

**National Park Service  
Summary Narrative Report  
Consultation and Partnerships with Federally Recognized Tribes  
& ANCSA Corporations**

**Reporting Period: October 1, 2017-September 30, 2019**

**Required by DOI Tribal Consultation Policy**

This report provides the Summary Narrative of National Park Service Consultation with Federally Recognized Tribes & ANCSA Corporations reported in Fiscal Years (FY) 2018 and 2019. The report also fulfills reporting requirements under Department of the Interior Secretarial Order 3342, “Identifying Opportunities for Cooperative and Collaborative Partnerships with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes in the Management of Federal Lands and Resources.”

The report contains:

I. Executive Summary	2
II. Introduction	3
III. NPS American Indian Liaison Office and Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures Summary	5
IV. Overview of Tribal Consultation (FY 2018-2019)	7
V. Secretarial Order 3342: Overview of Regional Reporting on Cooperative Agreements and Collaborative Partnerships with Tribes	24
VI. Appendices: Regional, Park and Program Reports	26
Appendix A: Training .....	26
Appendix B: Feedback from Tribal Governments.....	34
Appendix C: Review of Existing Practices.....	44
Appendix D: Tracking and Documentation.....	51
Appendix E: Consultation Activities .....	61
Appendix F: Native Hawaiian Organization Consultations.....	74
Appendix G: Non-Federally Recognized Tribes/State Recognized Tribes .....	76
Appendix H: Considering Tribal Input & Communicating to Tribes about NPS Decisions	80
Appendix I: Reported Consultation Location .....	102
Appendix J: Cooperative and Collaborative Partnerships (SO 3342) .....	121

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In FY 2018 and FY 2019, the National Park Service (NPS) reports 3,531 consultations with 237 Tribes, 34 Alaska Native Villages and 13 ANSCA corporations at an estimated cost of \$709,151. This report summarizes all tribal consultations in FY 2018 and FY 2019 as reported by NPS national programs, regions, and park units. Detailed narratives are provided in the Appendices.

This report also fulfills annual reporting requirements for Secretarial Order 3342, “Identifying Opportunities for Cooperative and Collaborative Partnerships with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes in the Management of Federal Lands and Resources.” There are currently 56 agreements between the NPS and individual (or multiple) Tribes, with 17 pending agreements.

The most frequently listed topics for consultation involved compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), cultural resource management, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), facilities, and general management and park planning. Starting in FY 2017, the reporting template was updated to request information on the number of tribal consultations regarding infrastructure projects—261 were reported. A majority of consultations included the direct participation of the park Superintendent who has delegated authority for decision-making at the park level. In FY 2018 and FY 2019, there was a significant increase in the number of consultations that involved the level of Regional Director (from 3 in 2017 to 406 between FY 2018 and FY 2019). Of the total in-person consultation activities, 37% of in-person consultation meetings reported occurred at tribal locations, and 38% occurred at NPS locations. The remaining 25% were listed as “Other,” for example, convenient public locations such as libraries, hotel conference rooms, facilities of other federal agencies, or community centers.

This year, in response to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report “Tribal Consultation: Additional Federal Actions Needed for Infrastructure Projects” (GAO-19-22), the NPS reported on actions taken by parks and programs to “communicate with tribes about how tribal input from consultation was considered in agency decisions” on infrastructure and other projects. Appendix H provides a wide range of examples of this communication Servicewide.

## II. INTRODUCTION

The NPS developed a reporting template to meet the requirements of: Executive Order 13175, “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments”; Secretarial Order 3317, “Department of the Interior Policy on Consultation with Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA)”; and Secretarial Order 3342, “Identifying Opportunities for Cooperative and Collaborative Partnerships with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes in the Management of Federal Lands and Resources.” This template was developed by the NPS American Indian Liaison Office (AILO) in Washington, DC with knowledgeable staff in the NPS regional offices and parks and has been refined and in use for the last seven years. Since 2017, the Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures (TRAC) has offered an optional digital version of the reporting template to aid parks and regions in reporting annual consultation data. The reporting template was distributed Servicewide through a December 2019 memorandum from the Deputy Director of Operations, Exercising the Authority of the Director. This Summary Narrative Report reflects the data collected from parks, programs and NPS regions, compiled by the NPS Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures. Digital copies of all regional annual reports and the combined NPS Summary Narrative Reports, beginning in FY 2012, are maintained by the NPS American Indian Liaison Office and the NPS Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures in Washington, DC.

This Summary Narrative Report lists: the names of the Tribes and corporations with whom the NPS consulted; the topics and programs discussed; involvement of senior leadership; consultation format; training and innovations; and feedback from Tribes. In addition, the report includes information on tracking and documentation of tribal consultation, and consultations with non-federally recognized tribal entities, as a means of documenting efforts to work with tribal peoples throughout all units of the National Park System. Since FY 2016, the report format includes documentation of the location of in-person consultations held with Tribes. Since FY 2017, the reporting materials have included a brief section to meet our new annual reporting requirements for Secretarial Order 3342, “Identifying Opportunities for Cooperative and Collaborative Partnerships with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes in the Management of Federal Lands and Resources,” which went into effect in October 2016.

In 2019, the annual tribal consultation reporting template was updated in response to the Government Accountability Office report “Tribal Consultation: Additional Federal Actions Needed for Infrastructure Projects” ([GAO-19-22](#)). This report recommended that the NPS “should document in the agency's tribal consultation policy how agency officials are to communicate with Tribes about how tribal input from consultation was considered in agency decisions on infrastructure projects.” The FY 2018-2019 Tribal Consultation Summary Report template has been updated to request information from parks and programs about: a) whether they have communicated with Tribes about how tribal input from consultation was considered in NPS decisions and b) the manner in which this communication occurred. The inclusion of this information in the annual reporting template and the distribution of this report implement the GAO recommendation to the NPS. The resulting consolidated report provides a valuable, Servicewide overview of communication with tribal partners as well as tribal consultations and partnerships for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

In order to provide consistency between the FY 17 and FY 18-19 reports, regional coordinators for the report data were asked to use NPS legacy regions for FY 18-19 reporting. Information on the Department of Interior Unified Regional Boundaries established in August 2018 can be found here: <https://www.doi.gov/employees/reorg/unified-regional-boundaries>. For future comparison, below are the legacy NPS Regions along with the current DOI Unified Regions.

NPS Legacy Region	Serving DOI Unified Region(s)
Alaska Region	11
Intermountain Region	6, 7, 8
Midwest Region	3, 4, 5
National Capital Region	1
Northeast Region	1
Pacific West Region	8, 9, 10, 12
Southeast Region	2, 4

The following definitions were also provided:

*Consultation:* For the purposes of reporting, consultation is a mutually agreed upon process of exchanging information between the NPS and Indian Tribes. In order to be reported under the DOI policy, consultation should reflect some agreement between the Tribe(s) and the NPS that government-to-government consultation is occurring/has occurred. (For example, consultation documented in meeting notes, an agreement document, etc.). Consultation is an ongoing dialogue on a given issue or issues, including Departmental Actions with Tribal Implication, between decision-level NPS representatives and designated tribal officials. While the NPS recognizes that side-bar conversations, telephone calls, emails, and other forms of communication may take place regarding these issues, each phone call, letter, etc. is not counted as a separate consultation.

*Departmental Action with Tribal Implications* – Any Departmental regulation, rulemaking, policy, guidance, legislative proposal, grant funding formula changes, or operational activity that may have a substantial direct effect on an Indian Tribe on matters including, but not limited to:

1. Tribal cultural practices, lands, resources, or access to traditional areas of cultural or religious importance on federally managed lands;
2. The ability of an Indian Tribe to govern or provide services to its members;
3. An Indian Tribe’s formal relationship with the Department; or
4. The consideration of the Department’s trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes.

*Indian Tribe or Tribe* – Any Indian or Alaska Native Tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian Tribe pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994, 25 U.S.C. § 479a. View the 2019 BIA Federal Register Notice at: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/02/01/2019-00897/indian-entities-recognized-by-and-eligible-to-receive-services-from-the-united-states-bureau-of>

### **III. NPS AMERICAN INDIAN LIAISON OFFICE AND OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS AND AMERICAN CULTURES SUMMARY**

The American Indian Liaison Office (AILO) and the Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures (TRAC) provide guidance to National Park Service field and program managers to assist their interactions with American Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives on a government-to-government basis. The office provides guidance concerning Indian self-determination, tribal self-governance, environmental review, land restoration, free exercise of religion, sacred sites, and traditional cultural properties. The AILO assists in reconciling programs, policies, and regulations with traditional uses of NPS lands by Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. TRAC and the AILO serve the National Park Service directorate, regional, and park staff with training, consulting, and guidance to resolve specific longstanding tribal concerns regarding park units, park lands, and park resources, and to collaboratively develop policy and guidance on many matters of mutual tribal-park interest. The Offices serve tribal governments and tribal members regarding matters related to natural resources, park policy, park units, NPS management practices, land restoration, and the resolution of long-standing issues with NPS. In addition, the AILO collaborates with other Department of the Interior bureaus to develop Department-wide and government-wide guidance on issues involving tribal governments. The AILO and the Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures also participate in international efforts to join with indigenous peoples to achieve common natural resource and cultural heritage preservation goals.

The former NPS AILO retired in May 2018. Since then, the Manager of the Midwest Regional Office of American Indian Affairs, and the NPS Bureau Cultural Anthropologist (TRAC) have each served as Acting AILO. The AILO position will be re-classified and moved back to the Office of the Director; the vacancy will be advertised in FY 2020. The position title will change to Assistant Director, Native American Affairs (Native American Affairs Liaison) and will report directly to the Director of the National Park Service.

The AILO and TRAC have been involved in multiple new and ongoing projects in support of tribal consultation in the NPS in FY 18-19. A letter of congratulations was developed to present a “one NPS” welcome to the six Tribes who recently received federal recognition in Virginia. The letter, with NPS park, regional, and Washington level contact information and maps, was sent to each Tribe in November 2018. Since the NPS Plant Gathering Regulation (36 CFR 2.6) went into effect in 2016, the NPS has received four initial tribal requests and completed two agreements. TRAC is currently updating a “Best Practices” document and an internal webpage to provide additional technical support for NPS staff regarding plant gathering agreements. The OMB information clearance related to the Plant Gathering Regulation was updated in August 2019. The AILO also supported ongoing topics in NPS-Tribal relations including tribal consultation regarding the Department’s proposed rule change for listing properties on the National Register of Historic Places (2019), and leading the NPS response (2017-2019) and implementation of the recommendation to NPS from the GAO report, “Tribal Consultation: Additional Federal Actions Needed for Infrastructure Projects” (GAO-19-22).

The AILO serves as point of contact for regions and park units on tribal self-governance issues under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (ISDEAA). There are currently three existing agreements between Self-Governance Tribes and the National Park Service, totaling \$4.4 million. These agreements support tribal activities to complete a range of projects in parks including air quality monitoring, maintenance, roads, trails and other infrastructure work, and visitor services. A new Multi-Year Funding Agreement between the National Park Service and the Pueblo of Santa Clara for activities at Valles Caldera National Preserve was signed in October 2019.

AILO and TRAC continue to support the development of the NPS Tribal Consultation Curriculum along with the Office of Learning and Development, the Office of Relevancy, Diversity and Inclusion, and the employee resource group CIRCLE (Council for Indigenous, Relevancy, Communication, Leadership, and Excellence). The tribal consultation course, *Pathway to Confidence: Engaging in Effective NPS-Tribal Consultation*, provides 40 training hours in a blended learning environment (16 hours digital classroom, 3 days in-person). A key take-home element is the Build-Your-Own Consultation Guidebook which can be individualized for each participant/host park. A key component of the in-person class is participation of local tribal leaders/THPOs. The NPS course is designed as an intermediate course; it is recommended to take the DOI University course “Consulting with Tribal Nations” in advance. In 2018, a beta course was held at Effigy Mounds National Monument and the pilot *Pathway to Confidence* course was held at Ft. Smith National Historic Site. The training was featured in a news article by Alaska’s “The Arctic Sounder” following the beta course: ([http://www.thearcticsounder.com/article/1820park\\_service\\_holds\\_trial\\_tribal\\_consultation](http://www.thearcticsounder.com/article/1820park_service_holds_trial_tribal_consultation)) A curriculum refinement workshop based on feedback from these courses is planned for FY 2020.

The AILO and TRAC supported park and regional NPS Tribal Liaisons and those with tribal relations responsibilities by establishing a monthly Servicewide conference call and NPS e-mail group for this cohort. Additionally, several individuals from parks, regions, CIRCLE, and the AILO supported the initiation of NPS planning efforts around the 250th anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence. Early conversations include how to reach out to tribal nations in consultation (locally and nationally) about appropriate engagement surrounding America 250th commemorative events in 2026.

#### **IV. OVERVIEW OF TRIBAL CONSULTATION (FY 2018-2019)**

**Total number of consultations conducted:** 3,531

**Total number of Tribes consulted:** 309

**Total number of ANCSA Corporations and Native Entities within Alaska Consulted:** 14  
and 34, respectively

**Names of Tribes consulted** (based on the BIA Federal Register Notice, dated January 30, 2020):

##### **Indian Tribal Entities within the Contiguous 48 States Consulted:**

1. Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
2. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California
3. Ak-Chin Indian Community (previously listed as Ak Chin Indian Community of the Maricopa (Ak Chin) Indian Reservation, Arizona)
4. Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas (previously listed as Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas)
5. Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town
6. Alturas Indian Rancheria, California
7. Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
8. Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming
9. Aroostook Band of Micmacs (previously listed as Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians)
10. Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana
11. Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians, California (previously listed as Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Augustine Reservation)
12. Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians of the Bad River Reservation, Wisconsin
13. Bay Mills Indian Community, Michigan
14. Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, California
15. Berry Creek Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California
16. Big Lagoon Rancheria, California
17. Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley (previously listed as Big Pine Band of Owens Valley Paiute Shoshone Indians of the Big Pine Reservation, California)
18. Big Sandy Rancheria of Western Mono Indians of California (previously listed as Big Sandy Rancheria of Mono Indians of California)
19. Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Big Valley Rancheria, California
20. Bishop Paiute Tribe (previously listed as Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Bishop Community of the Bishop Colony, California)
21. Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation of Montana
22. Blue Lake Rancheria, California
23. Bridgeport Indian Colony (previously listed as Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony of California)

24. Burns Paiute Tribe (previously listed as Burns Paiute Tribe of the Burns Paiute Indian Colony of Oregon)
25. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, California
26. Cachil DeHe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community of the Colusa Rancheria, California
27. Caddo Nation of Oklahoma
28. Cahto Tribe of the Laytonville Rancheria
29. Cahuilla Band of Indians (previously listed as Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians of the Cahuilla Reservation, California)
30. Catawba Indian Nation (aka Catawba Tribe of South Carolina)
31. Cayuga Nation
32. Cedarville Rancheria, California
33. Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Tribes of Alaska
34. Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of the Chemehuevi Reservation, California
35. Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, California
36. Cherokee Nation
37. Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, Oklahoma (previously listed as the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma)
38. Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota
39. Chickahominy Indian Tribe
40. Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division
41. Chippewa Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Montana (previously listed as Chippewa-Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Montana)
42. Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana
43. Citizen Potawatomi Nation, Oklahoma
44. Cocopah Tribe of Arizona
45. Coeur D'Alene Tribe (previously listed as the Coeur D'Alene Tribe of the Coeur D'Alene Reservation, Idaho)
46. Cold Springs Rancheria of Mono Indians of California
47. Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona and California
48. Comanche Nation, Oklahoma
49. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation
50. Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
51. Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon (previously listed as Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation)
52. Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
53. Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
54. Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
55. Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Nevada and Utah
56. Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
57. Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (previously listed as Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, Oregon)
58. Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon
59. Coquille Indian Tribe (previously listed as Coquille Tribe of Oregon)
60. Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana



61. Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians (previously listed as Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon)
62. Cowlitz Indian Tribe
63. Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians of California
64. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe of the Crow Creek Reservation, South Dakota
65. Crow Tribe of Montana
66. Delaware Nation, Oklahoma
67. Delaware Tribe of Indians
68. Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation, Nevada
69. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
70. Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
71. Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming (previously listed as the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming)
72. Elem Indian Colony of Pomo Indians of the Sulphur Bank Rancheria, California
73. Elk Valley Rancheria, California
74. Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada
75. Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California
76. Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, California
77. Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota
78. Forest County Potawatomi Community
79. Fort Belknap Indian Community of the Fort Belknap Reservation of Montana
80. Fort Bidwell Indian Community of the Fort Bidwell Reservation of California
81. Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians of the Fort Independence Reservation, California
82. Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribes of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nevada and Oregon
83. Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizona
84. Fort Mojave Indian Tribe of Arizona, California & Nevada
85. Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
86. Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona
87. Greenville Rancheria (previously listed as Greenville Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California)
88. Grindstone Indian Rancheria of Wintun-Wailaki Indians of California
89. Guidiville Rancheria of California
90. Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake, California
91. Hannahville Indian Community, Michigan
92. Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation, Arizona
93. Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin
94. Hoh Indian Tribe (previously listed as Hoh Indian Tribe of the Hoh Indian Reservation, Washington)
95. Hoopa Valley Tribe, California
96. Hopi Tribe of Arizona
97. Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, California (previously listed as Hopland Band of Pomo Indians of the Hopland Rancheria, California)
98. Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians
99. Hualapai Indian Tribe of the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Arizona

100. Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska
101. Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma
102. Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
103. Jena Band of Choctaw Indians
104. Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico
105. Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation, Arizona
106. Kalispel Indian Community of the Kalispel Reservation
107. Karuk Tribe (previously listed as Karuk Tribe of California)
108. Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria, California
109. Kaw Nation, Oklahoma
110. Kewa Pueblo, New Mexico (previously listed as the Pueblo of Santo Domingo)
111. Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, Michigan
112. Kialegee Tribal Town
113. Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas
114. Kickapoo Tribe of Indians of the Kickapoo Reservation in Kansas
115. Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma
116. Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma
117. Klamath Tribes
118. Kletsel Dehe Band of Wintun Indians (previously listed as Cortina Indian Rancheria and the Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians of California)
119. Koi Nation of Northern California (previously listed as Lower Lake Rancheria, California)
120. Kootenai Tribe of Idaho
121. Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin
122. Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation of Wisconsin
123. Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Michigan
124. Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians of the Las Vegas Indian Colony, Nevada
125. Little River Band of Ottawa Indians, Michigan
126. Little Traverse Bay Band of Odowa Indians, Michigan
127. Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, (previously listed as Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Lone Pine Community of the Lone Pine Reservation, California)
128. Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians, California (previously listed as Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla & Cupeno Indians of the Los Coyotes Reservation)
129. Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony, Nevada
130. Lower Brule Sioux Tribe of the Lower Brule Reservation, South Dakota
131. Lower Elwha Tribal Community (previously listed as Lower Elwha Tribal Community of the Lower Elwha Reservation, Washington)
132. Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota
133. Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation
134. Makah Indian Tribe of the Makah Indian Reservation
135. Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria, California (previously listed as Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester-Point Arena Rancheria, California)
136. Mashantucket Pequot Indian Tribe (previously listed as Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut)

137. Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe (previously listed as Mashpee Wampanoag Indian Tribal Council, Inc.)
138. Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Potawatomi Indians of Michigan
139. Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria, California
140. Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin
141. Mescalero Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, New Mexico
142. Miami Tribe of Oklahoma
143. Miccosukee Tribe of Indians
144. Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota (all six component reservations all reported in FY 18-19 reports: Bois Forte Band (Nett Lake); Fond du Lac Band; Grand Portage Band; Leech Lake Band; Mille Lacs Band; White Earth Band)
145. Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians
146. Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation, Nevada
147. Modoc Nation (previously listed as The Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma)
148. Mohegan Tribe of Indians of Connecticut (previously listed as Mohegan Indian Tribe of Connecticut)
149. Monacan Indian Nation
150. Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California
151. Morongo Band of Mission Indians, California (previously listed as Morongo Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Morongo Reservation)
152. Muckleshoot Indian Tribe (previously listed as Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the Muckleshoot Reservation, Washington)
153. Nansemond Indian Nation Nansemond Indian Tribe
154. Narragansett Indian Tribe
155. Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah
156. Nenana Native Association
157. Nez Perce Tribe (previously listed as the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho)
158. Nisqually Indian Tribe (previously listed as Nisqually Indian Tribe of the Nisqually Reservation, Washington)
159. Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana
160. Northfork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California
161. Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation (previously listed as Northwestern Band of Shoshoni Nation and the Northwestern Band of Shoshoni Nation of Utah (Washakie))
162. Nottawaseppi Huron Band of Potawatomi, Michigan (previously listed as Huron Potawatomi, Inc.)
163. Oglala Sioux Tribe (previously listed as Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota)
164. Ohkay Owingeh, New Mexico (previously listed as the Pueblo of San Juan)
165. Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
166. Oneida Nation (previously listed as Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin)
167. Oneida Indian Nation (previously listed as Oneida Nation of New York)
168. Onondaga Nation
169. Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma
170. Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma

171. Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar Band of Paiutes, Kanosh Band of Paiutes, Koosharem Band of Paiutes, Indian Peaks Band of Paiutes, and Shivwits Band of Paiutes (Previously listed as Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar City Band of Paiutes, Kanosh Band of Paiutes, Koosharem Band of Paiutes, Indian Peaks Band of Paiutes, and Shivwits Band of Paiutes))
172. Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians of California
173. Pamunkey Indian Tribe
174. Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona
175. Passamaquoddy Tribe
176. Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma
177. Penobscot Nation (previously listed as Penobscot Tribe of Maine)
178. Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
179. Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians of California
180. Pinoleville Pomo Nation, California (previously listed as Pinoleville Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California)
181. Pit River Tribe, California (includes XL Ranch, Big Bend, Likely, Lookout, Montgomery Creek and Roaring Creek Rancherias)
182. Poarch Band of Creeks (previously listed as Poarch Band of Creek Indians of Alabama)
183. Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians, Michigan and Indiana
184. Ponca of Indians of Oklahoma
185. Ponca Tribe of Nebraska
186. Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe (previously listed as Port Gamble Band of S'Klallam Indians)
187. Potter Valley Tribe, California
188. Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation (previously listed as Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, Kansas)
189. Prairie Island Indian Community in the State of Minnesota
190. Pueblo of Acoma, New Mexico
191. Pueblo of Cochiti, New Mexico
192. Pueblo of Isleta, New Mexico
193. Pueblo of Jemez, New Mexico
194. Pueblo of Laguna, New Mexico
195. Pueblo of Nambe, New Mexico
196. Pueblo of Picuris, New Mexico
197. Pueblo of Pojoaque, New Mexico
198. Pueblo of San Felipe, New Mexico
199. Pueblo of San Ildefonso, New Mexico
200. Pueblo of Sandia, New Mexico
201. Pueblo of Santa Ana, New Mexico
202. Pueblo of Santa Clara, New Mexico
203. Pueblo of Taos, New Mexico
204. Pueblo of Tesuque, New Mexico
205. Pueblo of Zia, New Mexico
206. Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation
207. Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation, Nevada

