around. Maybe you think we don't do enough, but we are going to the tribes. I want to respond because I fear you misheard me. I didn't say that this survey won't bring more housing. I said the need is deep and the full need is more than we can achieve in annual appropriations. That is not to say that money that is available isn't valuable or useful.

Paul Ironcloud: You said this won't jeopardize the formula. What does that mean?

Raphael Bostic: This is designed to quantify the need. One issue is the size of the pie and the second is how you divide it. This study won't address the latter part.

Jim Wagenlander: The pie should not be about all tribal people. We want to separate the pie from non-tribal to tribal members. There is an implied purpose from Congress that they will use this for NAHASDA funding.

Raphael Bostic: That is implied but may not be true. The scope of this is subject to a number of perspectives and views for the purpose of this study. We have to take all of those seriously. We do hear what you say and it does shape things. The existence of different answers does not mean that any one or other is not valid. This is a large country with a tremendous diversity of

perspectives and challenges. It is hard to blend those into a single line of thinking. We will hear and listen to your perspectives and take them seriously.

Lori Bear: With the utmost respect, my experience has been that there has not been as much consultation with tribal leaders as there should be. We have come to the table after the fact. I appreciate the protocol that has been demonstrated in this effort. It sounds to me like consultations are where you have to address things because tribal leaders make decisions for tribes. I have to look at the big picture of Indian Country because if not, my reservation will stay the same. There is poor housing and inadequate funding so we need to prioritize. I drove all night to get here instead of paying thousands of dollars to get here. It seems to me that housing directors need to get this word to tribal leaders. I live in Utah and we have a tribal leaders meeting four quarters of the year. If it is not too late, at our June meeting, I would like to address this there. Maybe tribal leaders are busy but we see our people living in these conditions and its demanding work. We are in these positions because we care. When the Census was going on, I was chosen to go visit other tribes and reservations to get through the door and get numbers. Unless you figure out a way to get more tribal leaders to listen and participate, it will stay the way it is. I want to keep the traditions and cultures alive but not without progressing and being a part of interacting with the Federal Government; we have to deal with the Federal Government. That is why I am here.

Raphael Bostic: Thank you for driving and for being here. I agree with just about everything you said. I expect hard conversations in these consultations and I love the passion and energy displayed. It elevates how important it is to do something about this. Tribal leaders should be demanding things from the Federal Government and should hold them accountable and responsible. I said at the beginning that research is not covered under HUD's consultation policy. Our first approach was to follow policy and engage this as it was written. That was a mistake, a poor judgment, and it won't be repeated. What can we do differently or better to get attention to these things, from your leadership? How do we do better so that you hear about it sooner? I would be interested in reflections on that. We are recording all of this. My approach is to take that information and use it to be smarter and better.

Jason Adams: As part of the open discussion and dialogue, as part of the comments that our tribal chairman is making, we talk about an advisory panel. On the national level you serve as an Assistant Secretary to Secretary Donovan. Tribes have asked over the years for an Indian Advisory Committee to Shaun Donovan, a panel of advisors that could be at his beck and call like other agencies have. We would welcome that opportunity if someone would create that role.

Raphael Bostic: I'll bring that message back.

Raphael Bostic: There are a lot of materials in your packets. Please do look at them and share with others; let us know if you need more copies. We can send them and they are available online as well.

Formal Statements read by Jason Adams and others (name missing)

Roberta Roberts: [Ms. Roberts spoke briefly in her native language.] You are faced with a huge task of representing a diverse culture and tradition and I speak my language to say that this survey will not take an hour in the native language. There are questions regarding interpretation – some of the survey words have no translated word. There will be language barriers and therefore tribal members administering the surveys will help mitigate some of this. The final report we are looking forward to. Navajo has submitted their own housing needs report to HUD. It will be interesting for other states to compare the results of this survey to their own. With the Assistant Secretary here, we feel that this is a sort of one size approach and there is some concern about definitions in Indian Country that do not exist. For example overcrowding may not mean the same thing in Navajo as some large families are intentionally living together. Similar issues exist with homelessness. There are not homeless but there are houseless. The definition of a family is different in Indian Country; it could include extended family. This is already an issue with respect to NAHASDA definitions. You have a very important task and we all understand that, and look forward to moving on it. Bringing all of the tribal nations together to produce one report seems inadequate but regardless it does provide some representation. Thank you to each of the tribal members and others participating here today to speak and ask questions. We have a huge task ahead of us and there will be room for improvement as we move forward, and we have to speak for our people.

Raphael Bostic: Thank you and I appreciate you communicating in your own native language. It hammers home the reality of the hugeness of this task. There are so many realities we are trying to represent and it is hard. I also wanted to say the issues about definitions and translations are real. That is one of the reasons why we are going to do that initial outreach to leadership at tribes to review the survey to see if there are issues discussed very differently and if survey modules need to be modified to reflect those realities. We don't want to create frustration during the questionnaire administration. The issues around definitions are hard. Overcrowding for instance has a value judgment concerning what the "right" number should be and the goal of this study is to be descriptive, without value judgment. The issue regarding this not being "our" survey – we will have to think about that and how it plays out during implementation.