208. Quapaw Nation (previously listed as The Quapaw Tribe of Indians)
209. Quartz Valley Indian Community of the Quartz Valley Reservation of California
210. Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, California & Arizona
211. Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation
212. Quinault Indian Nation (previously listed as Quinault Tribe of the Quinault Reservation, Washington)
213. Ramona Band of Cahuilla, California (previously listed as Ramona Band or Village of Cahuilla Mission Indians of California)
214. Rappahannock Tribe, Inc.
215. Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin
216. Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Minnesota
217. Redding Rancheria, California
218. Redwood Valley or Little River Band of Pomo Indians of the Redwood Valley Rancheria California (previously listed as Redwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California)
219. Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Nevada
220. Resighini Rancheria, California
221. Robinson Rancheria (previously listed as Robinson Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians, California and the Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California)
222. Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota
223. Round Valley Indian Tribes, Round Valley Reservation, California (previously listed as Round Valley Indian Tribes of the Round Valley Reservation, California)
224. Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska
225. Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa
226. Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan
227. Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe (previously listed as St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians of New York)
228. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of the Salt River Reservation, Arizona
229. San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona
230. San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe of Arizona
231. San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, California (previously listed as San Manuel Band of Serrano Mission Indians of the San Manuel Reservation)
232. Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, California (previously listed as Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Santa Rosa Reservation)
233. Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria, California
234. Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians of the Santa Ynez Reservation, California
235. Santee Sioux Nation, Nebraska
236. Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe
237. Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Michigan
238. Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of California
239. Seminole Tribe of Florida (previously listed as Seminole Tribe of Florida (Dania, Big Cypress, Brighton, Hollywood & Tampa Reservations))
240. Seneca Nation of Indians (previously listed as Seneca Nation of New York)
241. Seneca-Cayuga Nation (previously listed as Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma)
242. Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota

243. Shawnee Tribe
244. Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, Shingle Springs Rancheria (Verona Tract), California
245. Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation (previously listed as Shoalwater Bay Tribe of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation, Washington)
246. Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation
247. Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, Nevada
248. Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation, South Dakota
249. Skokomish Indian Tribe (previously listed as Skokomish Indian Tribe of the Skokomish Reservation, Washington)
250. Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah
251. Snoqualmie Indian Tribe (previously listed as Snoqualmie Tribe, Washington)
252. Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California
253. Sokaogon Chippewa Community, Wisconsin
254. Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colorado
255. Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota
256. Spokane Tribe of the Spokane Reservation
257. Squaxin Island Tribe of the Squaxin Island Reservation
258. St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin
259. Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North & South Dakota
260. Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians of Washington (previously listed as Stillaguamish Tribe of Washington)
261. Summit Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada
262. Suquamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation
263. Susanville Indian Rancheria, California
264. Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin
265. Swinomish Indian Tribal Community (previously listed as Swinomish Indians of the Swinomish Reservation of Washington)
266. Table Mountain Rancheria (previously listed as Table Mountain Rancheria of California)
267. Tejon Indian Tribe
268. Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Four constituent bands: Battle Mountain Band; Elko Band; South Fork Band and Wells Band)
269. The Chickasaw Nation
270. The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma
271. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation
272. The Osage Nation (previously listed as the Osage Tribe)
273. The Seminole Nation of Oklahoma
274. Thlopthlocco Tribal Town
275. Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota
276. Timbisha Shoshone Tribe (previously listed as Death Valley Timbi-sha Shoshone Tribe and the Death Valley Timbi-Sha Shoshone Band of California)
277. Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona
278. Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation (previously listed as Smith River Rancheria, California)

279. Tonawanda Band of Seneca (previously listed as Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians of New York)
280. Tonkawa Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
281. Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona
282. Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, California (previously listed as Torres-Martinez Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of California)
283. Tulalip Tribes of Washington (previously listed as Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation, Washington)
284. Tule River Indian Tribe of the Tule River Reservation, California
285. Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe
286. Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians of the Tuolumne Rancheria of California
287. Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota
288. Tuscarora Nation
289. Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians of California
290. United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria of California
291. United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma
292. Upper Mattaponi Tribe
293. Upper Sioux Community, Minnesota
294. Upper Skagit Indian Tribe
295. Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, Utah
296. Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (previously listed as the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico & Utah)
297. Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)
298. White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona
299. Wichita and Affiliated Tribes (Wichita, Keechi, Waco & Tawakonie), Oklahoma
300. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska
301. Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada
302. Wiyot Tribe, California (previously listed as Table Bluff Reservation—Wiyot Tribe)
303. Wyandotte Nation
304. Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota
305. Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Reservation, Arizona
306. Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (previously listed as the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe of the Yavapai Reservation, Arizona)
307. Ysleta del Sur Pueblo (previously listed as the Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo of Texas)
308. Yurok Tribe of the Yurok Reservation, California
309. Zuni Tribe of the Zuni Reservation, New Mexico

**Names of ANCSA Corporations and Native Entities within Alaska consulted:**

**Names of ANCSA Corporations Consulted:**

Regional Corporations

1. Ahtna, Incorporated
2. Bristol Bay Native Corporation
3. Chugach Alaska Corporation
4. Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated
5. Doyon, Limited

6. Sealaska Corporation

Community Corporations

7. Chitina Native Corporation
8. English Bay Corporation
9. Evansville, Inc.
10. Huna Totem Corporation
11. Kijik Corporation (originally Nondalton Native Corporation)
12. Paug-Vik Incorporated Limited
13. Port Graham Corporation
14. Shee Atiká, Incorporated

**Native Entities within the State of Alaska Consulted:**

1. Alatna Village
2. Allakaket Village
3. Cheesh'Na Tribe (previously listed as Native Village of Chistochina)
4. Chilkat Indian Village (Klukwan)
5. Chilkoot Indian Association (Haines)
6. Evansville Village (aka Bettles Field)
7. Hoonah Indian Association
8. Hughes Village
9. Huslia Village
10. King Salmon Tribe
11. Mentasta Traditional Council
12. Native Village of Cantwell
13. Native Village of Deering
14. Native Village of Kobuk
15. Native Village of Kotzebue
16. Native Village of Minto
17. Native Village of Nanwalek (aka English Bay)
18. Native Village of Noatak
19. Native Village of Port Graham
20. Native Village of Shishmaref
21. Native Village of Shungnak
22. Native Village of Tanana
23. Native Village of Tazlina
24. Nikolai Village
25. Nondalton Village
26. Noorvik Native Community
27. Northway Village
28. Seldovia Village Tribe
29. Sitka Tribe of Alaska
30. Skagway Village
31. Telida Village
32. Village of Anaktuvuk Pass



33. Village of Wainwright
34. Yakutat Tlingit Tribe

**Estimated cost of consultation(s):** The following costs include travel, professional services (consultation reimbursements), supplies, meeting space, meeting facilitation, and other incidentals. These costs do not include federal salaries. \$ **709,151**

**Consultations by Topic/Program:**

(Numbers reflect multiple topics covered within individual consultations, for example one consultation may cover both NHPA & Cultural Resources.)

Consultation Topic	# Consultations in FYs 18-19
NAGPRA	123
NEPA	384
NHPA (Sec.106, THPO Program, Grants)	1,418
Indian Self-Governance Act	49
Subsistence (ANILCA)	3
Climate Change	35
Concessions	49
Cultural Resources	570
Education Programs	106
Exhibit Design/Interpretation	205
Facilities	332
Infrastructure Projects	261
General Management	239
Natural Resources	223
Park Planning	225
Programmatic Agreements	4
Other (Relationship Building)	15
Other (Special Use Permits)	9

\*\*Other topics of consultation reported: Reserved Rights/Treaty Rights (Northeast Region), ethnographic research and presentations (Southeast Region; Northeast Region), Research Permits (Pacific West Region), Wild and Scenic River Management (Northeast Region), unanticipated discoveries of archeological artifacts (Southeast Region), NPS Wildlife Rule (Alaska Region), Commercial Use Authorizations (Southeast Region, Pacific West Region), National Register listing (Northeast Region), fire management (Pacific West Region), plant gathering agreements (Intermountain Region, Northeast Region, Southeast Region); International Relations (Pacific West Region), Memorandum of Understanding updates (Pacific West Region), park utilities (Pacific West Region), Visitor Protection (Pacific West Region), youth employment opportunities (Pacific West Region), collections management (Midwest Region), drones and LiDAR (light detection and ranging), and the sale of pipestone (Midwest Region).

**Involvement of Senior Leadership in Consultations:**

FY	Regional Director	Associate Regional Director	Superintendent/ Deputy Superintendent	Regional/Park Program Manager	Regional/Park Anthropologist	Regional/Park Tribal Liaisons	WASO, DOI (ASIA)	Other
2017	3	21	910	210	161	148	6	
2018-2019	406	10	1,976	573	199	228	6	1*

\* The National Capital Region reported a consultation completed through the Federal Railroad Administration for an Amtrak project that involves park resources.

**Consultation Format:**

Consultation Format	# FY 2017 Consultations	# FY 2018-2019 Consultations
In Person***	542	758
In Writing	1080	6883
Teleconference	71	83
Videoconference	1	0
Other	0	0

\*\*\* This number reflects numbers of consultations reported by parks, regions, and programs. However, as reflected in the detailed list of in-person consultations in Appendix I (totaling 1,202 in-person meetings), some consultations included more than one in-person meeting in various locations.

**Location of Consultation Summary:**

Of the total in-person consultation activities reported an almost equal occurrence of in-person meetings took place at tribal locations and NPS locations: 37% of in-person consultation meetings reported occurred at tribal locations, and 38% occurred at NPS locations. The remaining 25% were listed as “Other,” for example, convenient public locations such as libraries, hotel conference rooms, facilities of other federal agencies, or community centers. The Pacific West Region and Alaska Region reported more in-person consultation activities at tribal locations than at NPS locations, and other regions reported between 21% and 34% of in-person meetings at tribal locations. Region by region details, and a log of consultation location information by city and states reported by regions can be found in Appendix I.

## **Training Summary:**

There were several system-wide trainings available in FY 2018-2019. Several regions including the Intermountain, Southeast and Midwest Regions hosted the introductory DOI course “Consulting with Tribal Nations,” which provides an overview of DOI’s consultation policy, step-by-step guidance for how to implement the policy, and an interactive mock consultation. In regions providing the course, Superintendents, Facility Managers, Resource Chiefs, Section 106 Coordinators, Interpretation Chiefs and Cultural Resource staff from multiple parks attended. Staff from the National Capital Region, including the Regional Anthropologist with formal tribal liaison responsibilities, participated in the course held at DOI University in Washington, DC.

In addition to the DOI introductory course, regions and parks provided specialized training in tribal consultation to regional and park staff. In FY 2018, the Alaska Native Affairs Liaison provided tribal consultation training to staff at Bering Land Bridge National Preservation. Two other parks, Katmai National Park and Preserve and Lake Clark National Park, reported sending a total of 10 staff members to a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service training in Alaska Native Relations. In the Intermountain Region, several parks reported hosting training sessions on consultation and relationship-building with tribal partners. Grand Teton National Park’s Tribal Liaison obtained a grant to develop and host the course “Meaningful Engagement: Building Trust & Strengthening Relationships with Native American Tribes.” Devil’s Tower National Monument collaborated with the Intermountain and Midwest Regions to host a Tribal Consultation Collaboration Initiative that brought together 18 leaders in Cultural Resources and Superintendents from 10 parks to discuss ways to collaborate to improve tribal consultation. The Midwest Regional Office of American Indian Affairs presented a 3-day workshop “Working in Indian Country-Building Successful Business Relationships with American Indian Tribes” that reached over 100 park Superintendents, Regional Directors, Program Managers, and NPS staff in FY 19.

All regions, parks, and programs reported support for training in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and/or the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) that contain units about tribal consultation. For example, the Northeast Region and the WASO Park NAGPRA Program supported three trainings in NAGPRA that reached 31 staff members.

In support of bureau-specific tribal consultation training, the NPS tribal consultation curriculum development team, the NPS Council for Indigenous Relevancy, Communication, Leadership and Excellence (CIRCLE), the NPS Mather Training Center, the Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures (TRAC) and the American Indian Liaison Office (AILO) continued to refine an NPS-specific consultation curriculum. In March 2018, Effigy Mounds National Monument hosted the “Nuts & Bolts” beta version of the course. Participants from all NPS regions with experience in NPS consultation were selected to attend and evaluate the course materials. After the beta course, the curriculum team used the participant feedback to further refine the course materials for both the digital classroom and the in-person class. The revised pilot course, titled “Pathway to Confidence: Engaging in Effective NPS-Tribal Consultation,” was hosted by Fort Smith National Historic Site in August 2018. Additional refinements will be made from the pilot class participant feedback (planned FY 2020).

### **Feedback from Tribal Governments Summary:**

In general, feedback from tribal governments on NPS consultations was positive. Some NPS regions reported feedback from Tribes to parks commending the NPS for investing in relationship building in general even outside of formal consultation, for hosting regular meetings, and for communicating as often and transparently as possible. In other cases, parks reported Tribes providing constructive feedback that was used to update consultation protocols and NPS approaches to projects, communication, and consultation. Feedback reported suggests the ongoing importance of reaching out early and often, and a preference for more advanced notice for in-person consultation meetings.

Some parks and regions received feedback that the NPS needs to seek further opportunities to combine park and/or regional consultations or create standing monthly or quarterly meetings instead of sending discrete project consultation requests due to the large number of consultation requests Tribes receive. Some also received feedback that a record of follow up notes via email is a preferred way to document and present formal comments and recommendations from Tribes to park management. In general, parks reporting requests to update their consultation approach or protocol also reported updating how they approached consultation with Tribes in response to that feedback.

This year, reporting from parks found multiple cases of Tribes requesting to seek additional opportunities to collaborate and find ways for tribal individuals to work with and/or for NPS. For example, the Navajo Nation expressed an interest in developing a comprehensive joint management plan for Canyon de Chelly National Monument. Grand Teton National Park received feedback that increased agreements with the NPS could better facilitate hiring tribal consultants and monitors for projects. In response to similar feedback, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area launched a series of trainings for tribal members on applying for federal jobs in FY 19.

In some cases, Tribes have recommended redesigning project elements, removing items from stores in National Parks, or replacing interpretive exhibit text, and appreciate seeing those recommendations implemented. In other cases, Tribes have reached out to ask the NPS for information about previous consultations or areas of interest in the park and appreciated being able to have that information on file for future consultations.

(See Appendix B for additional details.)

### **Review of Existing Policies Summary:**

Many parks reported updating consultation procedures and protocols, including development of new joint tribal consultation protocols, updating consultation contacts, initiating new planning and review processes, updating Section 106 compliance protocols, and updating regional or park guidance about best practices in tribal consultation. Several reports also contained updates to standing meetings between parks and Tribes. For example, some parks, such as Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Montezuma Castle National Monument, and Tonto National Monument, reported scheduling a new approach that includes annual standing consultation meetings that provide an overview of proposed major projects. Great Basin National Park reported that the park found it helpful for the Superintendent

to attend annual Tribal Council meetings to share information about NPS projects impacting park resources. Channel Islands National Park reported meeting regularly with the Chumash Nation Elders Council to facilitate relationship building.

(See Appendix C for additional details.)

### **Tracking and Documentation Summary:**

National Park Service regions continue to track consultations in a variety of ways. Regional methods of recording consultation range from utilizing an Excel sheet on a shared drive specific to consultation, a shared Google Sheets tracker that tracks physical meetings, letters, and calls to using the Planning Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) system to create and maintain a spreadsheet or database of Tribes involved in consultation and consultation activities. The majority of consultation records are maintained within the park or NPS program of origin in both electronic and hard-copy archival systems. Parks report that official notes from in-person consultation meetings are shared between NPS and tribal officials. Some parks report hiring note takers or a stenographer to prepare transcripts and/or formal meeting notes.

(See Appendix D for additional details.)

### **Consultation Activities Summary:**

There was a wide range of consultation activities conducted in FY 2018 and FY 2019. As noted in the table above, the three most common general topics for consultation related to project compliance under the National Historic Preservation Act (primarily Section 106 consultation), facilities, and “cultural resources” (both are topics which cover direct project impacts and more generalized approaches to resource planning and management). The NPS consulted with Tribes regarding Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) topics, including repatriation and inadvertent discoveries, as well as the National Environmental Policy Act (relating to general tribal interests of proposed federal undertakings).

Other consultation topics included infrastructure projects; general management and park planning; plant gathering agreements, ethnographic research and presentations, research permits, Commercial Use Authorizations, nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, collections management, and visitor center media and exhibit planning. For example, the Missouri National Recreational River reported that increased consultation and collaboration with Tribes resulted in the park’s first visitor educational film that highlights tribal connections to the river. An additional short film was developed collaboratively with three Tribes about traditional uses of the river and can be accessed on the park’s website.

Several parks and Tribes worked together to develop public events, exhibits and programming, and educational opportunities. Fort Laramie National Historic Site reported consultation with Tribes in FY 2018-2019 about how to approach the commemoration of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. This resulted in more accurate and respectful interpretation of the treaty and the legacy of the treaty, and two years of consultation culminated in a multi-week event that brought tribal members, NPS staff, and the public together to participate in the commemoration. The park reported that the relationship-building resulting from these meetings

and the success of the commemoration event strengthened the foundation to engage in future conversations about education, interpretation, and resource protection in the park.

Consultation also supported park efforts to research natural and cultural resources in the park, and update resource management plans. For example, at Hovenweep National Monument, consultations spanning 2017-2019 regarding an Ethnographic Overview and Assessment allowed the park to engage with Tribes on collaborative cultural and natural resource management. The meetings also resulted in expanded opportunities to reconnect tribal youth to ancestral lands, and in the NPS accommodating a request to access an area of the park for educational purposes that is typically closed to the general public.



1. Top: The Pueblo of Acoma Learning Center Summer Youth Program with Hovenweep National Monument staff, NPS Photo/McElveen. Bottom: NPS Preservation Specialist, Eloy Wytewa (left), guiding a group of the Acoma youth around Little Ruin Canyon, NPS Photo/Martin

Several reports received indicated that a number of parks and Tribes continue to maintain agreements with regular, annual or biannual meetings.

(See Appendix E for more examples and additional details.)

**Considering Tribal Input Summary:**

All NPS regions reported communicating with Tribes about how input from consultation was considered in NPS decisions in various formats. The chart below summarizes region-specific findings about the ways in which the NPS communicates with Tribes about the outcome of consultation.

Communication Format	AKR	IMR	MWR	NCR	NER	PWR	SER
In Person	X	X	X		X	X	X
In writing (letter)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
In writing (email)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Telephone	X	X	X		X	X	X
Signed agreement with the Tribe	X	X	X		X	X	
Other (Please Specify)							

All reports received indicated that the input received from tribal governments is central not only to the stewardship of cultural and natural resources, but also to enriching the ability of the NPS to provide accurate and culturally relevant interpretation, exhibits, and waysides. Input received from Tribes was incorporated into updating methods and protocols for researching traditional uses and ethnographic resources in parks to ensure that research products fulfill the needs of the park, the Tribes, and the public. Additionally, many reports indicated that tribal input led to the development of new approaches to park management, interpretive planning, and even the design of new trails that highlight indigenous connections to park lands. For example, Indiana Dunes National Park’s ongoing relationship and consultation with the Miami Band of Oklahoma and the Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi has led to a collaborative effort to design a Native American Cultural Trail that will highlight new interpretive themes in the park related to ethnobotany, the contemporary connection of Tribes to park resources, and more. Other reports indicated that input received from Tribes led to increased opportunity to partner with Tribes on trail maintenance, preservation, and interpretation/tours. Tribal input was also used to develop or enhance protocols related to historic preservation and communicating about inadvertent discoveries of human remains. Regional reporting on how input from Tribes enhances the NPS’ ability to research, protect, preserve, and enhance public understanding of park units can be found in Appendix H.

**V. SECRETARIAL ORDER 3342: OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL REPORTING ON COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS WITH TRIBES**

**Reported Agreements by Region**

Region	Agreements	Pending	Declined Agreements
Alaska Region	10	2	N/A
Intermountain Region	14	1	N/A
Midwest Region	8	4	0
National Capital Region	0	0	0
Northeast Region	2	1	2
Pacific West Region	21	9	N/A
Southeast Region	1	N/A	N/A
Totals	56	17	2

\*Some regions and parks reported one agreement signed by multiple Tribes. Those agreements are listed above as one agreement. Declined agreements were described as declined by tribal partners.

**Regions reported current or pending agreements between the NPS and the following:**

**Indian Tribal Entities within the Contiguous 48 States\*:**

1. Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
2. Cowlitz Indian Tribe
3. The Crow Nation
4. Delaware Nation, Oklahoma
5. Delaware Tribe of Indians
6. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
7. Elk Valley Rancheria, California
8. Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, California
9. Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation, Arizona
10. Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah
11. Nez Perce Tribe
12. Nisqually Indian Tribe
13. Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma
14. Ponca Tribe of Oklahoma
15. Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi
16. Pueblo of Jemez
17. Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin
18. The Chickasaw Nation
19. The Osage Nation
20. Timbisha Shoshone Tribe
21. Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation
22. Yurok Tribe



\*Some regions and parks reported listed “Affiliated Tribes” or “tribes” versus the names of Tribes with whom they have agreements. Thus, this does not provide a comprehensive list of Tribes reported in this section.

**Associations, Intertribal Councils, Non-Federally Recognized Tribes, and Tribal Organizations:**

1. Alaska Native Voices (non-profit arm of Huna Totem Corporation)
2. Bristol Bay Native Association (the non-profit arm of Bristol Bay Native Corporation)
3. Chugachmiut (non-profit arm of Chugach Alaska Corporation)
4. Maniilaq Association
5. Southwest Conservation Corp (Ancestral Lands Crew)

**Names of ANCSA Regional and Community Corporations:**

1. Bristol Bay Native Corporation
2. Kijik Corporation (originally Nondalton Native Corporation)
3. Paug-Vik Incorporated Limited

**Native Entities within the State of Alaska:**

1. Hoonah Indian Association
2. King Salmon Tribe
3. Sitka Tribe of Alaska
4. Yakutat Tlingit Tribe
5. Nondalton Village

In Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019, parks reporting on agreements and partnerships with Tribes confirmed that NPS-tribal collaborations benefit the NPS, the public, and our tribal partners. The application of traditional knowledge, and of tribal input enhances the agency’s ability to preserve and protect park resources. Additionally, agreements and partnerships with Tribes enhance the ability for the NPS to engage with Tribes to offer interpretation and education to visitors, and to broaden opportunities for Tribes to work with the NPS in a variety of capacities. For example, an agreement between Glacier Bay Park and Preserve and the Hoonah Indian Association facilitated the co-management of Huna Tribal House by NPS employees and tribal staff in the park. The arrangement expands the opportunity for tribal members to work in the park, increases the accuracy of interpretation and education on natural and cultural resources in the park, and enhances public understanding of indigenous connections to park resources both contemporarily and in historical contexts. For example, a co-management agreement between the Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe and Grand Portage National Monument provides employment opportunities for tribal community members, and provides mentoring in skills development in maintenance, interpretation, and prescribed fire and forestry programs. The NPS and the Tribe co-manage the National Monument, providing quality interpretation for the public on Lake Superior Ojibwe culture, the fur trade, and natural resources. See Appendix J for additional details regarding efforts currently underway for engaging in new cooperative management opportunities and collaborative partnerships with Tribes

## **Appendices: Regional, Park and Program Reports**

The following sections have been compiled from reports provided by parks, regional offices, and NPS programs. The narratives have been minimally edited.

### **APPENDIX A: TRAINING**

#### **National Park Service Training and Development**

The NPS Mather Training Center, the Council for Indigenous, Relevance, Communication, Leadership and Excellence (CIRCLE), the Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures (TRAC) and the American Indian Liaison Office (AILO) developed and produced one beta and one pilot course in NPS Tribal Consultation. The beta test was held at Effigy Mounds National Monument in March 2018 and the pilot course was held at Fort Smith National Historic Site in August 2018. The courses involved blended online and in-person training designed to be easily customized for regions and parks. The training covers several topics, including: the History of Consultation within the NPS; Law & Policy; Players in the Consultation Process; Creating and Sustaining Relationships; Topics for Consultation; Practical Aspects of Consultation; and After Consultation: Honoring Agreements. Individuals who complete the training will: develop the skills to build collaborative relationships with federally recognized Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations; increase their awareness of tribal culture(s) associated or affiliated with park lands and recognize the importance of current issues within local tribal communities; and recognize that decisions made about the management of park lands will impact the ongoing relationships between federally recognized Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations and their heritage resources located within the park. The participants in the beta and pilot courses included Superintendents, program managers, law enforcement, resource managers, facility managers, administrative staff and interpretation and education professionals. Participants were asked to give their candid feedback on the course materials. Throughout FY 2019, the curriculum design team worked to synthesize and implement feedback to improve the course. An in-person curriculum refinement workshop is planned for FY 2020.

#### **Alaska Region**

**Bering Land Bridge National Preserve (BELA):** Several park staff participated in consultation training via teleconference with Alaska Native Affairs Liaison in 2018.

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):** In winter of 2018, two KATM staff (Superintendent and Interpretation Division lead) attended Alaska Native Cultural Awareness training offered by USFWS Native Liaison staff in Anchorage.

**Lake Clark National Park and Preserve (LACL):** Six park staff attended 32-hour USFWS Alaska Native Relations Training.

## **Intermountain Region**

Park staff throughout IMR participated in tribal-related training opportunities as well as presented on tribal relations themselves. Trainings attended covered topics such as: NAGPRA and consultation, archeology, NHPA, Section 106, programmatic agreements, cultural sensitivity, and tribal consultation.

**Big Thicket National Preserve (BITH):** The Superintendent and Chief of Resources attended the course “Improving Tribal Relationships” in 2018.

**Bryce Canyon National Park (BRCA):** The park's Section 106 coordinator attended a Tribal Relations course.

**Capitol Reef National Park (CARE):** In FY18, the park Archeologist/Cultural Resource Program Manager completed “NAGPRA in the Parks” training held in Moab, Utah.

**Casa Grande Ruins National Monument (CAGR):** The park Resources Manager, Facilities Management Chief, and Cultural Resources staff attended a NAGPRA training with a day focused on tribal consultation.

**Cedar Breaks National Monument (CEBR):** During seasonal training, we discussed the importance of having good relationships with our partners and with Tribes.

**Devils Tower National Monument (DETO):** Trainings included: NAGPRA training (Environmental Protection Specialist) September 2018, Tribal Consultation training (Interpretation and Education Program Manager Detail) August 2019. The park hosted DETO/IMR/MWR Tribal Consultation Collaboration Initiative (18 cultural resource and Superintendent participants from 10 parks) December 2018. DOI “Consulting with Tribal Nations” Training June 2019 (1 participant).

**El Morro National Monument (ELMO):** No specific training, although several Interpretation Division staff sat in on the consultation meetings to experience tribal consultation in person to learn about resources in the proposed district and tribal perspectives on those resources. The tribal representatives were very welcoming of the spectators, and some contributed to the discussions.

**Fort Union National Monument (FOUN):** In August 2018, the Chief of Interpretation attended the "Consulting with Tribal Nations" training in Tucson.

**Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument (GICL):** Park staff attended the 3-day DOI workshop "Consulting with Tribal Nations" in Tucson AZ (August 2018).

**Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GLCA) -** In FY19, the park launched a series of trainings for tribal members on applying for federal jobs. These trainings stemmed from consultations wherein a Tribe expressed the desire for NPS assistance with economic development and federal job employment.

**Golden Spike National Historical Park (GOSP):** The previous Superintendent attended "Consulting with Tribal Nations" training in August 2019.

**Grand Teton National Park (GRTA):** Staff obtained an Albright Wirth Grant for a tribal relations training held at the park September 2019 by the park tribal liaison. The class was called “Meaningful Engagement: Building Trust & Strengthening Relationships with Native American Tribes,” and was attended by 22 NPS employees.

**Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (ORPI):** Archaeologist and Cultural Resource Program Manager attended a tribal consultation training, organized by NPS, held in Tucson, AZ, in August 2018.

**Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS):** The park staff attended NPS tribal consultation training in 2018.

**Pecos National Historical Park (PECO):** The park staff held an on-site training of seasonal staff about tribal concerns and consultation, including how to handle requests for plant collection or permits to visit sacred sites/archaeological sites.

**Petrified Forest National Park (PEFO):** The park staff requested a class, and key staff attended NAGPRA training in 2018.

**Pipe Spring National Monument (PISP):** The Superintendent attended “American Indian Tribal Relationships” training (24 hr) in 2018.

**Rocky Mountain National Park (ROMO):** Park staff (Cultural Resources Program Manager, NEPA Specialist, and Interpretation/Education Specialist) attended a 3-day workshop/training “Working in Indian Country” and the park Cultural Resources Program Manager led a “cultural sensitivity/working with Tribes” half-day session for select park staff.

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** Through the park’s Long-Range Interpretive Plan, the tribal liaison brought in experts to train staff on their knowledge regarding the massacre and/or historical information during the time period. The class was targeted for Interpretation staff/park guides; however, all staff attended. The class was not specific to tribal consultation, but the information was designed to provide an overview of American Indian history, law, and guidance.

**White Sands National Park (WNSA):** The Superintendent, Resource Chief, and Interpretation Chief attended the 2018 Tribal Relations Training and 2019 NAGPRA in the Parks.

### **Midwest Region**

**Apostle Islands National Seashore (APIS):** Planning cultural sensitivity training with two affiliated Tribes in FY20.

**Arkansas Post National Memorial (ARPO):** Region supported the Superintendent to attend the DOI Tribal Consultation Training in 2019.

**Buffalo National River (BUFF):** NAGPRA Training, ARPA Training, Cultural Resource Training.

**Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO):** Hosted the “Nuts & Bolts” pilot version of the NPS tribal consultation training course in FY 2018. Also, all EFMO employees are routinely invited to sit in on consultation sessions to learn directly about how it is done.

**Fort Smith National Historic Site (FOSM):** The park hosted the pilot course in NPS tribal consultation titled, “Pathway to Confidence: Engaging in Effective NPS-Tribal Consultation,” August 2018.

**Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site (FOUS):** The park's Section 106 coordinator participated in the Midwest Region's April 23-26, 2018 "Consulting with Tribal Nations" training provided by the Department of the Interior. The park Section 106 coordinator has also joined with the park Superintendents and resource management staff from North Dakota's other NPS units to visit THPOs and tribal leaders at their offices on their reservations.

**Herbert Hoover National Historic Site (HEHO):** Senior Leaders Training, October 2019.

**Homestead National Monument of America (HOME):** Incoming park historian attended a two-day training seminar at MWRO - "Working in Indian Country.”

**Hot Springs National Park (HOSP):** NPS “Pathway to Confidence: Engaging in Effective NPS-Tribal Consultation.” The park's new Superintendent and curator attended this training in late FY18. In-person meetings are being scheduled for FY 2020 with the first in February 2020.

**Ice Age National Scenic Trail (IATR):** NPS Senior Leaders Training at the Regional Office in November of 2019.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** The park's Compliance Coordinator completed NAGPRA webinars in August of 2017.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** contracted a "Working in Indian Country" training session for staff on how to improve consultations between the trail and various American Indian partners along it.

**Midwest Regional Office of American Indian Affairs (MWRO/OAIA):** FY18 OAIA provided DOIU Consulting with Tribal Nations to 25 employees from across the region. FY19 OAIA presented consultation best practices training to over 100 park Superintendents, associate regional directors, program managers, & the directorate. MWRO/OAIA also represented the agency at the annual DOI Self-Governance Conference, represented the region and agency at the NATHPO conference, and audited two (beta & pilot) NPS tribal consultation training sessions.

**Minuteman Missile National Historic Site (MIMI):** Joint IMR/Nekota zone consultation discussion meeting.

**Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (MISS):** DOI Consulting with Tribal Nations Training, Cultural Resource Program Manager, October 2019.

**Missouri National Recreational River (MNRR):** Regional tribal consultation & coordination training offered and attended by MNRR staff in Omaha at MWRO in 2018.

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** Working in Indian Country-Building Successful Business Relationships with American Indian Tribes, 2019.

### **National Capital Region**

The National Capital Regional Anthropology team completed training in Consulting with Tribal Nations, offered by the Department of the Interior, and NAGPRA in the Parks, offered by the Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures (WASO).

### **Northeast Region**

Region 1 supported regional NAGPRA training as a collaboration between THPOs, SHPOs, and Park NAGPRA Programs facilitated by the National Preservation Institute. The class ran 3 times during the reporting period and a total of 31 NPS staff were trained.

**Appalachian National Scenic Trail (APPA):** Park staff reviewed and discussed the Effigy Mounds Series, which had many lessons related to tribal consultation, NAGPRA, and ARPA.

**Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO):** FY18: CAJO Trail Administrator and NCR regional anthropologist attended training provided by NPS and CIRCLE at Fort Smith NHS in August 2018. CAJO Superintendent and COLO Curator attended DOI consultation training in FY18.

**Colonial National Historical Park (COLO):** The Superintendent and Park Conservator attended “Consulting with Tribal Nations” in New Mexico in 2018. Park Cultural Resources Program Manager attended same course in Washington DC August 2019.

**Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (DEWA):** Primary staff completed NAGPRA training provided by WASO.

**Fire Island National Seashore (FIIS):** FY19 Park hosted 106 consultation training, tribal consultation was a part of the training.

**Fort Monroe National Monument (FOMR):** Consulting with Tribal Nations Training.

**Gateway National Recreation Area (GATE):** NAGPRA in the Parks webinars were attended by Cultural Resource staff.

**Richmond National Battlefield Park (RICH):** There were no formal tribal consultation training initiatives in 2018 or 2019. However, the Chief of Resource Management met with the Regional Ethnographer to gain a better understanding of the expectations of parks to informally engage with interested Tribes in preparation for future more formal consultations.

**Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites (ROVA):** No formal training to report for 2018-2019, however, park Section 106 Coordinator has participated in several discussions with colleagues outside of the park and at the regional level for the purpose of improving the park's procedures.

**Statue of Liberty National Monument (STLI):** One member of park staff went to a NAGPRA training that also included information about tribal consultation.

**Thomas Edison National Historical Park (EDIS):** Effigy Mounds videos on Common Learning Portal, Section 106 for Superintendents and Facility Managers, Cultural Resources Meeting at Weir Farm NHS.

**Weir Farm National Historic Site (WEFA):** Park Superintendent participated in Region 1 Webinar on tribal consultation.

Regional Planning and Compliance- "Find your Parks, Find your Native Peoples: Compliance and Tribal Partnership" Compliance Call in (June 2018).

### **Pacific West Region**

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** NHPA training, ACHP webinars (3+), NAGPRA training.

**City of Rocks National Reserve (CIRO):** on 5/9/2018 the Park Superintendent, Park 106 Coordinator, and (former) Chief of Maintenance for City of Rocks attended Introduction to NHPA Section 106 training held at Craters of the Moon. CIRO's new maintenance foreman and operations ranger attended NPS Section 106 training in November.

**Craters of the Moon National Monument (CRMO):** Section 106 Agreement documents, Nov. 19.

**Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve (EBEY):** Attended summit of Tribes and government officials convened by WA State Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** Viewed the "In Effigy" series; attended summit of Tribes and government officials convened by WA State Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation; Curator and Archaeologists attended and presented at summit of Tribes in Suquamish; Assisted in development of After EFMO 106 training.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** Park staff participated in "The NATIVE Act," a webinar sponsored by the NPS employee resource group CIRCLE (Council for Indigenous Relevancy, Communication, Leadership and Excellence,) and the NPS Tourism Program. Park staff also participated in "Tribal Perspectives on Ecological Landscape and Cultural Resources Restoration Work" webinar sponsored by the California Landscape Conservation Partnership.

**Hagerman Fossil Beds National Monument (HAFO):** Section 106 agreement documents, Nov. 2019

**Joshua Tree National Park (JOTR):** The "In Effigy" series was screened for park staff, who were encouraged to view the videos and participate in the associated webinars. The park provided Section 106 training for the CRM team and Section 106 training for attendees at the Desert Parks Leadership Academy class of 2019.

**Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAME):** An in-house training on the new park SOP for the NEPA process included info on the role of tribal consultation. The new park SOP on Sec. 106 details the role of tribal consultation on the 106 process.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** Annual Cultural Resource and NHPA/Section 106 Training made available to all Project Leads and Division Representatives by the LARO Cultural Resource Program (Section 106 Coordinator).

**Lewis and Clark National Historical Park (LEWI):** The park's cultural resource specialist attended advanced Section 106 training.

**Minidoka National Historic Site (MIIN):** Section 106 agreements, Nov. 2019

**Mount Rainer National Park (MORA):** Tribal Consultation Summit hosted by DAHP, NPS Section 106 training hosted by MORA,

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** The Superintendent attended three-day DOI “Consulting with Tribal Nations” Consultation Training in FY19.

**North Cascades National Park (NOCA):** Staff attended Tribal Summit put on by the SHPO, park hosted a Sect. 106 class

**Pearl Harbor National Memorial/ Honolulu National Historic Site (HONO):** National Preservation Institute's NAGPRA Essentials Course

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** Redwood National Park's, Chief of Resource Management and Science has been joining monthly calls for NPS tribal liaisons that are being coordinated by WASO's Cultural Anthropology Program Manager and Acting American Indian Liaison Officer.

**San Juan Island National Historical Park (SAJH):** NAGPRA in the Parks, NPS Section 106 Training

**Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SAMO):** NAGPRA webinar, Section 106 training

**Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks (SEKI):** Informal project-specific training by tribal liaison to project lead on the consultation process and etiquette for in-person and phone conversations.

**Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (WHIS):** Attending ACHP Webinars as offered.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** Yosemite National Park hosted a Section 106 and Wilderness training session for NPS and other agency staff in October 2019. Area tribal representatives were invited to attend. Two representatives from traditionally associated Tribes and groups were invited to present tribal perspectives on NPS management of wilderness to the group.



## **Southeast Region**

**Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park (ABLI):** Training was not included in this consultation, but the park does annual compliance and resource training. This year the park is holding an Effigy Mounds training for the entire staff.

**Biscayne (BISC), Dry Tortugas (DRTO) and Everglades National Parks (EVER):** Provide mentoring and engagement opportunities with the Tribes and staff.

**Cane River Creole National Historical Park (CARI):** CARI Superintendent and Chief of Resource Management completed the "Pathways to Confidence: Engaging in Effective Tribal Consultation" training course at NPS-FOSM in August 2018. Both CARI staff planned to attend the 21st NATHPO Conference in August 2019, however the event was cancelled.

**Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park (CHCH):** Superintendent attended the Department of the Interior course, Consulting with Tribal Nations

**Mammoth Cave National Park (MACA):** The following training has been completed by the MACA Cultural Resource Program Manager during the review period: ARPA for Cultural Resource Professionals, July 2019; Webinar Series Re: Section 106 and the NPS Nationwide Programmatic Agreement, Summer 2019 (joint facilitator); SER Compliance with Section 106 and NEPA Training, July 2018.

**Southeast Archeological Center (SEAC)/SER NAGPRA Program:** SEAC staff completed training for NAGPRA in the parks and tribal consultation.

**Great Smoky Mountains National Park (GRSM):** The park worked with Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians to support training for appropriate collection of sochan plants per the gathering agreement and special use permit.

**Vicksburg National Military Park (VICK):** I would like to host a Section 106 training workshop at VICK in FY20, and I would like to invite THPOs to present sessions on consultation with their specific tribal governments.

## **APPENDIX B: FEEDBACK FROM TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS**

### **Alaska Region**

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):** Our consultation meetings with both Paug-Vik, Ltd. Inc., and King Salmon Tribe identified several areas for collaborative project building in protecting cultural resources, creating interpretative programs that focus on Alaska Native history and connections to specific areas such as Brooks Camp/Kittivik; and working together to improve resource protection within long-range park planning efforts.

**Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park (KLG0):** On May 7, 2018, the park received a letter from the President of the Skagway Traditional Council expressing her concerns with what the Tribe perceived as an unorganized, decentralized, and overwhelming amount of consultation from the park. Outlined in the letter were four examples of miscommunications between park staff and tribal members that posed a hardship to the Tribe. As a result, the park and Tribe agreed to a monthly, standing meeting between the tribal administrator and park Superintendent, and/or between the Tribal Council and the park Superintendent. The park Superintendent agreed that the park would use an internal spreadsheet to track contacts (similar to formal consultation tracking done by the park Chief of Resources) with the Tribal Administrator to avoid confusion and redundancy. The Superintendent also offered that the park would have an "external contacts" agenda item at the beginning of each Leadership Team Meeting to help park leaders understand multiple levels of communication happening simultaneously with the STC. On August 28, 2019, during an in-person meeting with the Skagway Traditional Council, the park committed to revamping our tribal consultation process in response to input from the Tribe. New process was implemented in FY 2020.

**Sitka National Historic Park (SITK):** The Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes provided a written memo that enumerated their role in affairs that are "local" to other Tribes in SE Alaska. The Sitka Tribe of Alaska requested that park managers follow the Tribe's Consultation Policy, which was subsequently adopted by the park. The Sitka Tribe of Alaska has also provided feedback on specific projects, ranging from a "no interest in consulting" to "would like detailed information and the opportunity to provide detailed feedback," depending on the project.

**Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve and Gates of the Arctic National Park (YUGA):** One of the tribal governments thanked Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve for reaching out, saying that the "personal touch" was very helpful given all of the reviews and projects that their tribal office was receiving from government and other entities.

### **Intermountain Region**

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** During a phone conversation with one of the tribal representatives about a project at a different park, the conversation drifted to ethnographic studies, at which point the representative suggested that the NPS should initiate contact with the Tribes prior to writing the scope of work and selecting the CESU partner. This step would improve collaboration and ensure that the product benefits the Tribe as much as it benefits the park and public.

**Aztec Ruins National Monument (AZRU):** In face-to-face tribal consultations, we learned that it would be a good idea to have tribal input and park actions well-demonstrated to help all parties understand what has been acted upon by parks and consulting Tribes. This was a result of constructive feedback and discussion with tribal consultants.

**Bandelier National Monument (BAND):** Tribes requested more in-person interactions. They also requested project lists for the upcoming year (versus piecemeal consultation). They overwhelmingly emphasized the need for personal relationships and noted that they take time and energy on both sides. Also, Tribes requested historical information on previous consultations with the park, so they can keep track of past tribal recommendations. They stated that they also want to be able to teach the younger tribal consultants about government-to-government consultation because, like the NPS, they are seeing turnover and generational changes.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** The Crow Nation expressed their gratitude on the Concession Agreement and allowing time to come into compliance with building improvements, services, and reporting. Due to circumstances, the Superintendent agreed to clarify contract terms and allowed for improvement. Both agreed to building the government-to-government relationship to improve future collaboration.

**Bryce Canyon National Park (BRCA):** The park was co-lead with Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) on the SR-12 Highway Stabilization and Improvement Project. The Section 106 and tribal consultation process were led by UDOT, who coordinated all consultation efforts with the NPS. UDOT communicated concurrence on findings of effect responses from Tribes to the NPS. Information exchange was good.

**Canyon de Chelly National Monument (CACH):** The Navajo Nation and local community members - parties with management responsibilities and retained rights, respectively, within the park – expressed eagerness to develop a comprehensive joint management plan for Canyon de Chelly National Monument. The strategic agreement that was cooperatively developed and signed by the Navajo Nation, the National Park Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs was a crucial phase in the development of a future joint management plan.

**Canyonlands National Park (CANY)** – The park received feedback from several Tribes regarding the need for more economic opportunities within the parks for indigenous persons. This could be through job placement or through concessions contracts, or through partnerships and collaborative task agreements in which the Tribe is awarded the funding as other partners are.

**Capitol Reef National Park (CARE):** Consultation on the development of interpretive exhibits for the Visitor Center included constructive feedback on the use of language possessing the potential to convey cultural biases and unbalanced representation of traditionally associated Tribes.

**Casa Grande Ruins National Monument (CAGR):** The park received very valuable, somewhat surprising, and direct feedback on some park practices during two day-long tribal consultation meetings. These meetings provided the most insight and opportunities to build

better working relationships. The park has been working with our associated Tribes to address their concerns.

**Cedar Breaks National Monument (CEBR):** Feedback was positive and support for exhibit design assistance was approved.

**Chaco Culture National Historical Park (CHCU):** In face-to-face tribal consultations, we learned that it would be a good idea to have tribal input and park actions well-demonstrated to help all parties understand what has been acted upon by parks and consulting Tribes. This was a result of constructive feedback and discussion with tribal consultants.