Jason, thank you for the statement. The panel of experts is diverse and does include tribal representatives but also research experts and survey experts. It's a balance of size with scope of survey needed.

Jennifer Stoloff: We will make the expert panel list available. It includes academics, tribal members, and representatives from national organizations related to housing.

Raphael Bostic: There are different processes for advisory panels versus boards etc. There are policies related to each. Our goal is to talk to the right people.

Patrick Goggles: There are a couple of issues that we have with the instrument itself in terms of what it is going to produce. I heard what the type of results expected; numbers, categories. I haven't seen the picture that you are trying to produce. I would appreciate an elaboration on that.

Raphael Bostic: That is a good question. Our team can be very statistical. We are trying to be descriptive. For instance X% of people reports this problem. Y% of homes has internet connection, central a/c or central heat. The report will contain a host of these descriptive characteristics. Then we look at the range of issues, we can report things such as "the most common issue is 'roof integrity' the second most common is lack of potable water, etc. Once you have that break down, for example, "30% of people live in homes where the average number of people exceeds 4 per room;" "x percentage of people living within X miles of bus stop." then what you can do is for each of these problems or issues, there is an average cost to deal with it. If you have a bad roof, the cost is \$5,000 for average repairs. If 40% of homes need a roof then we can calculate a national estimate of cost to address the roof problems. Piece by piece, we can build a quantified assessment of cost. Then this can inform policy and program design such as set-asides. This is beyond the survey scope but is informed by the results of it.

Patrick Goggles: I believe you need perspective Dr. Bostic. For example how houses are built in Alaska is greatly different than Wyoming; no model can account for all of this diversity.

Raphael Bostic: I agree wholeheartedly. That is why when I talk about the survey, I refer to it as the beginning of a conversation. We then have to have discussions on these nuances and shades of grey on these issues. Everyone purports to have unique issues, and that may be true in many cases, but there are also likely instances where it is not true. Even within Alaska, there are huge variations. That is why this is a reason to begin these conversations.

Warren Mackey: About 75% of our population lives off of the reservation and half of those would come back if there is housing for them. Are you accounting for these?

Raphael Bostic: Yes. The mandate was to look at tribal members on reservations but we have created means in this survey to try and address your issue as well. To me, this is another one of those issues that when we have the report released, there is a conversation about off-reservation needs. In Minnesota they did a study of homelessness in Native Americans and compared on-reservation and off-reservation. Their study found a lot more need than previously reported and the new information led to a new conversation with respect to state funding.

Jennifer Stoloff: We are asking a questions about that on the TDHE survey about percentage living off-reservation and why. We are aware of the issue.

Warren Mackey: The term Indian Country is used in the materials; this should mean traditional lands.

Raphael Bostic: Indian Country means different things to different people. What we have been doing is that there are some Census designated areas that are tribal lands. Those are the geographic spaces that we focus on.

Jennifer Stoloff: We couldn't just sample reservations because that would exclude many people who live in tribal lands and other places that aren't reservations. We did use the Census definitions for initial sampling and we are aware of the issues there.

Warren Mackey: Since you aren't limited to reservations why can't you sample our population in Sioux City?

Jennifer Stoloff: They could potentially be included in the urban areas aspect of this study and that is why we think it is important to have that component of this study. Other places with large concentrations of tribal members but that are not reservations are captured by the Census areas.

Raphael Bostic: We have heard a lot of concern about this issue and we are trying to address it. We felt it was important to have some word about it.

Jennifer provided her contact information and the availability of business cards for Tom Kingsley and Carol Hafford (NORC) and also their willingness to discuss questions here today.

Raphael Bostic: I'd like to end with some reflections. Thank you for taking the time to do this. If this is going to work, we need you to understand and support it and shape it so the administration goes as intended. The second thing is that this is really important to us. This is long overdue and I feel like we have a responsibility to help you get the information you need to make cases on various issues. This is an important step in that direction. This cannot be the end of the conversation. This is the beginning. We should continue to have dialogue during implementation, data collection, analysis, and report writing. My office will continue with that; ONAP will continue with that. We have to broaden our reach to bring others in, such as University professors who should be interested in these issues. Fourth, I want to thank all of the folks associated with working on this. They have worked incredibly hard and it is getting us to a good place. I want to thank all of you for helping put this session together. We cannot do this alone, we need partners. Please talk to people; spread the word and information. If there are people you think need information, let us know, give us the information and we can send them materials. We want to be open, transparent and easily accessible. Lastly, safe travels home – a lot of people came long distances in various modes. I look forward to working with you in the times to come through this survey and other efforts. Thank you and good afternoon.