**Chamizal National Memorial (CHAM):** Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo mentioned that they were very pleased with their partnership and collaboration with the park.

**Devils Tower National Monument (DETO):** Through consultation, the park's associated Tribes emphasized that:

- While e-mail communication is not considered “formal” government-to-government consultation, it is becoming an easier mechanism to use to present and document formal comments and recommendations from Tribes to park management.
- Any projects with ground disturbing activities should be subject to monitoring from a tribal archeologist.
- Tribal officials communicated appreciation for the variety of topics that the park consulted on in FY 18-19.
- Tribes recommended that the National Park Service respect the privacy of the practices involved in ethnobotanical and ceremonial plant collection and use.
- Tribes recommended that the federal government improve its proactive consultation practices rather than continuing to be reactive.

**El Malpais National Monument (ELMA):** The Pueblo of Acoma requested a map of the lava tube cave from the park for Advisory Council discussion. The park's Resources Management staff provided the map (and NAGPRA Plan of Action and PA report at prior meetings). The Acoma THPO called the park following the meeting to say that the map and other information helped Acoma Preservation Office council members understand the conditions of the inadvertent discovery and was very helpful during the discussion. The discussion led to subsequent visits to the cave by Acoma Preservation Office members. Dialogue regarding the inadvertent discovery and significance of lava tube caves is ongoing. The park, Acoma and Zuni are planning additional field visits to the inadvertent discovery site and to other lava tube caves and surface cultural sites in the area. Acoma and Zuni representatives are interested in participating in a study of the cultural resources associated with the lava tube caves.

**El Morro National Monument (ELMO):** Initially, representatives from both Acoma and Zuni pueblos had many questions about why we were seeking a district nomination for the pueblos atop Inscription Rock. Following in-person discussions with tribal representatives that gave them the opportunity to contribute to the research direction and outcome of the study, El Morro received strong support for the nomination. Tribal representatives were keen to review and contribute to the proposed themes.

**Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument (GICL):** The Tribes were mostly satisfied with the consultation process that took place in Silver City, New Mexico, in November 2017, and hoped their suggestions would be considered in designing the upgraded museum exhibit.

**Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GLCA):** The park received feedback on where it holds consultation meetings. For example, the Navajo Nation has expressed that it is more convenient to meet with them at a mid-point location and/or in Window Rock. This allows them to accommodate the schedules of multiple attendees.

**Grand Teton National Park (GRTA):** Tribes would like a better process for identifying Traditional Cultural Properties and to establish agreements with NPS and the park to better facilitate working with Tribes to hire consultants and tribal monitors for projects.

**Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve (GRSA):** The park received a great review from the Tribes on the park's Traditional Use Study.

**Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LIBI):** The Tribes requested to follow all laws and policies within the realm of tribal consultation requirements. The Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument agreed to improve the government-to-government relationships and follow laws and policies by keeping Division Leads informed and educated.

**Natural Bridges National Monument (NABR):** On-site, in-person visits were critical for Tribes building trust with the NPS.

**Pecos National Historic Park (PECO):** Feedback was usually positive and constructive and included major items for each project that need to be followed up on.

**Petroglyph National Monument (PETR):** The park received positive feedback on the anticipated project lists/maps that we sent out periodically; and on completion of the Visitor Use Management Plan.

**Rocky Mountain National Park (ROMO):** The park received a great deal of constructive feedback as a result of consultations. General feedback was that the park was doing well to involve Tribes early in the required compliance process, and that it was good that the park was engaging Tribes in 'bigger picture' collaborative goals for resource protection. The park also received feedback that past actions of the park resulted in a loss of trust, and that the park had 'one more chance' to show that we are listening.

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** We consulted with tribal governments through their officially designated tribal representatives as directed in the NPS Cooperative Agreement. Tribal comments received at the October 2018 consultation: The sacred herb, sage, should not be a sales item in the WNPS store without explanation of its use from a tribal representative; and tribal representatives preferred a film crew not use drones on park property. Tribal representatives' consensus at the April 2018 meeting for a Cheyenne & Arapaho monument on site was for the next step to get all three tribal governments to send an official letter/document. For the April 2019 consultation, the park sent a "follow-up items" document to each tribal representative. This document contained questions that were answered, artifacts requested, interpretive panels reviewed, books for sale in WNPA store, Chief Laird Cometsevah's collection, native plants on the park site, and additional archeology.

**Southeast Utah Group (SEUG):** In-person communication and site visits are key.

**Southern Arizona Office (SOAR):** The Tribes indicated that decisions about the choice of CESU cooperators for ethnographic projects should be reviewed by interested tribal governments. Also, students should not be used to draft/write Ethnographic Overview and Assessment documents.

**Tonto National Monument (TONT):** In-person meetings were very positive, and Tribes provided input on various topics such as interpretation, NAGPRA, and project development.

**Valles Caldera National Preserve (VALL):** Tribal governments requested to formalize routine consultation meetings throughout the year. The park received very positive feedback for developing economic partnerships with two Tribes. The park received input relating to the plant gathering rule and how tribal concerns are being addressed with the required sensitivity to move forward on an agreement.

**White Sands National Park (WNSA):** Tribal governments desired to see more regional-level leadership at meetings and would like to be present with more monitoring activities.

### **Midwest Region**

**Badlands National Park (BADL):** the Oglala Sioux Tribe is very concerned about concessions contract process. The Tribe is very concerned about resource protection in the South Unit and wants to know when we intend to move forward with new visitor center, overlooks, etc. in the South Unit.

**Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO):** We routinely offer an opportunity for feedback at the conclusion of consultation events. Feedback we have received in the past indicates a desire to receive written notes on a timelier basis - something we struggle with.

**Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site (FOUS):** Tribal Historic Preservation Officers have requested that parks increase involvement of Tribal Cultural Specialists (TCSs) in conducting onsite surveys to inform project planning through identification of resources; they have also requested that parks invite TCSs to monitor projects during implementation. With respect to Section 106 documentation, Tribes have requested that documentation provided to them for concurrence evaluation be specific/detailed and include photographs of the Area of Potential Effect to ensure they have adequate information for a complete and thorough understanding of a project and its potential effects. THPOs have also requested that letters sent to them be explicit about what is being asked of them.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** Our consultation on projects with the Tribes is ongoing, and we have developed good working relationships with the THPOs and CR Directors of the Miami of Oklahoma and the Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi.

**Knife River Indian Villages National Historic Site (KNRI):** We reached out to the Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation for feedback on our tribal consultation process and practices. They responded that they are happy with our current strategy and appreciate our ongoing communications.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation offered some of the most constructive feedback; specifically they requested that when LECL requests a meeting we give a greater lead time (preferably up to a year) between the invitation and the expected meeting, as well as a wider window (preferably several months) of potential dates to be agreed upon.

**Midwest Regional Office of American Indian Affairs (MWRO/OAIA):** During consultation with the Rosebud Sioux Tribe (RST), the RST THPO recommended the NPS develop “regional consultation meetings” in order to ease the burden on Tribes to accommodate numerous and uncoordinated consultation requests coming from across the service, thus NPS would gain trust and priority from tribal partners.

**Missouri National Recreational River (MNRR):** Expressed appreciation by the Tribes to be involved and provided an opportunity early during scoping on planning and environmental compliance projects (e.g. management plans and park's visitor educational film)

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** A fifteen-point caucus statement was written by Tribes attending the in-person meeting in June 2019 at the park and copies were provided to regional staff. Comments on increased number and quality of consultation efforts have been praised by tribal leaders. Tribal representatives have requested more collaboration, coordination, and consistency among NPS units conducting consultation.

**Voyageurs National Park (VOYA):** The park and the Bois Forte Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe have had excellent conversations about tribal concerns and park management during boat tours of the park and visits to the Bois Forte Heritage Center. Both parties have expressed a strong interest in continuing to grow the relationship.

### Northeast Region

**Cape Cod National Seashore (CACO):** Feedback from Mashpee Tribe during CCNS/regional office meeting in Mashpee offices August 2019 clarified the frequency and communication mediums desired for future consultations, which the park is implementing (e.g. sending NHPA info both in writing and electronically, and following up with both letters and phone calls, and insuring future opportunities to assist with Section 110 projects are communicated in advance).

**Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO):** We talked about whether the meeting facility suited everyone and decided to choose something different for next time.

**Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (DEWA):** Tribes would like to have an annual consultation meeting at the park in April.

**Gateway National Recreation Area (GATE):** The Tribes typically respond with a concurrence to proceed with the project and express interest to be informed as the project progresses. Responses are often received via email and all Tribes have requested that consultation requests be submitted electronically.

**Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument (KAWW):** Feedback is included in the reports from the 4 meetings where all Tribes met with the NPS. Tribal input is being added to both Foundation Document and Management Framework planning.

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** The Tribe had very specific suggestions for the technical approach taken with our archeology projects including the number of shovel test pits and the use of remote sensing. They also suggested looking into geophysical testing. These suggestions shaped the decision-making process for several projects. These suggestions were also incorporated into PMIS project statements for future archeology projects.

**Statue of Liberty National Monument (STLI):** The Tribes repeatedly expressed appreciation of the park's consultation efforts. The experience of consulting about the reburial of human remains on Ellis Island and the shared onsite experience of working with all three Tribes and the NPS-staff was particularly meaningful. Throughout that consultation and afterward, tribal representatives referenced their happiness with the way the consultation and reburial took place.

**Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO):** Tribes want more interpretation of Native American people and events. This is not only for the past (e.g., Native American occupation of the park over time), but also for the present Tribes: where they are now, how they got there, current activities, etc.

### **Pacific West Region**

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** Provide materials ahead of time; use subcommittees where practicable (e.g., tribal NAGPRA committee)

**City of Rocks National Reserve (CIRO):** The waysides were approved at the Tribe's cultural committee meeting.

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** The Park recently held a meeting with the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe to re-initiate the quarterly meetings and ensure we are communicating effectively through the proper channels. The Park recently filled the Cultural Resources Manager position, who also serves as the Tribal Liaison. The Tribal Liaison is beginning to reach back out to Tribes we have had less contact with over the past decade to initiate an all-Tribes meeting and, as needed, individual meetings.

**Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve (EBEY):** Strong interest in native plant collecting.

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** Tribal input suggested that the traditional use study (TUS) should have a theme of healing, on many levels, including military, families, and landscape; that it should continue to decolonize/re-indigenize the landscape, reversing some of the historical damage and traumas. This could look like many things, including reminding visitors of the history of the people, restoring habitats, reminding people what the landscape meant and means. Further, the TUS can help to address the need for teaching children and changing their minds and hearts. This is an opportunity to speak to them. It was discussed that an event and multipurpose use space is needed at FOVA. More tribal groups have been using FOVA for events during the summer, but they are in need of a space. It would be useful for



there to be a space for people to stay during these events. There should also be an educational function to this space. The Canoe Landing is growing in numbers and with the location of FOVA, it could be used as a camping location. The space could be used by any Tribes that need it. People want FOVA to be a place to stop on cultural journeys. The Tribes expressed that the landscape outside the fort is important. People are very visual, and it speaks softly but is really powerful.

**Joshua Tree National Park (JOTR):** Joshua Tree National Park continues to receive significant positive feedback from its Native American communities. Tribal communities appreciated the attention Joshua Tree showed to minimally affecting the Setting and Feeling of archeological sites, despite those aspects of integrity being secondary for properties eligible for the National Register under Criterion D. Following the 2018 meeting, the communities commented positively on:

- The park’s openness to listening to the communities and considering their viewpoints.
- Efforts to be transparent regarding identified historic properties (archeological sites) and potential effects to those properties.
- The park’s efforts to build community with tribal representatives, including the employee provided potluck lunch.
- Following the 2019 annual in-person meeting, communities commented that:
  - They appreciated that the park is open to tribal feedback and genuinely listens to and considers tribal feedback.
  - They appreciate that the park begins consultations early in project processes, before it is “too late” to meaningfully incorporate tribal comments or perspectives.
  - They complimented the thoroughness of Joshua Tree’s consultation efforts, noting that other consulting entities are often less thorough or communicative.
  - They expressed appreciation that Joshua Tree is revisiting inappropriate historic names and inaccurate interpretative exhibits in the park and partnering with Native American communities to improve those.

**Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAME):** One Tribe requested that mailings be sent to both the tribal chair and the THPO.

**Mojave National Preserve (MOJA):** Representative from Fort Mojave expressed interest in our attempts to limit the effects of visitors to the park. Projects aimed at reducing damage to resources by visitors were well regarded by the Tribes, specifically one project to keep off-roaders from damaging natural resources. FMIT also informed that they prefer that we do not refer to cultural resources as sites.

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** Tribes appreciate early and frequent face-to-face consultation on issues of significance, including interpretation.

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** The one example that REDW can provide is that the Tolowa Dee-ni’ Nation has requested that the NPS adhere strictly to its consultation and communication protocols. The Nation recently had an election and staffing changes and felt that the NPS bringing projects to its culture committee was not sufficient to meet the government-to-government consultation standards, however they also recognized that not all projects need to be

elevated to the Tribal Council and could be addressed at a staff-to-staff level. As a result, the Nation requested that the NPS meet with its THPO (the point of contact in our mutual General Agreement regarding government-to-government consultations) to go over projects prior to authorizing any communications with the cultural committee; and the NPS has agreed that we will ask the THPO if a project is one that needs to be elevated to the Council for government-to-government consultation. Since that meeting, the NPS has not attended a Culture Committee meeting with the Nation, and instead has met face-to-face with the THPO, and keeps the THPO informed via phone calls and emails. Several projects have since been discussed with the Tribal Council.

**San Juan Island National Historical Park (SAJH):** Consultation feedback directly influenced park actions involving NAGPRA and exhibits development for the new visitor center project.

**Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (WHIS):** Current feedback indicates a desire for continuing consultation and communication. No negative feedback has been received.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** Tribal feedback: Visitation is too high; too much human waste in park; please inform us when non-associated tribes ask to conduct religious ceremonies in Yosemite; Tribes provided countless points of feedback regarding park projects; Non-federally recognized tribes have asked park to support them in their effort for federal recognition.

### **Southeast Region**

**Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park (ABLI):** In-person tribal consultation take place when possible.

**Biscayne (BISC), Dry Tortugas (DRTO) and Everglades National Parks (EVER):** We regularly solicit feedback as to how the process is or is not working for the Tribes and make adjustments based on the feedback.

**Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (CHAT):** The Cherokee Nation and the Muscogee (Creek) Nation both are concerned that there is a proposed infrastructure project (non-NPS) in the park that will pose adverse effects to archaeological sites. However, they both expressed thanks that they had been contacted and engaged in the NHPA 106 and MOA process.

**Congaree National Park (CONG):** Thirty-four letters were sent to contacts from 16 Tribes regarding a suite of facilities/infrastructure projects entered into PEPC. The park received four responses. None of the four responses indicated significant concerns with the project work as described, but all four responses did ask that if cultural material or human remains are discovered then work should stop immediately and they should be notified. At a more detailed level, one of the responses clarified that we should notify them if any work qualified as an undertaking according to 36 CFR 800.16 (though none of the projects did). Another response wanted to ensure that we conducted "appropriate inquiries with other pertinent Tribal and Historic Preservation Offices regarding historic and prehistoric resources not included in the Nation's databases or records."

**Fort Donelson National Battlefield (FODO):** Replies received from Tribal programs are beneficial and appreciated. For technical information received, such as for ground excavation,

specifics as to what to look for and whom to contact/how to proceed if potential culturally identifiable resources are observed. In 2017, I along with the other four Superintendents of Kentucky-located parks, traveled to Oklahoma and North Carolina to meet in-person with each of our seven affiliated Tribal Nations. The face-to-face introductions and sharing were of benefit to dialog and consultations to follow. To do the same in 2020 or 2021 would be likely of benefit.

**Gulf Islands National Seashore (GUIS):** I have reached out to some of our tribal partners as the opportunity has arisen to ask how they feel about the use of the word "Chief" as a title for non-native persons during consultation, as well as how they may feel about the para-military style uniform that NPS employees wear. Of the Tribes that I have received feedback from (3), none of them registered a complaint on either front. The Seminole Tribe of Florida have been especially helpful in addressing language concerns. They felt that certain language in the NHPA Assessment of Effect form attached to one consultation letter was dismissive and suggested a book to help with future consultations.

**Mammoth Cave National Park (MACA):** The fall 2019 discovery and response treatment of a small group of wood artifacts in Mammoth Cave was supported by tribal representatives who discussed the identification of the materials via phone conversation.

**Southeast Archeological Center (SEAC)/SER NAGPRA Program:** We received positive feedback from multiple Tribes during the reporting period. Many told us that we handled consultation in a good way by holding consultations in parks and bringing tribal members to get a first-hand look at park resources (RUCA). Another Tribe provided us positive feedback stating that they very much enjoyed in-person consultations and saw the importance of face-to-face meetings, but that they knew us and trusted us and would rather "save funds" for other NAGPRA work, and that teleconference worked fine for them.



2. Tribal representatives from the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians, Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma and Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma attending the Russell Cave NM NAGPRA Consultation

## APPENDIX C: REVIEW OF EXISTING PRACTICES

Section VIII of the Department of the Interior Policy on Consultation with Indian Tribes requires bureaus to review their existing practices and revise those practices on consultation.

### Alaska Region

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):** Katmai is building a collaborative tribal and corporation consultation protocol, a process that began in 2016 and is continuing through 2020. The park expanded its consultee list in 2016 to include all Tribes, village corporations, and regional corporations that held known or potential cultural, historic, subsistence, or financial interests to the Katmai parklands. To date, the list includes 78 entities spanning western Bristol Bay and Kodiak Archipelago, with the intent that the Tribes and corporations self-identify their continued interest in consultation invitations. As of December 2018, no Tribes or corporations have requested removal from this initial “invite-to-consult” list. Even if the topic at hand is not of particular concern, the park receives positive feedback from the attempt to contact Tribes/corporation and to be inclusive with the planning process. Also in KATM, additional support for building the consultation protocol is funded through PMIS project 183847, “Partnering with Elders to Develop Cultural Resource Inventory, Assessment and Preservation Goals.” In 2018, Katmai cultural resources staff met informally with members of several communities to identify ethnographic resource documentation goals, and more fundamentally, how to improve the annual “Proposed Projects List” distributed by the park to federally recognized Tribes, corporations with financial interest, and affiliated Alaska Native organizations as an invitation to consult on parkwide infrastructure and resources projects.

### Intermountain Region

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** Resource management staff at Southeast Utah Group identified an ongoing need to conduct annual consultations with all associated Tribes for all four parks. This need was based on the following factors:

- input received from Tribes during a 2017 consultation
- a recent uptick in infrastructure projects that require tribal consultation under NHPA
- general rise in visitor-related impacts to archeological sites that require more effective management
- threats from climate change to ethnographic resources important for ongoing cultural practices

**Big Thicket National Preserve (BITH):** Since July 2019, in consultation with State of Texas, the park included Tribes recognized by the State of Texas in all consultations.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** Bighorn Canyon, Little Bighorn Battlefield parks and Tribes agreed to conduct an annual tribal consultation with both parks presenting their current projects and 5-year projects to comply with NHPA Section 106, NAGPRA, NEPA and Executive Orders to allow time for the Tribes to take information back to their governments for expert advice. This process has worked for FY 2019, and we conducted a

follow-up as a bi-annual tribal consultation four months later. As projects arose through the year, the parks and Tribes consulted to address those projects.

**Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park (BLCA):** The park sought funding for an ethnographic overview and assessment in order to better facilitate consultation.

**Bryce Canyon National Park (BRCA):** The park did not have a cultural resource specialist for the FY18-FY19 period of reporting. The park's Superintendent made concerted efforts to attend, at minimum, annual meetings with the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah and the Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians.

**Canyonlands National Park (CANY):** Tribes requested an adjustment to the professional service/per diem compensation rates listed within the IMR guidance.

**Casa Grande Ruins National Monument (CAGR):** In 2018 and 2019, the park participated with Montezuma Castle and Tonto parks in all-day tribal consultation meetings. Those annual meetings are the biggest change from past practices on how we conducted tribal consultation. We attempted to have those longer discussions and be more proactive in anticipating concerns.

**Curecanti National Recreation Area (CURE):** The park sought funding for an ethnographic overview and assessment.

**Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LIBI):** The park was more proactive in involving Tribes, and Tribes recognized the improvement.

**Mesa Verde National Park Colorado (MEVE):** The park renewed the agreement with the 26 associated Tribes, regarding the treatment of inadvertent discoveries of human remains and repatriating remains and objects to a burial site in the park.

**Montezuma Castle National Monument (MOCA):** Beginning in FY18, Montezuma Castle and Tuzigoot, in conjunction with Southern Arizona Group, Tonto and Casa Grande parks, conducted annual consultation meetings with the associated Tribes to update them on past year projects and provide information on forthcoming projects.

**Natural Bridges National Monument (NABR):** – Tribes requested federal agencies to increase the professional services honorarium.

**Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS):** After the arrival of new resource management staff at the park in early February 2019 and a review of past consultation practices, the park initiated a new project planning and review process, which included increased attention to tribal consultation and tribal communication.

**Petrified Forest National Park (PEFO):** In spring 2018, the NAGPRA coordinator role moved from the archaeologist to the museum coordinator.

**Rocky Mountain National Park (ROMO):** The park started sending draft cultural resource survey reports (Class III--pedestrian inventories) to Tribes for review and encouraged tribal comments on the documentation and recommended NRHP eligibility of resources (when appropriate--mostly pre-contact/historic Native American resources).

**Southeast Utah Group (SEUG):** Many representatives commented on how difficult the NPS reimbursement process is. Many suggested using prepaid credit cards that would draw from a central "consultation" account or perhaps a direct deposit to facilitate travel arrangements for tribal representatives. Others have said that they resent having to wait to be reimbursed and/or dealing with a check to cash.

**Tonto National Monument (TONT):** The park participated in annual multi-park and multi-Tribe consultation meetings in AZ.

**Tuzigoot National Monument (TUZI):** Beginning in FY18, Montezuma Castle and Tuzigoot, in conjunction with Southern Arizona Group, Tonto and Casa Grande parks, conducted annual consultation meetings with the associated Tribes to update them on past year projects and provide information on forthcoming projects.

**Valles Caldera National Preserve (VALL)** – The park revised its compliance SOP, which includes required tribal consultation.

### **Midwest Region**

**Apostle Islands National Seashore (APIS):** New lakeshore Superintendent in FY19- updating consultation SOP & developing new General Agreements with Red Cliff & with Bad River to define consultation processes for each nation related to their areas of interest.

**Arkansas Post National Memorial (ARPO):** Training in tribal consultation is encouraged.

**Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO):** We have had to modify our procedures for providing catering for our consultation events. We remain concerned that as an agency, the NPS seems far more intent on placing roadblocks than providing solutions to this absolutely vital component of tribal consultation.

**Fort Scott National Historic Site (FOSC):** The park is developing a NHPA/106 Programmatic Agreement in collaboration with The Osage Nation. The Interpretation, Education, and Volunteers Advisory Council has set goals and action items around tribal collaboration.

**Hot Springs National Park (HOSP):** As a new Superintendent to the park, I am working with other state Superintendents to schedule face to face meetings with our tribal partners as their schedules allow and as they wish to meet with us. Our first meeting with representatives of the Cherokee Nation is scheduled for February 4, 2020.

**Ice Age National Scenic Trail (IATR):** Superintendent and Trail Planner reviewed Improving Tribal Consultation in Infrastructure Projects. Superintendent, Trail Planner and Trail Manager participated in a conference call with the Regional Tribal Liaison to develop a Strategy for engaging Tribal Communities. This document is in draft and being implemented.

**Knife River Indian Villages National Historic Site (KNRI):** In 2019, the ND Group of parks initiated an effort to visit tribal historic preservation offices. These visits were initiated without an agenda or specific consultation need, but rather to build relationships and identify areas of

common interest. These trips have been extremely valuable, and interesting and fruitful avenues of collaboration have emerged.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** Following the recommendation of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, LECL has allowed for greater time in advance of proposed meetings as well as greater flexibility in meeting dates with tribal partners.

**Midwest Regional Office of American Indian Affairs (MWRO/OAIA):** Past consultation at MORU included sending letters inviting Tribes to consult on specific projects, but no responses were received. A new integrated resource manager was hired in September 2019, who has initiated consultation with 13 Tribes in FY20. An additional 7 Tribes will also be included in future consultations (total of 20). The Midwest Regional American Indian Affairs Program Manager served a detail as NPS Acting American Indian Liaison Officer and developed a draft strategic plan for program updates.

**North Country National Scenic Trail (NOCO):** The North Country National Scenic Trail is 4,800 miles long and crosses through eight states, but has only a Superintendent, manager, seasonal planner, and a shared administrative officer (.5). Given the length of the Trail and the number of tribal governments potentially interested in our activities and plans, we cannot effectively communicate or support relationships without additional specialized staff.

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OZAR):** We recognize the need to do more in-person consultations, particularly with the number of planning documents and construction projects coming up resulting from flood recovery. We look forward to meeting with our tribal partners in person in 2020.

**Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore (PIRO):** Developed a Tribal Consultation Coordination Strategy to define the park's process for engagement with the objective of developing stronger connections with our tribal partners through annual in-person meetings and regular correspondence.

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** The role of the Regional Tribal Liaison has helped significantly with correct protocol and consultation actions at PIPE. PIPE has also established more consistent reimbursement procedures to align with EFMO.

**Pullman National Monument (PULL):** This newly established park is developing a contact list of federally recognized Tribes for future consultation opportunities.

**Theodore Roosevelt National Park (THRO):** The Theodore Roosevelt National Park Superintendent has launched an initiative where representatives from each of North Dakota's three NPS sites meet as a team and visit the reservations and THPO offices of each Tribe with traditional association to the parks.

**Voyageurs National Park (VOYA):** is in the process of renewing and updating the Consultation Agreement with the Bois Forte Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

## **National Capital Region**

The region has created a team to discuss and improve tribal consultation. Additionally, the Region has filled the position of Tribal Liaison Officer and is starting the development of engagement protocols.

## **Northeast Region**

**Boston National Historical Park (BOST):** It would be helpful to have some structure around informal partnerships with Native American partners, and for communications with partners from non-federally recognized tribes.

**Colonial National Historical Park (COLO):** The Park is still in the beginning stages of consulting with newly recognized Tribes (09/18). The Superintendent has established a relationship with the tribal leaders, and we are trying to negotiate how consultation will occur for resource projects.

**Fire Island National Seashore (FIIS):** The park has engaged with local Native American liaison for Montauk, Shinnecock and Suffolk County division of Native Americans in FY 19.

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** The park Superintendent signed a MOA with the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Delaware Nation and Stockbridge Munsee Community for Consultations, Treatment and Disposition of Human Remains and Cultural Items That May Be Discovered Inadvertently During Planned Activities at Martin Van Buren NHS. The MOA is with the Tribes for review and signature.

**New River Gorge National River (NERI):** During FY 2015 the park wrote a plan for inadvertent discoveries and intentional excavation and adopted its policy into NEPA PEPC reviews and its standard operating procedures. This year the park will be conferring with WASO and NER to update its list of federally-recognized Tribes and proactively consult with these Tribes on whether they are interested in being consulted about park actions.

**Richmond National Battlefield Park (RICH):** After several conversations with the Regional Ethnographer, the park reached out to seven recommended Tribes informally via email to gauge their interest in consulting on park matters. We received three responses, resulting in two productive conversations with tribal representatives regarding future consultations. Park will begin consulting with two Tribes on ground disturbance projects and will check back with remaining five Tribes.

**Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites (ROVA):** The park's Section 106 coordinator has had several discussions with the Region 1 Tribal Affairs Lead on improving the park's procedures.

**Upper Delaware Scenic & Recreational River (UPDE):** N/A for FY18 and FY19. Attempt to re-establish relationships with tribal partners began in early FY20.



## **Pacific West Region**

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** New practices: Working with Chumash NAGPRA committee; meeting via regular monthly with Elders Council; collaborating on tribal youth employment; expanding cultural event to include sacred ceremony; NPS now working closely with tribal archeologist, which has enhanced communication and understanding of site protection and NAGPRA issues; refined NAGPRA procedures to include tribal representation at osteological examinations.

**Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve (EBEY):** Attempting to expand the number of Tribes consulted based on research into contemporary affiliations of native peoples with ties to the Reserve. A plain reading of policy provides for this; however, as a practical matter we lack the capacity to engage Tribes more fully due to lack of personnel resources and complexity of tribal affiliations. Also reached out to SAJH to secure assistance from Cultural Anthropologist based there.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** With the appointment of their first THPO in June 2015, the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) and Golden Gate National Recreation Area staff jointly developed a tribal consultation protocols agreement to formalize the working relationship between the two government entities. The document outlines procedures for information sharing (when, how, and specifically with whom), consultation (initiation and response times), engagement (park resource management operations, public programs, strategic park planning), confidentiality (sensitive resource information), reporting (documentation, annual reports, record keeping), and modifications to the agreement. Both parties continued with additional edits through FY19 and the agreement is nearing its signature stage, anticipated for early FY20. In response to a Regional Director requirement outlined in her December 20, 2016, memo addressing 106 issues in the region, GOGA updated its Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) #606, "Section 106 Review and Cultural Resource Compliance" in FY18. This SOP includes a discussion on completing tribal consultation, referencing the park's Tribal Consultation Protocol Agreement.

**Great Basin National Park (GRBA):** Superintendent annually attending Tribal Council meetings to inform on park projects.

**Kalaupapa National Historical Park (KALA):** Our park has been making a concerted effort these last two years to increase the number of NHOs with whom we consult.

**Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAME):** One Tribe has agreed to use email for transmitting their concurrence letters. Widespread adoption of electronic correspondence could be a major improvement to our agency consultation process generally.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** Cultural Resource Program lead is in the process of developing a more robust and comprehensive consultation program with the intent to engage and incorporate tribal involvement/review/comment earlier in the project development and planning phases. Currently the vast majority of tribal consultation at LARO consists of seeking review and comment on determinations and assessment of effects, not on planning and development.

**Mojave National Preserve (MOJA):** Started forwarding consultation letters addressed to Fort Mojave to the Director of their Cultural Society, in addition to the Chairman. Started including the Ahamakav Cultural Society from FMIT in consultations, at their request.

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** Superintendent has instituted a park-based Consultation Team to track park progress on conducting consultation and ensure appropriate communications with Tribes on issues of tribal significance. Team composed of program managers engaged or potentially engaged in consultation with Tribes.

**North Cascades National Park (NOCA):** NOCA's compliance SOP was updated in FY18 which includes Section 106 and consultation.

**Pearl Harbor National Memorial/ Honouliuli National Historic Site (HONO):** We are currently planning to initiate NHO consultation.

**San Juan Island National Historical Park (SAJH):** SAJH is working on updating its Superintendent's Compendium that will incorporate feedback from tribal consultation.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** A key response to policy review was the discussion/initiation of quarterly project tribal consultation meetings finalized at 2019 All Tribes Meeting. Also, establishment of Superintendent's financial support for traditional tribal activities in the park (Big Time Celebrations, Spiritual Camps, Traditional Gatherings, and Trans-Sierra Walks).

### **Southeast Region**

**Cape Lookout National Seashore (CALO):** CALO is trying to fund an ethnographic study that encompasses historic and Native American cultural affiliations and request a specialist look into this in more detail, but the information would likely be very, very scant.

**Cane River Creole National Historical Park (CARI):** Since 2019, CARI has involved five park-affiliated Tribes in all requests for Section 106 concurrence with the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office.

**Fort Donelson National Battlefield (FODO):** Both the Section 106 Coordinator and the NAGPRA Coordinator for the South Atlantic Gulf Region, Region 2, have been proactive in advising of opportunities, policy, and also in being a resource for questions and needs.

**Mammoth Cave National Park (MACA):** Updated practices in cultural resources documentation is currently underway at Mammoth Cave National Park, with increased baseline documents being implemented at the regional level (i.e., Cultural Landscape Report studies) and park level (i.e., Historic Structure Report studies). Also, the park is working to make more proactive efforts to document archeological resources according to SHPO standards. NPS policy remains consistent with current activities, but these efforts are towards building improved relationships with state, tribal, and regional partners.

## **APPENDIX D: TRACKING AND DOCUMENTATION**

### **Alaska Region**

**Bering Land Bridge National Preserve (BELA):** Folder on shared drive specific to consultation, Excel spreadsheet.

**Glacier Bay Park and Preserve (GLBA):** Document with meeting notes.

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):** Uses Google sheets to track physical mailings and follow-up calls to Tribes, corporations, and affiliated Alaska Native organizations for all invitations to consult. Physical mailings are sent using Certified Mail and Return Receipt postcards to ensure delivery and receipt of all mail. These mailings are also tracked internally using Google spreadsheets and batch codes to identify specific mailings to recipients. Mailings are also tracked via follow-up phone calls to tribal offices to ensure the letter was received without issue and to answer basic questions on next steps for the Chair/President/Council, should they choose to continue with consultation.

**Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park (KLG0):** The park Chief of Resources tracks park consultations on a spread sheet.

**Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve and Gates of the Arctic National Park (YUGA):** A shared Google spreadsheet.

### **Intermountain Region**

**Amistad National Recreation Area (AMIS):** All consultation notes and correspondence for a project (e.g. NHPA Sec. 106) go into a Tribal Consultation folder within the larger compliance folder for that project, which ultimately becomes part of the park archives.

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** The park staff logs each correspondence into an Excel spreadsheet by date. This spreadsheet is based on a template found on the IMR anthropology home page. Staff print to pdf all email correspondence received and sent to tribal representatives as well as scan all hard copy responses to a folder marked with permanent file retention code. In-person conversations and on-site consultations are summarized in writing and kept with other tribal correspondence.

**Aztec Ruins National Monument (AZRU):** In-person consultations: Notes are taken by park staff. These notes are later distributed to all consulting Tribes. Telephone consultations: Telephone consultation form is completed and archived to document consultation. Letter consultations: Letters are sent and archived as records.

**Bandelier National Monument (BAND):** The park uses spreadsheets, Google Calendar, informal notes, and formal minutes.

**Big Thicket National Preserve (BITH):** The park documents consultations in PEPC.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** Minutes are recorded by the Tribal Liaison.

**Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park (BLCA):** The park documents consultations in PEPC.

**Canyonlands National Park (CANY):** The park staff logs each correspondence into an Excel spreadsheet by date. This spreadsheet is based on a template found on the IMR anthropology home page. Staff print to pdf all email correspondence received and sent to tribal representatives as well as scan all hard copy responses to a folder marked with permanent file retention code. In-person conversations and on-site consultations are summarized in writing and kept with other tribal correspondence.

**Capitol Reef National Park (CARE):** The park uses a tribal contact log spreadsheet to document and record ongoing consultations with Tribes (other than in-person) that captures the date, recipient, contact information, consultation format, and summary of action and/or result of the consultation. The tribal contact log is completed for each consultation issue.

**Casa Grande Ruins National Monument (CAGR):** Copies of correspondence are saved on park drives, in folders related to annual compliance, or, a compliance folder for park projects. If applicable, correspondence is loaded into PEPC in internal documents. Spreadsheets are kept for contacting Tribes on complicated and large projects to track methods and attempts to consult.

**Cedar Breaks National Monument (CEBR):** The park uses an office calendar and project documents.

**Chaco Culture National Historical Park (CHCU):** In-person consultations: Notes are taken by park staff. These notes are later distributed to the consulting Tribes. Telephone consultations: Telephone consultation form is completed and archived to document the consultation. Letter consultations: Letters are sent and archived as records.

**Chamizal National Memorial (CHAM):** The park documents consultation in a written record.

**Curecanti National Recreation Area (CURE):** The park documents consultations in PEPC.

**Devils Tower National Monument (DETO):** The park actively uses digital and carbon tracking systems to categorize and document all consultation and communication efforts with Tribes. The park has documented all communications and in-person consultation efforts spanning the last fifteen years. All hardcopy materials are scanned and documented appropriately, and all carbon materials are archived within the park's Resource Management Division. New park management has undertaken the effort to save and record all e-mail correspondence by year regarding all topics for consultation. The park hires a professional stenographer to document all consultation activities and recommendations in formal consultation. The park manages a Tribal Leaders Directory spreadsheet and updates contacts twice every fiscal year (and dependent on tribal council/government election years).

**Dinosaur National Monument (DINO):** Information is uploaded into PEPC and archived in park files (digital and hard copy); the park uses a spreadsheet to track consultation initiation and responses.

**El Malpais National Monument (ELMA):** The park consults through letters, emails, notes from phone conversations and in-person meetings.

**El Morro National Monument (ELMO):** The park consults by letter, email, notes from calls and in-person discussion.

**Flagstaff Area National Monuments (FLAG):** Compliance records and PEPC are used to document/record consultations.

**Fort Laramie National Historic Site (FOLA):** Previous documentation was primarily electronic. Future notes and reporting will also include department disposition and appropriate filing methods (both electronic and physical documents).

**Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument (GICL):** The park uses the written record to document consultations.

**Glacier National Park (GLAC):** We utilize a shared electronic folder to record conversations and meeting notes.

**Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GLCA):** We document and record ongoing consultations using an Excel spreadsheet, official letter correspondence, emails, and consultation notes.

**Grand Teton National Park (GRTA):** The park uses a tracking spreadsheet updated regularly after each letter is sent, then a follow up emails and phone calls, and all letters/emails/comments are uploaded to PEPC.

**Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve (GRSA):** The park documents consultations through minutes from meeting and copies of letters.

**Hovenweep National Monument (HOVE):** The park staff logs each correspondence into an Excel spreadsheet by date. This spreadsheet is based on a template found on the IMR anthropology home page. The staff prints to pdf all email correspondence received and sent to tribal representatives as well as scans all hard copy responses to a folder marked with permanent file retention code. In-person conversations and on-site consultations are summarized in writing and kept with other tribal correspondence.

**Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LIBI):** Using a stenographer, the park keeps a consultation record/spreadsheet/record of actual meetings.

**Montezuma Castle National Monument (MOCA):** The park documents consultation in PEPC with a hard copy file maintained in the Cultural Resource Office and Administrative Office.

**Natural Bridges National Monument (NABR):** The park staff logs each correspondence into an Excel spreadsheet by date. This spreadsheet is based on a template found on the IMR anthropology home page. The staff prints to pdf all email correspondence received and sent to Tribal representatives as well as scans all hard copy responses to a folder marked with permanent file retention code. In-person conversations and on-site consultations are summarized in writing and kept with other tribal correspondence.

**Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (ORPI):** Usually, staff keeps a project file where copies of letters and call logs are saved; although, much of our consultation is carried out by our Chief of Resources through email and phone calls, and he retains notes of his conversations.

**Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS):** Staff includes information in PEPC (scanned letters, PDFs of emails, notes of phone conversations, etc.).

**Pecos National Historical Park (PECO):** Staff includes information in PEPC and sometimes spreadsheets.

**Pipe Spring National Monument (PISP):** Correspondence to and from Tribes and written documentation from in-person consultations are placed in park central files.

**Rocky Mountain National Park (ROMO):** The park staff uses an Excel table to track all correspondence. Electronic copies of all correspondence (letters/emails) is organized by year/folder. Hard copies of all correspondence (letters/emails) is organized by year/folder for the archives.

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** Two or three staff members take rough notes as the tribal liaison facilitates the consultation and/or meeting with Tribes. The tribal liaison transcribes the notes to be distributed to the tribal representatives to communicate what transpired during a consultation/meeting.

**Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument (SAPU):** The park sends NHPA Section 106 consultation letters to its associated Tribes. A hard copy of the consultation letter is kept in a compliance file drawer at SAPU's headquarters. Any hard copy consultation letter responses are also kept in the same compliance drawer. SAPU's tribal consultations are currently between the Superintendent and the Chief of Resource Management and the associated Tribes. These may be in the form of emails, telephone conversations, and on-site visits. Hard copy documentation of the conversations is kept with the project folder within the compliance file drawer.

**Southeast Utah Group (SEUG):** Staff logs each correspondence into an Excel spreadsheet by date. This spreadsheet is based on a template found on the IMR anthropology home page. Staff prints to pdf all email correspondence received and sent to tribal representatives as well as scans all hard copy responses to a folder marked with permanent file retention code. In-person

conversations and on-site consultations are summarized in writing and kept with other tribal correspondence.

**Southern Arizona Office (SOAR):** Staff uses phone records, trip reports, meeting notes and records of email/letter correspondence to document consultations.

**Tonto National Monument (TONT):** The park documents consultations in administrative files.

**Tumacácori National Historic Park (TUMA):** Depends on the project; the park uses emails, notes, letters, etc.

**Valles Caldera National Preserve (VALL):** The park uses an Excel spreadsheet; takes notes at all consultations and from each communication with associated Tribes.

**White Sands National Park (WNSA):** We are working with WACC to archive consultation and correspondence.

**Yellowstone National Park (YELL):** The park staff documents consultations with meeting transcripts.

### **Midwest Region**

**Apostle Islands National Seashore (APIS):** Internal spread sheet; agendas & meeting notes; letters.

**Badlands National Park (BADL):** Brief notes documented after each meeting. File copies of any written correspondence.

**Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO):** Handwritten notes from several individuals that are compiled into a single written record.

**Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site (FOUS):** Email and in-person meeting and teleconference minutes are recorded and copies added to the park's electronic files maintained on its network server and/or are added to the park's central files. Copies of consultation correspondence are likewise stored and managed electronically or in hard copy as part of the park's central files.

**Homestead National Monument of America (HOME):** Manages ongoing consultations through email and phone logs. Once the consultation is complete, records are kept in park central files.

**Ice Age National Scenic Trail (IATR):** Through Trail Planner/Compliance person maintains files on consultation.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** Electronic records uploaded to PEPC and written records on file.

**Jewel Cave National Monument (JECA):** Keep summary reports of visits.

**Knife River Indian Villages National Historic Site (KNRI):** We take handwritten notes during the meeting. These are then summarized and distributed to meeting participants.

**Mount Rushmore National Park (MORU):** FY 18-19: Letters sent to Tribes are retained in central files and in PEPC.

**Niobrara National Scenic River (NIOB):** Copies of letters and mailing list of who they were sent to, email responses and meeting notes are all part of the project record.

**Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore (PIRO):** Tribal Consultation outreach is tracked in a relevant project folder, and includes the Tribal Contact, the method of communication, dates of communication, and any pertinent notes.

**Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve (TAPR):** Hardcopy or email letters go to compliance files.

### **National Capital Region**

Consultation is recorded in writing; program managers maintain a log and report activities to the regional anthropologist for consolidated reporting. All consultation notes and correspondence for a project are tracked through PEPC.

### **Northeast Region**

**Acadia National Park (ACAD)/ Saint Croix Island International Historic Site (SACR):** PEPC # 68379 is being used to maintain documentation as well as for compliance for the tribal gathering project (ACAD). PEPC #17164 to maintain the record for the radio tower replacement project (ACAD). PEPC #58482 is used to maintain the record for the Acadia Transportation Plan. Personal spreadsheet is used to track progress of consultations.

**Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO):** A note taker, preferably two, strives for verbatim recording, and then later prepares formal meeting notes.

**Colonial National Historical Park (COLO):** A note taker, preferably two, strives for verbatim recording, and then later prepares formal meeting notes.

**Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (DEWA):** Consultation log (spreadsheet) to note SHPO and THPO consultations; PEPC NHPA documentation; notes and hardcopy files.

**Fire Island National Seashore (FIIS):** Normal agency correspondence.

**Fort Monroe National Monument (FOMR):** These documents are filed in our internal filing system. In addition, the compliance staff that oversee the park's work also keeps a record of all events.

**Gateway National Recreation Area (GATE):** Consultation is uploaded into the PEPC record for each project.



**George Washington Birthplace National Monument (GEWA):** Excel workbook with a spreadsheet for each associated Tribe.

**Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site (HOFU):** Park Planning and Projects-Project correspondence/records. All electronic files (consultation letters and E-mail correspondence) are uploaded to PEPC. Hard copies of consultation letters and E-mail correspondence are printed out and archived. In addition, Archeology keeps an excel file of consultation projects, with responses, dates, etc.

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** Consultations are included in the annual NHPA report to the regional director. Emails are printed and filed by the park curator and Superintendent and emails are archived.

**New River Gorge National River (NERI):** The record of consultations with Tribes is documented in the park's central files, PEPC, and the cultural resource program's project files.

**Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites (ROVA):** The park tracks consultation with PEPC. Relevant documents are retained in park NHPA file, Superintendent's file, and digital versions uploaded to PEPC.

**Shenandoah National Park (SHEN):** PEPC to document tribal consultations.

**Statue of Liberty National Monument (STLI):** Consultations are documented in PEPC and in park administrative files.

**The National Parks of Western Pennsylvania (WEPA):** I keep hard copies of all telephone notes and email correspondence in appropriate project files and upload pertinent documents to PEPC (during the reporting period, we have only consulted with THPOs on the JOFL lakebed project).

**Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO):** All electronic files (consultation letters and E-mail correspondence) are uploaded to PEPC. Hard copies of consultation letters and E-mail correspondence are printed out and archived. In addition, Archeology keeps an excel file of consultation projects, with responses, dates, etc.

### **Pacific West Region**

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** Memoranda to file document meetings, site visits and telephone conversations.

**City of Rocks National Reserve (CIRO):** We use PEPC to track formal consultation for specific projects.

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** PEPC, internal documents and blanks in the NHPA section.

**Devils Postpile National Monument (DEPO):** The Superintendent did meeting minutes of site visit to RX Burn site and sent to participants for review.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** Consultations are documented by the Park through meeting minutes, written correspondence, and a telephone and project contact log.

**Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park (HAVO):** Notes, summaries of decisions all part of the record.

**John Day Fossil Beds National Monument (JODA):** Paper files; compliance spreadsheet updated quarterly.

**Joshua Tree National Park (JOTR):** JOTR documents in writing all appropriate aspects of consultation. These materials are stored digitally within park archives as well as within PEPC.

**Kalaupapa National Historical Park (KALA):** Consultations may be recorded then transcribed & filed in our shared drive where appropriate; other consultations through letter/email are also filed appropriately, in both paper files & electronic files.

**Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAME):** Internal spreadsheet and PEPC.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** Project Files (Digital and Hardcopy); PEPC; and LARO Project NHPA Compliance Tracking Spreadsheet.

**Lassen Volcanic National Park (LAVO):** Lassen volcanic National Park maintains a spreadsheet listing all formal tribal consultation letters and in-person consultation meetings and phone calls. All meeting agendas and notes are located on the RM drive.

**Lava Beds National Monument (LBE):** Approved letter to tribal representatives.

**Lewis and Clark National Historical Park (LEWI):** The park uses the PEPC website as an electronic tool to store consultations. Paper files are also kept.

**Mojave National Preserve (MOJA):** Excel spreadsheet. Copy all letters, return receipts, and responses to PEPC. Keep physical copies of everything filed, and digital copies on office shared drive. I keep an excel spreadsheet tracking all the consultation letters, I keep all the letter and responses on file (both physically and on the shared drive), and I upload all letters and responses to PEPC.

**Mount Rainer National Park (MORA):** PEPC, Meeting notes.

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** Park Consultation Team meets biweekly to review completed consultation and prepare for upcoming consultation. Park Administrative Assistant manages consultation files.

**North Cascades National Park (NOCA):** We use letters and emails because that is the preferred method. Important or sensitive projects will include a phone call to the Tribes following the letter and potentially a meeting to discuss issues.

**Oregon Caves National Monument & Preserve (ORCA):** Enter into PEPC with formal letter attachment.

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** REDW tribal liaison take notes at every government-to-government consultation meeting. These notes are broken out by agenda item. Often multiple topics are covered in one meeting resulting in multiple consultations in a single meeting. Project specific meetings such as at cultural committee meetings are also documented in writing. Although ultimate responsibility for the Government-to-Government relationship rests with the Superintendent, REDW has had a staff person who has the responsibility to be the Tribal Liaison in their position description. It is this person's job to keep tabs on news that affects the local tribal community, develop relationships at the staff level, and to handle logistics and day-to-day work related to consultations and communication. Copies of all correspondences are kept in folders specific to government-to-government consultations for any needed projects.

**San Juan Island National Historical Park (SAJH):** Ongoing record keeping through project files, PEPC, Superintendent's signed correspondence, digitized consultation responses from tribal representatives, email, calendar entries, contemporaneous notes, official minutes from in-person meetings, official meeting attendance sign-in sheets, call logs, and other administrative records.

**Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SAMO):** Letters and emails are archived, and phone calls are captured in memos (also archived).

**Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks (SEKI):** Hard copy and digital versions of correspondence and replies. Digital tracking sheet for correspondence (including hard copy correspondence, emails, phone calls, text messages and voicemails).

**Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument (TUSP):** The Monument is new, and therefore no consultations have been conducted yet. However, general correspondence is documented in a Consultation Log by fiscal year.

**Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (WHIS):** Handwritten notes, formal letters summarizing phone consultation, and email summaries of consultations.

### **Southeast Region**

**Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park (ABLI):** Electronic and paper copies of all compliance documents including records on Tribal consultations.

**Cane River Creole National Historical Park (CARI):** CARI includes the THPO of each Tribe in the cc: line of all cover letters to the LA SHPO and in distribution of all supporting documentation via email submittals. CARI manages park compliance via PEPC and uploads all supporting documentation and requests for concurrence to each record therein. The PEPC Step 4 Natural/Cultural Compliance - NHPA/CRM data tab includes a data field which denotes THPO requirements and notes. CARI staff is able to document and record ongoing consultations via PEPC.

**Great Smoky Mountains National Park (GRSM):** Project administrative records.

**Gulf Islands National Seashore (GUIS):** Consultation letters are uploaded to the PEPC project they are attached to.

**Mammoth Cave National Park (MACA):** Currently, consultation is completed primarily by written, email correspondence. Efforts to better implement consultation process and develop stronger working relationships will be a key goal of NAGPRA consultations that are to occur in the upcoming year.

**Southeast Archeological Center (SEAC)/SER NAGPRA Program:** We use notes (written, electronic), emails, and official correspondences (memos); sign in sheets at consultations; note taking at consultations, and emails that document consultations through notes.

## APPENDIX E: CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES

### Alaska Region

**Bering Land Bridge National Preserve (BELA):** Consulted on the Bering Land Bridge National Preserve Emergency Shelter Cabin Strategic Facility Plan.

**Katmai National Park & Preserve (KATM):** To date, we have received constructive feedback on consultation outreach products; that long form letters on proposed projects are adequate, however additional guidance on the Section 106 process and the role of Tribes in consulting on these matters is welcome. A more visual format proposed by the park—similar to the Resources Newsletter distributed to commercial use authorization partners—would be appreciated. In spring of 2019, the park’s Superintendent was invited to speak at the Bristol Bay Native Association Annual meeting of Chairs, Presidents, and First Chiefs of 37 federally-recognized Tribes. The Superintendent explained the 2011 NAGPRA Plan of Action for the park had reached its sunset date and required tribal authority (or delegated authority to a descendant organization chosen by the Tribe) for renewal.

**Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve (YUCH):** Consultation best practice - consultation letters are mailed and emailed to tribal council offices. One to two weeks afterwards, a phone call is made to each tribal council office to verify the letters were received and to follow-up with any questions the tribal council may have. Lastly, a request is made to be put on the next tribal council meeting agenda in order to share additional information.

### Midwest Region

**Fort Smith National Historic Site (FOSM):** Several parks in the MWR have made great strides regarding their relationships with culturally affiliated Tribes and/or expanding opportunities, tribal inclusion and broadening the tribal narrative/multiple perspectives. Parks such as River Raisin, Pipestone, Effigy Mounds, Fort Larned, Fort Scott, Fort Smith and others are great examples of successes in working with tribal partners. Also, the fact that MWR has an Office of American Indian Affairs and Tribal Liaison is an essential need in continuing to meet our Treaty, Trust and Tribal Responsibilities and to build strong, cohesive tribal relationships.

**Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site (FOUS):** Exhibit design was altered around tribal requests and recommendations.

**Homestead National Monument of America (HOME):** An event planned for MWAC's 50th anniversary in 2019 turned into an archeological survey with multiple Tribes participating, strengthening NPS relations and providing unique opportunities for the project. The Friends of Homestead provided meals and gifts to tribal leaders participating in consultations at HOME.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** PEPC 73889 Development of Native American Cultural Trail (Original Name: Development of the Ethnobotany Trail). We are actively working with the Miami of Oklahoma and the Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi on the planning and design for this trail, including plant inventories of the entire site during all Seasons, a new picnic shelter (with Native American Art Installation), a boardwalk, waysides, exhibits,

programs, and most important a Land Acknowledgement including a Circle of Stones to acknowledge the Tribes who once lived here. This project has brought about a significant relationship between the Cultural Resource staffs of both Tribes and the park staff. The park staff who are involved in the planning are receiving an education on Native American Culture and Traditions.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** Consultation with the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation represents a positive interaction with USFS and NPS representatives benefiting from historic and modern cultural and natural resources stories. While initially scheduled to occur in FY 18 the Tribe informed the Trail that it would not be able to meet and fully participate in the meeting without more advanced notice of the meeting, and a wider time frame in which to schedule the dates. This resulted in a separate consultation with that Tribe in FY 19 in which the Tribe had greater control of the time, location, and agenda of the meeting. Western National Parks Association (WNPA) also provided for food to be contracted from a Tribal caterer, which greatly improved the tone and general feeling among the meeting's participants. The meeting itself provided considerable useful information and feedback from the Tribe, as well as plans for future collaboration between various Tribes with a historic connection to the Lolo Trail. Overall this meeting, and the meeting that preceded it, resulted in improved relations between LECL and all Tribes involved as well as the commissioning of an Oral History project to preserve and interpret traditional care taking of the Lolo Trail.

**Missouri National Recreational River (MNRR):** Coordination and collaborative process in engaging Tribes to secure their participation and endorsement of the park's (MNRR) first ever visitor educational film completed in 2018 not only provided added value to the content of the film but helped bridge improved communication and trust between the park and the Tribes. An American Indian short-film was also developed that illustrates the traditional connectivity by the Tribes (3) to the river. This film can be accessed via the Parks' website, [www.nps.gov/mnrr](http://www.nps.gov/mnrr).

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OZAR):** Wrote to our tribal partners regarding a sentencing hearing for an ARPA conviction within the park. With assistance from an impact statement from the Osage Nation, we were able to secure a one-year prison sentence for one of the individuals prosecuted in the case.

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** The format for consultation best practice at PIPE includes: 1) on-site group meetings with affiliated Tribes, 2) off-site individual meetings with Tribes at their headquarters, 3) collaborative project teams (for example with the Tribes most interested in archeology fieldwork), 4) guest speaker series (for example with tribal speakers promoting understanding of American Indian culture and history), and 5) follow up. See the included photos (next page) for some examples of Park/Tribe collaborative project teams.



3. Top: Alice Erickson, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Tribe, cleaning feather bonnets from the Pipestone National Monument Museum. Bottom: Michael Sletto and Vernon Haragara, Otoe-Missouria Tribe, surveying archaeological artifact distribution after a controlled burn.

**Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve (TAPR):** We've only corresponded on general management/operations compliance packages.

### **Intermountain Region**

**Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument (ALFL):** A Tribe submitted a NAGPRA claim, which the park accepted, and repatriation was completed.

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** During a phone conversation with one of the tribal representatives about a project at a different park, the conversation drifted to ethnographic studies, at which point, the representative suggested that the NPS should initiate contact with the Tribes prior to writing the scope of work and selecting the CESU partner. This would improve collaboration and ensure that the product benefits the Tribe as much as it benefits the park (and public). This input was immediately applied to the initial planning stage of an upcoming Traditional Use Study at the park, which will be carried out in FY 2020 and 2021.

**Aztec Ruins National Monument (AZRU):** Parks and regional cultural resource program staff are working together to create a database that will document past and future tribal input along with corresponding park actions taken. This was derived based on in-person consultation meetings where both parties recognized this would be a useful tool for the future.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** The park consults with Tribes that are associated with the subject matter of the national parks that they are entrusted to protect and preserve.

**Casa Grande Ruins National Monument (CAGR):** The park holds annual consultation meetings with associated Tribes.

**Chaco Culture National Historical Park (CHCU):** Parks and IMR cultural resource program collaborate on a database that document past and future tribal input along with corresponding park actions taken. This project was derived based on in-person consultation meetings where both parties recognized it would be a useful tool for the future.

**Chamizal National Memorial (CHAM):** The collaboration with the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo for the park's permanent museum planning effort strengthened our partnership with them. Most importantly, the Tribe has a voice in our new permanent exhibit that is scheduled to open in the Spring of 2020. The park consulted with Tribes on educational and interpretation programs, as appropriate.

**Devils Tower National Monument (DETO):** The park initiated a formal government-to-government consultation with its associated Tribes to discuss regulation 36 CFR 2.6 “Gathering of Certain Plants or Plant Parts by Federally Recognized Indian Tribes for Traditional Purposes.” The park hired an environmental protection specialist through a PMIS-funded project to help coordinate the consultation and help with any potential plant gathering agreements. The Environmental Protection Specialist attended a follow-up meeting held at the Rocky Mountain Leadership Council in Billings, Montana, to supplement the October 2018 consultation. Five THPOs attended the October consultation, in addition to three newly represented Tribes. Concerns about privacy of gathering practices, sovereignty, timing and follow-through regarding plant gathering agreements were discussed in person and through e-mail communication.

**Flagstaff Area National Monuments (FLAG):** The office is overhauling the exhibits in the Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument Visitor Center. Tribal input throughout the exhibit planning process resulted in culturally and regionally accurate exhibits that will give future visitors to the Monument a far better and richer understanding of the Monument’s history, both from natural and cultural resources perspectives. Exhibits will include audio of tribal elders, rotating art from local native youth, and so on.

**Fort Laramie National Historic Site (FOLA):** Consultation events that occurred in FY 18 and FY 19 centered around the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. There was a concerted effort from the park and Tribes to recognize the significance of the treaty and the subsequent consequences that arose from it. Two years of consultation and discussion culminated in a multi-week event, which tribal members, along with NPS staff and the public, participated. The goodwill brought forth from these meetings and the finality of the



commemoration provided a strong foundation to engage in future conversations about education, interpretation and the resources of the park.

**Guadalupe Mountains National Park (GUMO):** Our work with the Tribes has been in person and in the field. We walk and discuss the landscape and archaeological issues. The park takes this guidance into project design.

**Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument (GICL):** The consultation for the Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument museum exhibit upgrade provided NPS with important tribal suggestions that can be used for the new exhibit design once additional funding for the exhibit is secured. The suggestions came during consultation with participating pueblo and Apache Tribes.

**Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GLCA):** The park has instituted a voluntary closure for an archaeological site called the Descending Sheep Panel. This site has sustained significant defacement damage over the years; therefore, through consultation, the park decided to implement measures to increase public education about vandalism, as well as devise short-term and long-term mitigation strategies for cultural site monitoring and maintenance. This voluntary closure has been in the planning stages since the summer of 2019 and has now been officially implemented. The voluntary closure is from January 1, 2020, to February 28, 2020. All the voluntary closure signage, messaging, and strategic planning has been decided with tribal collaboration. During the voluntary closure period, the park management plans to work with Tribes to maintain momentum, regarding cultural site protection and how to visit such places with respect.

**Hovenweep National Monument (HOVE):** Consultations initiated 2017-2019 during the park's Ethnographic Overview and Assessment, the study significantly strengthened the park's relationship with traditionally associated Tribes. By engaging with Tribes on collaborative cultural and natural resource management, other opportunities for the Tribes have arisen to reconnect their youth to ancestral lands and to reaffirm their identity and sense of pride. After their participation in the Hovenweep Ethnographic Overview and Assessment, the Pueblo of Acoma requested special access to a significant spring area (which is closed to the public) for educational purposes. By accommodating and participating in the requests, park staff and tribal representatives strengthened relationships and gained new insights on the significance and meaning of spring resources to Native Americans.

**Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LIBI):** The park staff learned it takes work and effort to get Tribes involved due to their priorities vs. NPS priorities to meet on time-sensitive projects and to work diligently and cooperatively. Building strong and trustworthy relationships is important despite diverse cultures as is understanding, honor and respecting others' cultures. Keeping indigenous employees engaged and participating helps to ensure allies work together. Working with Tribes to express their cultures through their own stories is a best practice.

**Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (ORPI):** The park was interested in developing a TEK project with the Tohono O'odham Nation, but consultation resulted in the recognition that the Tribe was not ready for such a project and/or that such a project should be Tribally initiated, rather than NPS-led.

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** Our best practice is that our enabling legislation provides direction with whom we consult and how the Tribes are involved in the development of the park and education to the public. In addition, we have cooperative agreements with each of the three Tribes that outline their responsibilities and the NPS responsibilities to provide financial support for these three Tribes to come to the park for consultation and other related activities on which their expertise is needed.

**White Sands National Park (WNSA):** The park had great success with the Tribes through our cooperative agreement (CA), and we were told on multiple occasions by tribal representatives they were appreciative of the layout, meeting framework, and their inclusion into the development of the CA. From the outcomes of consultation, the park initiated several youth projects. We began a partnership project with the Tribes and pueblos to maintain and protect a large village site that had 31 exposed burials. With the help of everyone, the burials were covered and placed in long-term care to restore the site.

### Northeast Region

**Acadia National Park (ACAD)/ Saint Croix Island International Historic Site (SACR):** Resource management: the park is continuing consultations around tribal interests in plant gathering in the park. Research is being conducted with tribal gatherers to help determine the best way to document and to develop BMPs for gathering protocols to protect park resources and respect traditional tribal practices. The project has two co-PIs and they are coordinating consultation. A presentation about the process and data gathering elements of the project has been given several times by the PIs to multiple agencies, tribal member groups, and the public. The last meeting (July 2019) about the sweetgrass gathering project included a trip to Isle au Haut with the gatherers to visit and talk about cultural connections to the island.



4. Sweetgrass gatherers stop for a group photo while on Isle au Haut, 2019. NPS Photo.

Education/Interpretation: Ongoing collaboration with tribal artists and cultural specialists at the Abbe Museum to offer cultural demonstrations in the park that are culturally appropriate. SACR: Resource management: geophysical surveying is being conducted to monitor changes related to impacts from climate change to the island. The Tribe is being engaged around planning for future action to protect the island or to determine alternative actions. Education: Passamaquoddy youth to serve as archeological monitoring technicians. Discussions are ongoing. Interpretation: Passamaquoddy petroglyph exhibit developed using tribal input for content. Exhibit includes Passamaquoddy language and translation.



5. Opening of the petroglyph exhibit at Saint Croix Island International Historic Site, 2019. Pictured (left to right): Joan Dana, Brenda Dana, Margaret Apt (Passamaquoddy Tribe), and Meg Sheid, NPS Site Manager, NPS Photo.

Education: Morning Salute- NPS sponsored public gathering to salute/honor tribal members participating in the annual cultural canoe paddle - past SACR Island from Indian Township Reservation to Pleasant Point Reservation. Two tribal members answered questions and sang and drummed on land. 45 members of the public connected with the Tribe during this event, and experienced stories, singing, and drumming.

**Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO):** For the first formal consultation for which we had a new Superintendent, and five tribal partners had recently attained federal recognition status, we invited the co-chairs of CIRCLE to attend the consultation, to share their experiences at their parks with our tribal partners, and to advise us before the consultation and during the consultation. They shared their expertise with us in many areas including the content of our emails, our agenda, even which seats we should take around the consultation table. The experience was very valuable to NPS staff in strengthening our understanding of proper protocol. It is important to mention a significant months-long interaction with seven federally recognized Tribes that took place between July 2018 and October 2018. The seven Tribes are the Chickahominy, Eastern Chickahominy, Monacan,

Nansemond, Pamunkey, Rappahannock, and Upper Mattaponi nations. Werowocomoco was the host site for a “Sovereign Nations Tribal Recognition Event” which was attended by then-DOI Secretary Zinke. In preparation, CAJO Superintendent and tribal leaders participated in approximately six conference calls to discuss logistics, agenda, and participants.



6. Colonial NHP Superintendent and Tribal Chiefs from the Nansemond Indian Nation, Chickahominy Indians - Eastern Division, and Pamunkey Indian Tribe with tribal members and NPS staff at a consultation meeting regarding Werowocomoco, Virginia, May 2018. NPS Photo.

**Colonial National Historical Park (COLO):** Park Superintendent and staff coordinated ceremony in 2018, following federal recognition of Tribes. This meeting was held at CAJO Werowocomoco. For the first formal consultation for which we had a new Superintendent, and five tribal partners had recently attained federal recognition status, we invited the co-chairs of CIRCLE to attend the consultation, to share their experiences at their parks with our tribal partners, and to advise us before the consultation and during the consultation. The experience was very valuable to NPS staff in strengthening our understanding of proper protocol. Since that time the Superintendent has communicated with the Tribes generally via phone and email and one formal consultation for CAJO/COLO occurred in May 2019. At that meeting the Superintendent spoke with Tribes about their interest in participating in consultation for projects at COLO and Jamestown specifically formal letters were sent inviting Tribes to consult on an archeological project that was contracted inside of COLO at a site that is eroding from the shoreline. They agreed and expressed interest to participate. A MOA was sent and the Park met with tribal representatives in Nov 2019, but the MOA has not been signed.

**George Washington Birthplace National Monument (GEWA):** Consultation with the Rappahannock significantly influenced study results for the Northern Neck Heritage Area.

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** We consulted with the THPO in the early planning stages for several PMIS projects that we are including in FY20 SCC. Consultation influenced the scope and nature of the projects and the sequencing of a multi-component project.

**Statue of Liberty National Monument (STLI):** In September of 2018, the park had a very positive consultation and repatriation with three federally recognized Tribes. The consultation was assisted by regional staff and included representatives of neighboring parks and the City of New York. The onsite meeting including the re-interment of human remains at Ellis Island and a consultation about potential locations for future reburials. In addition to returning the remains to the ground in keeping with the Tribes' wishes, the meeting also fostered good discussion and closer relationships between the Tribes and the park. The ongoing consultation will help guide policies regarding potential future burials. Additionally, several other project-specific consultations significantly informed park and partner projects on both Ellis and Liberty Island. In all cases, input from the Tribes was considered and included in planning efforts for the projects. Specific tribal input that was incorporated into project efforts includes: specific guidance on plant selection, means of returning uncovered ethnographic resources, and specific protective measures for sites of significance to the Tribes during project work.

### **Pacific West Region**

The Region has had a variety of dynamic and constructive relationships and projects. Some are highlighted below:

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** Lessons were learned when a permitted researcher (ARPA) did not follow NAGPRA regulations upon discovery of human remains during excavation. This resulted in a review of the park process for consultation and permitting of research. Corrective actions will be instituted, that include incorporating NAGPRA information into the ARPA permitting process and a requirement for face-to-face discussions with each researcher on NAGPRA requirements. Consultation on the cultural event (Tomol Crossing) led to reduced environmental "footprint" for the event, such as the tribally sponsored zero waste initiative; inclusion of a sacred ceremony was accommodated following tribal input. Youth employment initiative resulted from consultations in which elders could not access certain locations for site visits; this initiative expanded the Tribe's capacity to understand park field conditions in remote and typically inaccessible areas.

**City of Rocks National Reserve (CIRO):** We have been working on the new wayside project for several years now with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation. When we started this project, the goal was to tell the full story of the Reserve, which includes the California Trail story that we always tell but also the American Indian story. This year we were able to commission a tribal member to do the art for five of the panels (uploaded one of the photos below) and also work with their cultural department to present their history on these panels in their own words. We are in the final stages of this project, the panels have to go through one more review with the Fort Hall Business Council, then we will be ready to print and

install by April/May 2020. Overall, it has been a great project, where we were able to work closely with the Tribe and build a great working relationship.



7. Image of interpretive panel art "Treasured Rocks" by No-Sun Brown, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation.

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** The Timbisha Shoshone Tribe sent representatives, including the THPO and several tribal elders to travel the route of Bonnie Clare Road. The road had been severely damaged by a flood in 2015. Engineers with Federal Highways were able to take feedback directly from the THPO and elders and edit the drawings in real time to avoid impacting important resources, such as the canyon walls.

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** Engagement of Tribes in the FOVA Traditional Use Study (TUS) is providing a road map for better interpretation of indigenous connections to the park, detailing areas of stakeholder connection and involvement, and a way to expand the colonial narrative on the precontact indigenous, fur trade, and the U.S. Army eras. Given the colonial connections of many different Tribes and Native Hawaiian groups to the fort, this provides a way to better address stakeholder involvement and improve visitor understanding of the connections between the colonial settlers and indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest.

**Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAME):** For one major infrastructure project, a tribal cultural specialist and park cultural resource staff spent a day walking the project area together in order to better understand the broad range of Native American cultural features present in the area of potential effect. This kind of direct collaboration in the field was invaluable to sensitizing staff archaeologists to tribal concerns for resources that occur at multiple scales - artifacts, features, landscapes, and the cosmos.

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** Beginning in FY 2019, Redwood National Park began formal government-to-government consultations with the Yurok Tribe, Elk Valley Rancheria, and Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation regarding the disposition of the former Redwood Hostel located in Redwood National Park, Del Norte County. The former Redwood hostel was closed in early FY 2010 after a structural investigation revealed deficiencies and identified that seismic retrofitting and septic system rehabilitation work would have been needed to bring the building into compliance with NPS concessions policies. Costs in 2010 exceeded \$1.5 million, which were more than double the NPS replacement value of the structure. Despite NPS efforts to keep the building secure, break-ins at this location were occurring on a regular basis due to the building's proximity and visibility from U.S. 101. Vandalism and trash accumulating inside and outside the building was severe. The damp northern California climate also contributed to the overall deterioration of the building with mold, mildew, rot, and vermin infestation being a primary reason the building was closed. The floor and ceilings had collapsed in places. The structure was also in a seismic and tsunami inundation zone and did not meet current building code requirements for overnight accommodations. The NPS wishes to emphasize that the immediate need was to remove the buildings to prevent further vandalism, and to resolve the safety and security hazards that currently existed at this location. The hostel was located on the former home site of Louis P. DeMartin an early Euroamerican settler to Del Norte County. The house was constructed in 1908, but due to substantial modifications and lack of integrity was determined ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Consultations with DeMartin descendants; and adjacent landowners contributed to the proposal by NPS to demolish the hostel. The hostel was also located at the ancestral village known by the Yurok as Omen hee-puer and by the Tolowa as Daa-ghehsh-ts'a' that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as CA-DNO-0002/7. Consultations with the Yurok Tribe, Tolowa Dee-ni Nation, and Elk Valley Rancheria contributed to the proposal by NPS to demolish the hostel. The Yurok Tribe, Elk Valley Rancheria, and Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation had direct input in the decision made for the method to demolish the former Redwood Hostel. Several methods were considered. The Yurok Tribe requested to be the entity that did the demolition. The NPS consulted with the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation and Elk Valley Rancheria about this request, and it was their preference that the Yurok Tribe did the work, versus having NPS staff or a contractor doing the work. Following all environmental and National Historic Preservation Act compliance, the NPS developed a project statement under the current Annual Funding Agreement (AFA) with the Yurok Tribe to have the Tribe dismantle the building and clean up the site. The project required minimal ground disturbance. The Yurok Tribe's Watershed Department began dismantling the site October 1, 2019 and completed the work in January 2020. Rather than simply demolishing the building, the Tribe's staff took meticulous effort to dismantle the building piece by piece, setting aside any materials they thought could be recycled. They set tarps on the ground surface to make clean-up easier. Upon completion of the project, the Tribe's staff picked up nearly every single small scrap of debris they could find. Following this effort, the site looked like a potential public nuisance with a wide-open flat area, therefore, we brought in a layer of soil to cap the site and spread vegetation and downed trees over the area so that it would deter any looters from digging and deter any illegal camping. The Yurok Tribe provided cultural monitors throughout all aspects of the project. Photos were taken throughout the process and were shared with all three Tribes. It is anticipated that a future project may consider full ecological restoration and use of the site in consultation with federally recognized Tribes and the public. Restoration is

considered a long-term project that currently has no funding and was beyond the scope of the demolition project to consider.

**Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SAMO):** The Chumash Fire Dept (Santa Ynez Band) helped with the initial fire damage assessments (funded by BIA) following the Woolsey Fire, leading up to the BAER Plan and funding which made it possible to bring the Chumash crew back for implementation of post-fire treatments. The crew is cross trained as both firefighters and cultural specialists, and they were an amazing help to SAMO.

**Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (WHIS):** At Whiskeytown NRA the best practice is simply to be available, be present, and communicate openly and comprehensively.

### Southeast Region

**Cane River Creole National Historic Park (CARI):** The Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana invited CARI Chief of Resource Management to present as keynote speaker for the Tribe's 3rd Intertribal Basketry Summit (October 2018). He accepted the honor and presented "Woven Culture: Shared Heritage Among Louisiana Creole and American Indian Communities" to approximately 50 participants, including traditional basket makers and Tribal leaders from the southeastern US. For more information refer to <https://www.tunicabiloxi.org/the-tunica-biloxi-language-and-culture-revitalization-program-hosts-the-3rd-annual-basketry-summit>



8. Janie Verret Luster of the United Houma Nation, a traditional palmetto basket maker, speaks with Dustin Fuqua, the Resource Manager from Cane River Creole National Historical Park (right), during the 3rd Intertribal Basketry Summit hosted by the Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana. Photo courtesy of Tammy Greer.



**Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area (CHAT):** Only informative consultations regarding the 106 PA were conducted. CHAT's consultation involved only the mailing of initial consultation letter to 12 tribal nations. We received responses from a total of 4 nations. Two of these were informational only. Two of the others may continue consultation in FY20.

## APPENDIX F: NATIVE HAWAIIAN ORGANIZATION CONSULTATIONS (OPTIONAL NPS REPORTING)

### Pacific West Region

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** Nine consultations on park and reserve projects.

**Haleakalā National Park (HALE):** In FY18, Haleakala National Park (HALE) conducted one in-person meeting with park Kupuna (elder) groups and Native Hawaiian Organization representatives regarding rehabilitation of Kalahaku Overlook in the Summit District of HALE. In addition, HALE conducted three reviews through written letters with park Kupuna (elders) groups and Native Hawaiian Organization representatives in FY18. The topics included three park Environmental Assessments, including implementation of a reservation system at sunrise at the Summit District of the park, rehabilitation of Kalahaku Overlook, and a comprehensive site plan for the Kipahulu District of the Park. Constructive feedback included preservation of access by Native Hawaiians to the park regardless of the sunrise reservation system and input into emphasizing cultural use areas in both the Kalahaku Overlook EA and Kipahulu Comprehensive Site Plan (KCP) EA. In FY19, Haleakala National Park conducted no in-person meetings with park Kupuna (elder) groups and Native Hawaiian Organization representatives. The park continued consultation on the KCP and Kalahaku Overlook EAs through letter form and consulted through letters on a waterline replacement project for the entire district of Kipahulu. Constructive feedback included identification of sensitive cultural resources (burials) in the Kipahulu District.

**Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park (HAVO):** Five sit down meetings, one letter (consultation, information), Superintendent and program managers, information used to inform I&E (new park waysides), maintenance (infrastructures), and future planning. We consult with NHO's and interested parties, contact is by email or letters, phone calls on occasion.

**Kalaupapa National Historical Park (KALA):** Eight consultations, most via letter sent by email, all for Sec 106 consultations; we currently consult with six NHOs: the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the Molokai Aha Kiolo, the Molokai Museum and Cultural Center, the Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement, the Hui Malama O Mo`omomi, and Aina Momona.

**Pu`uhonua O Hōnaunau National Historical Park (PUHO):** PUHO consulted with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) and 53 individuals with cultural ties to the lands the park encompasses\* on both NAGPRA and NHPA issues as well as park projects planned for FY18 and 19. NAGPRA consultation was initiated in writing on January 16, 2018 (NAGPRA Inventory, Future Applicability) and face-to-face consultation was held on February 10, 2018. Prior to the consultation with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 53 Native Hawaiian individuals with family ties to the lands the park encompasses were also contacted by mail and invited to the same face-to-face meetings as OHA. The meeting was attended by the park Superintendent, Supervisory Archeologist/Integrated Resources Program Manager, Park Archeologist, OHA representative, and 5 of the 53 individuals consulted. The group discussed the professional qualifications of an anthropologist who was proposed to verify the park archeologists'

determination that human remains were present in the collection, set a timetable for completion of the work, and the park received a recommendation about how the objects would be stored, and where, prior to publication of the Inventory notice. NAGPRA consultation was initiated in writing on June 14, 2018 (NAGPRA Summary) and face-to-face consultation scheduled for August 23, 2018, only to be cancelled due to Hurricane Lane. The rescheduled consultation occurred on October 25, 2019. Prior to the consultation with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 53 Native Hawaiian individuals with family ties to the lands the park encompasses were also contacted by mail and invited to the same face-to-face meetings as OHA. One representative of OHA and four of the 53 individuals attended the meeting. The park archeologist distributed tables of information about the museum collection items in question and answered questions about the scope of collection and why a Summary is published and how potential claimants can obtain more information or access the collection. NHPA consultation was initiated in writing on February 20, 2019 with OHA in accordance with Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for a 60-acre Archeological Inventory Survey in the Ki'ilae section of the park. OHA was invited to respond by telephone, in person, or in writing about any information they might have about the study area, including archeological sites, Traditional Cultural Properties, designed/cultural landscapes, roads and trails, buildings/structures, historic objects, and historic districts. No responses were received. Results of the survey will be made available to OHA as well as to the 53 consulted individuals with whom we also initiated consultation with about the survey project. A park project update letter, and follow-up on NAGPRA consultation was mailed on February 20, 2019 to the 53 individuals with ties to the lands the park encompasses. The letter described ongoing FY18 and formulated FY19 projects that the park determined eligible for Streamlined Review under the 2008 Nationwide Programmatic Agreement. These projects included preservation work on historic structures and in cultural landscapes, facilities projects, and the ongoing archeological inventory. The letter also informed the families that the park would be continuing a planning process to manage feral goats, would be hosting researchers engaged in shoreline inundation/sea level rise data collection to be used in future park planning efforts, and funding a shoreline erosion study through a cooperative agreement. The status of the NAGPRA inventory efforts was also shared. Comments on any of the above were invited by phone, in person, or in writing. \*The 53 individuals represented larger 'ohana (families).

## **APPENDIX G: NON-FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES/ STATE RECOGNIZED TRIBES**

### **(OPTIONAL NPS REPORTING)**

Relationships with non-federally recognized tribes continue to strengthen, though these relationships are different from the government-to-government responsibilities required with federally recognized Tribes. Cultural groups traditionally associated with NPS areas, including indigenous groups of non-federally recognized or state recognized Tribes, are frequently consulted during the Section 106 (NHPA) process as interested public parties. NPS communication with traditionally associated groups with ongoing cultural connections to park resources helped to inform cultural exhibits, interpretive programming, research and special events.

#### **Alaska Region**

**Katmai National Park & Preserve (KATM):** Periodically consults with the Council of Katmai Descendants and the Heirs of Pelagia Melgenak on matters related to Section 106 of NHPA and NEPA, concessions/facilities/infrastructure at Brooks Camp (where the Heirs retain ownership rights to an allotment) as well as cultural resource stewardship and agreements parkwide. The park has conveyed to the Council that their ability to consult as more than an interested party can be elevated with letters or resolutions enumerating them with designated tribal authority. These consultation meetings are typically held in Anchorage in the NPS ARO, on site at Brooks Camp, or occasionally telephonically. The Superintendent, the Cultural Resources manager and staff, and occasionally Regional NPS staff attend these meetings. Cultural Resources specialists have also visited with individual Council members as part of the Partnering with Elders project to build a collaborative process in cultural resource management, consultation, and park planning. Meetings with the Heirs of Pelagia Melgenak fall slightly outside of tribal consultation as the purview generally is that of landowner and park, however, the park Superintendent keeps regular telephonic communication with members of the family, and when able, in-person meetings with the spokesperson for the family. Letter correspondence to both the Council and the Heirs is sent to both the designated contact (Chair and Spokesperson) as well as the legal counsel retained by both entities.

#### **Intermountain Region**

**Chamizal National Memorial (CHAM):** Consultations occurred with descendants of two local non-federally recognized tribes-the Piro and Manso Indians. Their representatives were informally consulted with for the Border Cultural Folk Festival and for an ongoing project at Socorro Mission. This consultation was performed by phone, email, and face-to-face.

**Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (ORPI):** We tried to consult with the Hia Ce'd O'odham, a non-federally recognized tribe; the park sent emails or letters to the chairperson.

## **Midwest Region**

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** Two meetings were held with Traditionally Associated People who include the Dakota multiracial community who have quarried and carved pipestone for 4-5 generations. The park Superintendent and the Cultural Resources Program Manager were in attendance for group in-person meetings held at the park. The discussion format on pipe sales was intended to guide park actions on store content and location.

## **National Capital Region**

We consulted with the Piscataway Indian Nation and the Piscataway Conoy Tribe, recognized by the state of Maryland on three different instances over the Ethnographic Overview and Assessment of Piscataway Park. These consultations were held at the Accokeek Foundation with tribal leadership, Park Superintendent and the Regional Anthropologist. Their concerns were recorded as part of the minutes and their input on the report shaped the direction the research took.

## **Northeast Region**

**Fort Necessity National Battlefield (FONE):** The Park Cultural Resources and Interpretation and Education managers met in person with the Abenaki Nation of Vermont (state recognized tribe) on three occasions. The Tribe was pleased to share their story with the public in relation with the park's story of the French & Indian War. The Abenaki were historically French allies and assisted the French in their 1754 victory at Fort Necessity against British forces. Over 30,000 visitors took advantage of the temporary exhibit while on display for nine months. The Abenaki Nation participated in a year-long program and temporary exhibit. Final meeting was on close-out and removal of exhibit. The park estimates that it spent \$1000.00 on this engagement and has been keeping records by email, and through their exhibition development records.

**Shenandoah National Park (SHEN):** Two consultations with Monacan Indian Nation regarding Section 106. Meetings were face to face and held with the Superintendent.

## **Pacific West Region**

Parks that consulted with non-federally recognized tribes in the region are noted below:

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** 16 consultations, NHPA, Cultural Event, Youth Employment; Format: Telephone calls, emails, letters, in-person meetings.

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** One consultation, Pahrump Paiute Tribe, Superintendent.

**Devils Postpile National Monument (DEPO):** Two consultations --Sent letters on all topics, invited to site visit for RX burn (one participant), and phone.

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** 15 consultations, letters and face-to-face meetings, TUS and Section 106 undertakings, Chinook and Clatsop-Nehalem.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** The Park engaged in one consultation process in writing from the Park Superintendent, inviting several non-federally recognized Ohlone/Costanoan Tribes and individuals to participate in FY19 in the consultation process on the Rehabilitation of historic Building 643 in the Presidio of San Francisco NHL but received no responses of interest. (Ground disturbance is expected during proposed building foundation work that has a minor potential to affect any underground indigenous resources.) The Park also continued work in FY18 with non-federally recognized Ohlone that were contracted to monitor archaeological investigations that occurred in FY17 for an upcoming project to rehabilitate the electrical utility distribution system within the Park's Fort Mason Historic District. In addition, the Park outreached to Ohlone who participated in three upcoming park planning initiatives (Presidio's Crissy Field Rehabilitation, Fort Point NHS Exhibit Redevelopment, and Presidio Tunnel Tops Ground-making), as well as in four large Park public events (Ohlone Big Time, Pasados del Presidio, Alcatraz Island Indian Occupation 75 Anniversary, and the 250th Anniversary of the Portola Expedition at the San Francisco Bay "Discovery" Site in which Ohlone participated in the Park's commissioning of new artwork depicting Ohlone involvement in this historic sighting by Europeans of San Francisco Bay).

**Lewis and Clark National Historical Park (LEWI):** Two non-federally recognized tribes were consulted (Chinook Indian Nation and Clatsop-Nehalem Confederated Tribes) a total of 16 times for NHPA Section 106. Highest level of senior leadership was the park Superintendent. The format was in writing.

**North Cascades National Park (NOCA):** We sometimes consult with the Lower Thompson, one of the First Nations of the interior of British Columbia, via letter for NHPA through the park program manager. There was one consultation per year the last two years.

**Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SAMO):** Nine consultations.

**Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks (SEKI):** 23 consultations; Lodgepole VC Exhibits, Replace Bearpaw Visitor Contact Station, Convert Two NPS Corrals for Public Use, Hospital Rock Draft Wayside Exhibit Text, Wuksachi Village Telecommunications Facility, PG&E Pole Replacement in Grant Grove, Lodgepole Visitor Center exhibits invitation to review the design, Big Stump ABA Trail, Lewis Creek Bridge debris removal, Draft Ethnographic Overview and Assessment, Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS's), CUA's in Wilderness, Clough Cave Gate Repair, Hospital Rock Wayside Exhibit Update, Lodgepole Visitor Center Exhibit Update, PE&E Cable Replacement in Cedar Grove, Sediment Deposit Excavation in Crystal and Bear Den Caves, Paradise Bridge Replacement; tribal Chair, in-person meetings and field visits. Constructive feedback during this reporting period mostly is related to exhibit content.

**Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (WHIS):** Four consultations, Infrastructure and Carr Fire Response, Consultations included the Superintendent and CRM.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** Two consultations, At Yosemite, we include two non-federally recognized tribes in all consultations with the support and encouragement of the 5 federally recognized tribes, thus all numbers above are identical for the two non-federally recognized tribes, The American Indian Council of Mariposa County also known as the Southern Sierra Miwuk and the Mono Lake Kutzadikaa.

## **APPENDIX H: CONSIDERING TRIBAL INPUT & COMMUNICATING TO TRIBES ABOUT NPS DECISIONS**

In 2016, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) was asked by Congress to review federal agency procedures for consulting Tribes on infrastructure projects following widespread concern surrounding the Dakota Access Pipeline. GAO examined laws, regulations, and policies and interviewed officials from 21 federal agencies that are generally members of the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council (FPISC), including the National Park Service (NPS). GAO also summarized comments that 100 Tribes submitted to federal agencies in 2016 and interviewed available officials from 57 Tribes and eight tribal organizations. Since the GAO initiated the inquiry in February 2017, the NPS American Indian Liaison Office (AILO) and Office of Tribal Relations and American Cultures (TRAC) have consolidated the NPS response throughout the process. The first in-person meeting with the GAO team was in May 2017.

In April 2019, GAO released their report, “Tribal Consultation: Additional Federal Actions Needed for Infrastructure Projects” ([GAO-19-22](#)). The report identifies several key factors across all 21 examined federal agencies including: agencies initiating consultation too late; agencies not adequately considering tribal input when making decisions; agencies not respecting tribal sovereignty and the government-to-government relationship between Tribes and federal agencies; challenges among agencies in obtaining and maintaining contact information for Tribes; agency resource constraints in supporting effective consultation; and coordination difficulties when multiple federal agencies are involved in a project. Many best practices and recommendations from Tribes to address these issues are included in the report.

In addition, the report specifically recommended that the NPS “should document in the agency’s tribal consultation policy how agency officials are to communicate with Tribes about how tribal input from consultation was considered in agency decisions on infrastructure projects.” The NPS follows the Department of the Interior’s (DOI) Tribal Consultation Policy (as indicated in [GAO-19-22](#)), and supports any Departmental action to update this policy to indicate the requirement for Bureaus to communicate with Tribes about how tribal input from consultation was considered in Bureau decisions on infrastructure projects.

In response to the GAO recommendation, the NPS annual tribal consultation reporting template has been updated to request information from parks and programs about: a) whether they have communicated with Tribes about how tribal input from consultation was considered in NPS decisions and b) the manner in which this communication occurred. This information was first requested in the combined data call for FY 2018 and FY 2019 and is provided below. The inclusion of this information in the annual reporting template, and the distribution of this NPS report, implement the GAO recommendation to the NPS.

### **Alaska Region**

**Denali National Park (DNA):** In conjunction with Nenana Tribal Council, the Denali National Park Subsistence Resource Commission met on August 28, 2018 in Nenana, AK at the Mitch Demientieff Tribal Hall. The main highlight from the August meeting was a discussion about opportunities for creating partnerships between the Park and the Nenana Tribal Council.



Together the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission and the Nenana Tribal Council suggested the Park support the following partnerships:

- Share traditional knowledge with Park interpreters (including JV staff) and the visiting public;
- Engage Native partners in culturally significant projects;
- Develop a video depicting Nenana peoples' traditional subsistence lifestyles;
- Participate actively in annual Nenana "Culture Camp" that is scheduled in July;
- Obtain moose data in NW and Cantwell areas, including outside the Park boundary;
- Offer interpretative bus tours to Nenana for Park staff and students to get more familiar with local subsistence culture;
- Hire more local tribal people at the Park;
- Develop more integrated projects that look at things like climate, big game, and changes in the ecosystem.

**Glacier Bay Park and Preserve (GLBA):** The Hoonah Indian Association collaboratively manages the Huna Tribal House in Glacier Bay; all programs and projects are developed and overseen by a working group that includes NPS and tribal staff. Additionally, input from two Tribes (Hoonah Indian Association and Yakutat Tlingit Tribe) inform a variety of cultural programs at the park and preserve. The NPS has a General Agreement signed by a tribal government (Hoonah Indian Association) and the non-profit arm of an ANCSA Corporation (Huna Totem Corporation - Alaska Native Voices) to provide cultural interpretive services on board cruise ships in the park.



9. Sarah Doyle, GLBA Planner/Compliance Lead shares information with the Hoonah Indian Association Tribal Council in the Huna Tribal House. Photo courtesy of Mary Beth Moss, GLBA Cultural Anthropologist.

**Kenai Fjords National Park (KEFJ):** There were significant discussions with our affiliated Alaska Native groups about the design of the new Kenai Fjords National Park Visitor Center. After consultation the cultural interpretive panels were expanded from one panel to an entire wall. Having tribal input on these interpretive panels created exquisite new exhibits that included native art in the form of a kayak visor as well as in-depth understanding of how the Sugpiaq people used the Kenai Fjords coast. These discussions provided great depth, insight, and beauty to the Visitor Center exhibits that would not have been possible without the Tribes. The new visitor center is greatly enhanced from these new Visitor Center exhibits about the Sugpiaq way of life. In a separate project, Chugach Alaska Corporation (CAC) contacted KEFJ during FY19 about conducting a mineral exploration to investigate the economic viability of subsurface rights owned by CAC within the boundaries of KEFJ. KEFJ staff worked diligently to help provide CAC access to their resources while working with other stakeholders, including ANCSA village corporations.

**Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park (KLG0):** After discussion about tribal consultation processing with members of the Skagway Traditional Council, the park committed to change the way it consults with all Tribes. (New process was implemented in FY 2020).

**Lake Clark National Park and Preserve (LACL):** The park listened to tribal feedback about proposed park projects and undertakings and incorporated tribal suggestions where possible.

**Sitka National Historic Park (SITK):** Specific tribal input and concerns were incorporated into park projects. In FY18, the Sitka Tribe was briefed on park fund sources and the potential for jointly-developed projects through the Service-wide Combined Call. The development of new exhibits for the Russian Bishops House included team members from the Sitka Tribe of Alaska. The park entered into an Annual Funding Agreement with the Sitka Tribe of Alaska for both FY18 and FY19 to provide interpretive services for the park.

### **Intermountain Region**

**Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument (ALFL):** The park accepted a NAGPRA claim and reburial occurred in the park.

**Amistad National Recreation Area (AMIS):** Tribes offered no objections to the proposed work. In some cases, they asked to be kept in the loop as a project progressed.

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** The park considered input from tribal representatives during the planning and compliance stage of park infrastructure projects that had the potential to negatively impact ethnographic resources. On both occasions, Tribes concurred with the NPS assessment of effect. During an informal phone conversation with a tribal representative about how the NPS can improve implementation of ethnographic studies, the tribal representative recommended that we initiate contact with the Tribes prior to writing the scope of work and selecting the CESU partner. This would improve collaboration and ensure that the product benefits the Tribe as much as it benefits the park (and public). This input was immediately applied to the initial planning stage of an upcoming Traditional Use Study at the park, which is being carried out in FY 2020 and 2021.

**Aztec Ruins National Monument (AZRU):** The park intensively documented tribal input and seriously considered it in planning and actions. As a result of consultations, the park has decided to work with IMR to compile notes and action items from past consultations to demonstrate specifically how tribal input was used. This document should help all parties to better understand how tribal input is used and acted upon by the parks.

**Bandelier National Monument (BAND):** For NAGPRA consultations, we coordinated repatriation exactly according to tribal wishes, as expressed through consensus during consultation meetings. We are working very closely with a Tribe on a cultural landscape report and are incorporating current ethnographic information and input received during formal consultation into treatment and management recommendations.

**Big Thicket National Preserve (BITH):** During this FY, the park replaced boardwalk posts near prehistoric sites. The Tribes requested that an archeologist monitor the work during ground-disturbing activities. One was present, and no cultural resources were discovered.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** The Crow Tribe requested us to add their native language to the Junior Ranger pamphlets for the Bighorn Canyon NRA. The park will contact the Crow Historian and/or local college Crow Language Instructor.

**Bryce Canyon National Park (BRCA):** The park received responses from three Tribes for scoping of the proposed Verizon Cell Tower EA at BRCA. The park responded to one Tribe in writing via email regarding concerns about possible archeological sites and/or culturally important resources. The park considered the tower design preference expressed by two Tribes.

**Canyon de Chelly National Monument (CACH):** The park jointly developed a strategic agreement with the Navajo Nation, local Navajo chapters, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a first step towards joint management planning in the park. The strategic agreement outlined legal roles and responsibilities for all parties with management responsibilities. This agreement will serve as the basis for future joint management planning. Tribal consultation also included input from two Tribes regarding the repatriation of human remains and associated funerary objects. These discussions resulted in a repatriation and reburial agreement. The park utilized tribal input in the development of a culturally sensitive plan for removing remnant climbing rope and hardware at a highly significant traditional cultural property. The park conducted consultation for the operation of an unmanned drone in the park. This consultation resulted in a plan to address the privacy of traditional ceremonies occurring within the park. Lastly, the park consulted with one of the local Navajo Nation chapters regarding a plan for a proposed vendor village located within and immediately outside the park boundaries. This plan is being developed by the local chapter in cooperation with the National Park Service.

**Canyonlands National Park (CANY):** The park used tribal input to reevaluate the official assessment of effect determinations of ongoing concessions contracts for backcountry recreation. The Tribes expressed a general concern that NPS does not adequately assess cumulative impacts from recreational use on the entirety of the cultural landscape, which has led the Southeast Utah Group to broaden National Historic Preservation Act analysis to include consideration of features, such as viewsapes, as well as consideration of how park operations impact economic opportunities for underrepresented communities. The park used tribal input from consultation on the development of interpretive exhibits for the park Visitor Center in reconsidering the narrative

components that were identified as potentially insensitive, vague, and simple interpretations of what are more complex histories of traditional associations with the landscape.

**Casa Grande Ruins National Monument (CAGR):** It was very informative, and we were able to meet the requests of Tribes in nearly all projects. The park completed two annual consultation day-long meetings in conjunction with several Southern Arizona Group parks. These consultations really provided a lot of information on some of the interests of Tribes, on what topics they wish to consult, and their views and concerns that would not necessarily have been easy to recognize without these long conversations, including how we can improve, and their general feelings about the stewardship of their ancestral sites. In addition, and not included in the tally of consultations, we have several telephone calls per month to discuss stewardship and park planning to better understand the level of documentation and information some of the Tribes would prefer. For instance, when we have found great horned owls deceased in and around the Great House, one Tribe would like to be contacted immediately, as they will come to do a blessing. Often, we are asked to prepare a PowerPoint for projects that would use a technical method for assessing resources. As it was explained to us, Tribes are cultural specialists, not necessarily scientists, and they would like to see a presentation on non-destructive methods to understand what we are proposing. This is a reasonable request and has been beneficial in the consultation process and has provided a means for the park to understand concerns Tribes have about park management activities.

**Cedar Breaks National Monument (CEBR):** Tribal support for the construction of a new Visitor Contact Station at Point Supreme was critical to the success of the project. We also requested future exhibit design assistance from the Tribal Cultural Specialist to ensure that the messages presented are what the Tribe wants to share.

**Chaco Culture National Historical Park (CHCU):** The park intensively documented and seriously considered tribal input in planning and actions. As a result of consultations, the park has decided to work with IMR to compile notes and action items from past consultations to demonstrate specifically how tribal input was used. This document should help all parties to better understand how tribal input is used and acted upon by the parks.

**Chamizal National Memorial (CHAM):** The park informed Ysleta del Sur Pueblo about the results of their assistance with the Border Cultural Folk Festival and of their assistance in planning for the new permanent exhibit at Chamizal National Memorial.

**Colorado National Monument (COLM):** The park changed the language in its film to address tribal concerns. The park and Tribes discussed how to remove graffiti from cultural resources.

**Devils Tower National Monument (DETO):** Through a combination of face-to-face interactions, phone calls, and e-mail correspondence with 26 associated tribal nations, the park transparently communicated how consultation recommendations guided project planning and management decisions. Regarding the Plant Gathering Regulation (36 CFR 2.6): the park respected the will of the Tribes to remain private about traditional plant gathering uses and traditions within their respective cultures. Through government-to-government interaction and e-mail communication, the park advised Tribes to apply for plant gathering agreements upon Tribes' own terms, time, and volition. Meadow Unit Prescribed Burn: the park management communicated to Tribes that any proposed prescribed fire near the ceremonial meadow would be

postponed until the park provides an updated survey from a qualified archeologist. Tribes are continuously updated on progress through e-mail. Accessibility Improvement Project: Tribes' consultative input was used in the proposed wayside exhibits for the Accessibility Improvement Project (AIP), culminating with an agreement to hire an artist from an associated Tribe to incorporate appropriate perspective into new wayside exhibits. Staff documented and communicated to the proper project leaders all e-mail correspondence on concurrence and recommendations for the AIP Environmental Assessment. Paleontological Specimen: Initial NPS management decisions sought to respect the wishes communicated by Tribes to leave the paleontological specimen in place. However, erosion occurred throughout the wet months of 2019, and the fossil came loose. Park management decisions deferred to scientific study recommendations for preservation of the specimen upon dislodgement.

**Dinosaur National Monument (DINO):** The park modified its response to graffiti on rock art panels due to input from the Tribes; the park is in ongoing discussions with several Tribes to incorporate tribal perspectives into the park film.

**El Malpais National Monument (ELMA):** The park sought input on an inadvertent discovery within a lava tube cave. Tribal representatives from Acoma and Zuni recommended stabilization in place, taking care to conceal human remains. The park fully concurred and implemented their recommendations. The park conducts Tribe-recommended monitoring quarterly.

**El Morro National Monument (ELMO):** El Morro received tribal input on a National Register of Historic Places archaeological district nomination form. Tribal members from the pueblos of Acoma and Zuni participated in the initial planning, review meetings, and field visits regarding the district boundary and contributing elements. Input from the Tribes at the meetings resulted in expansion of the district boundary and the inclusion of about 20 additional cultural resources.

**Flagstaff Area National Monuments (FLAG):** The office is fortunate to have very positive lines of communication with the 13 Tribes in the region. Input from tribal representatives weighed heavily into many decisions made in the monuments during FY 18-19, particularly those having to do with public access and public interpretation through signage and exhibits.

**Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument (FLFO):** Due to documentation in our Ethnographic Assessment, the park changed its policy regarding Culturally Modified Trees (CMT) to no longer consider "bent trees" as CMT.

**Fort Laramie National Historic Site (FOLA):** Consultation centered around the 150th Fort Laramie Treaty Commemoration event, education and interpretation, effects and impact to the resources, and beginning long range inclusion of tribal perspectives in park planning and interpretation.

**Fort Union National Monument (FOUN):** Tribal input was incorporated into the new interpretive exhibits and shared with Tribes.

**Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument (GICL):** The park elicited suggestions from the Tribes for upgrading the current museum exhibit at Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument. Following the consultation in Silver City, NM, the park offered feedback to the Tribes on how the information would help in upgrading the exhibit. At this time, the museum renovation has not been implemented due to the need for additional funds.

**Glacier National Park (GLAC):** The park continued to discuss projects in person, by phone, and in writing in coordination with both Tribal Historic Preservation Officers.

**Grand Teton National Park (GRTE):** Tribal consultation results in the park include considering the comments and concerns from the Tribes in how projects are managed and executed. At times, consultation dictates additional discussions throughout the project implementation.

**Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve (GRSA):** The Tribes provided very important information for a fish management project.

**Guadalupe Mountains National Park (GUMO):** Mescalero Apache THPO and elders were invited to the park during an archaeological survey to participate and discuss project design and goals. The park and the Tribe engaged in further conversations, regarding future cultural landscape and archaeological projects for 2020 and beyond.

**Hovenweep National Monument (HOVE):** The Tribes made recommendations regarding springs management during work performed as part of the park's Ethnographic Overview and Assessment. The park has already incorporated the recommendations into general park management planning for all the units at Hovenweep. The park is currently discussing collaborative springs management at Square Tower with several pueblos and has accommodated and participated in two requests by the Pueblo of Acoma to visit the spring with tribal youth as part of their youth summer education program. The park also accommodated two visits by Acoma elders to perform traditional cultural practices to benefit the health of the resource.

**Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LIBI):** Eleven of the 17 traditionally associated Tribes participated in tribal consultations. The Tribes requested to have a representative from the Federal Highways road contractors explain the plans, designs and timeline, since the Tribes were not involved from the start. The park arranged for a representative to meet with the Tribes. A regional NPS representative met with the Tribes, toured the road, and explained the plans. Tribes requested to perform a cultural ceremony before the construction begins. The park is honoring the request, and the Tribes will coordinate the ceremonial appointees. Tribes requested to have tribal monitors present during the construction, and the park is seeking funding for two monitors. The Tribes requested to be informed and involved when the artifacts and museum collections are moved when the expansion of the Visitor Center begins. The Superintendent will continue to keep the Tribes informed in accordance to NHPA Section 106 & NAGPRA. The Tribes requested to table the land donation to the Little Bighorn Battlefield and discuss it with the Crow Tribe, since it is located within the exterior boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation. NPS honored the request. The request to have a name added to the Indian Memorial was agreed upon, and the Superintendent will explore the process for adding the name to the permanent panel. Tribes requested for the park to continue to keep them informed about projects' progress and when new projects arise, and the park agreed.

**Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park (LYJO):** The park used tribal input to draft a MOA between Lyndon B Johnson NHP and the Texas State Historic Preservation Office of Texas. The San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona, declined to comment on the MOA when they received the draft.

**Mesa Verde National Park Colorado (MEVE):** Most of the consultations are on-going, and the park is still gathering and considering tribal input. For the consultations that have concluded, the park notified the Tribes by having them as an invited signatory to a PA in which their suggestions for avoiding cultural resources were incorporated.

**Montezuma Castle National Monument (MOCA):** Tribal input was highly integrated into the project decision-making process.

**Natural Bridges National Monument (NABR):** The park incorporated tribal recommendations on how best to protect ancestors on the landscape into the Plan of Action for two separate inadvertent discoveries subject to NAGPRA. The park captured tribal concerns about public access to archaeologically sensitive areas and their suggestions on to how to improve interpretation and public education of indigenous cultural landscapes as official management recommendations for further consideration. The park recorded tribal recommendations for improving exhibits at the Visitor Center during the planning stage of upcoming interpretive exhibit replacement projects.

**Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument (ORPI):** The park considered tribal input as an important part of the decision-making process.

**Pecos National Historical Park (PECO):** The park received tribal input for three projects: 1) during the new visitor center exhibits planning, tribal input was used to determine the best design, content, and appropriate terminology, as well as artifacts to use; 2) a NAGPRA repatriation and reburial was carried out with extensive input and tribal participation on site; 3) test excavations to support the Trading Post rehab project, including tribal input about specifications for when they wanted to be notified. Tribal input was also gathered for several projects also related to the desire for tribal employment in projects and concerns about proper interpretive language and materials.

**Petrified Forest National Park (PEFO):** Two NAGPRA consultations are still underway. Tribes had no issues with proposals for the education program or NHPA.

**Petroglyph National Monument (PETR):** The park considered tribal input in the final alternative selected for the Visitor Use Management Plan, which included the prohibition of bicycles in the majority of the monument because of tribal concerns.

**Pipe Spring National Monument (PISP):** The park did not commence projects until receiving a documented response from the Tribes.

**Rocky Mountain National Park (ROMO):** The park considered tribal input in almost every occasion. The Southern Ute Tribe provided feedback/alternatives for the future use of Cascade Cottages as a place for tribal members to stay overnight during visits to the park. Many Tribes noted the difficulty in finding affordable lodging during the summer and fall months in Estes Park, and the park is looking into alternative park/researcher housing options. Numerous Tribes

were supportive of the decision to close the Crater Trail to avoid further impacts to natural and cultural resources. The park added additional phrasing to enhance park coordination with Tribes into the Park PA for Exotic Plant Treatments based on comments from the Northern Cheyenne Tribe. The park received comments from the Tribes that inappropriate items were for sale by concessionaires at the park gift shop, encouraged the park to remove these items, and consider working with traditionally associated tribal artists to sell their native art. The park revisited the concessionaire contract and provided the store manager with contact information for tribal artists. The park is following up with additional recommendations.

**Saguaro National Park (SAGU):** For consideration in their annual saguaro fruit harvests, Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona requested annual information on areas where herbicide was applied. The park now provides this information annually.

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** Staff completed action items or sent requested information to the officially designated tribal representatives, such as transcribing meeting notes for follow-up and input.

**Southeast Utah Group (SEUG):** The Group received input and recommendations regarding the Tribes' preferred temporary protection measures to take while undergoing NAGPRA consultations. The Group immediately incorporated these recommendations into its guidelines. The Group is concerned about visitor-related impacts to vulnerable backcountry archaeologically dense areas when approving Commercial Use Authorizations, Special Use Permits, and conducting other back-country recreation-related planning. Two Tribes, the Jicarilla Apache Nation and the Quapaw Tribe, stated that they do not recognize the Group parks as part of their traditional landscape and declined further consultation.

**Southern Arizona Office (SOAR):** The park used tribal input to assist with project planning and implementation. The park escalated tribal input about the CESU process and concerns about ethnographic research in Southern Arizona Office parks to the regional office for further consideration.

**Tonto National Monument (TONT):** The park used tribal input to inform several project directions and NAGPRA disputes.

**Tumacácori National Historical Park (TUMA):** Tribes agreed with the proposed actions. The park gave a treatment report on emergency preservation work to the Tribes. The Tribes provided valuable feedback in making the new park film.

**Tuzigoot National Monument (TUZI):** The park significantly integrated tribal input into the project decision-making process.

**Valles Caldera National Preserve (VALL):** Input from tribal consultation resulted in modifications to park projects; the creation of tribal/ park partnerships, including a multiyear funding agreement; led to cooperative grants for natural resource restoration; and developed Youth Conservation Corps programs supporting Native American youth and tribal internships.

**White Sands National Park (WNSA):** The park received tribal input regarding mitigation as part of a Comprehensive Agreement for inadvertent discoveries.



**Yellowstone National Park (YELL):** Federal, state, and tribal governments mutually made management decisions about Yellowstone bison at the Interagency Bison Management Plan meetings.

### **Midwest Region**

**Arkansas Post National Memorial (ARPO):** All comments received from the Tribes are presented to the Park Superintendent and are addressed immediately.

**Badlands National Park (BADL):** Tribal input has been carefully considered with decision making regarding bison management and surplus bison distribution, concessions contract management, and South Unit GMP implementation planning.

**Buffalo National River (BUFF):** Input received for multiple NAGPRA issues and a Park/Tribal Agreement.

**Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO):** Tribal input is routinely incorporated into EFMO decisions. A few examples: tribal partners helped us arrive at a consensus approach to adding a new septic system in a highly sensitive area, and one Tribe was a signatory to the Section 106 MOA for this project; tribal input was considered vital for the park's Long Range Interpretive Plan, and tribal partners directly contributed content to the plan; and tribal input was likewise vital in NAGPRA decisions regarding the first round of repatriation and reburial in the wake of the Munson case. We accommodated every request from tribal partners on how this was to be done.

**Fort Scott National Historic Site (FOSC):** Through both written and verbal communication, all input from NHPA consultation will be integrated into the decisions and actions from the park. Through both written and verbal communication, all curriculum developed through the teacher workshops will be reviewed by participating Tribes and then made available to educational organizations through the park web page. Photographs on the next page.



10. Images of the Fort Scott National Historic Site's collaborative Native American curriculum building workshop, September 2019. NPS Photo courtesy of Carl Brenner.

**Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site (FOUS):** Through written and verbal communication, all input from consultation was integrated into the exhibit decisions and design for the park's new exhibits. Following discovery of archeological remains during a park infrastructure improvement project, Tribes requested that resources be protected, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) be invited to participate, and additional alternatives for improvement be developed and considered. As a result, the park secured ACHP involvement, terminated the initial project, and rehabilitated the disturbed land to its condition prior to disturbance. Development and consideration of additional alternatives in consultation with Tribes is planned for the near future. In another instance during an NHPA/Section 106 consultation, a tribal representative visited the park to conduct a pedestrian survey; archeological and ethnographic features previously unknown to the park were identified and the recommendation made to list them on the National Register, which the park is pursuing; in addition, at the request of the consulting Tribe, these newly identified features were excluded from a planned project's area of potential impact. In a third consultation, the park sought feedback on the scope, content, completeness, and quality of its compliance documentation shared with a THPO; because of that feedback, the park is providing Tribes with more detailed consultation letters and documentation to ensure they have enough information, including photographs, for evaluating projects and potential effects.

**Grand Portage National Monument (GRPO):** Coming to consensus with the Grand Portage Band during project review/proposal meetings for the AFA and how they will be implemented through co-management. Agreement is reached prior signing the agreements.

**George Washington Carver National Monument (GWCA):** The park sought tribal input while developing guidelines for work carried out under a park specific programmatic agreement.

**Homestead National Monument of America (HOME):** Information from tribal consultation was highly valued at HOME in FY 18-19. The consultations were government to government partnerships, forging a Programmatic Agreement for Section 106 Compliance, as well as an invitation to an archeological survey conducted by MWAC. Other input was utilized for education and interpretation programs.

**Hopewell Culture National Historical Park (HOCU):** In person and teleconference.

**Ice Age National Scenic Trail (IATR):** In 2018, The Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin requested copies of the Phase I Archaeological survey from a Langlade County trail project which was subsequently provided to the respective THPO. In 2019, Ice Age NST received a request from Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin for additional information regarding the need for Phase I surveys of a proposed new trail segment along with a request that an additional survey be undertaken regarding the placement of a dispersed campsite. Our office provided the additional information that was requested and had additional archaeological investigations performed per this request. Copies of the resulting archaeological report were provided to the respective THPO upon the completion of the survey.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** On PEPC 73889 Development of Native American Cultural Trail - We are actively working with the Miami of Oklahoma and the Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi on the planning and design for this trail, including plant inventories of the entire site during all Seasons, a new picnic shelter, a boardwalk, waysides, exhibits, programs, and most important a Land Acknowledgement including a Circle of Stones to acknowledge the Tribes who once lived here. On PEPC 77910 Development and Installation of New Waysides Along the Bailly/Chellberg Trail - We are actively working with the Miami of Oklahoma on the development of the new waysides. The Potawatomi Bands did not respond to our original consultation letter for this project. The Pokagon Band has a new THPO and a new CR Director, and we will be reinitiating consultation with them on this project. On PEPC 82741 Manoomin (Wild Rice) Protection Activities at Miller Woods - Ongoing project - The Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi are spraying invasive plants in a portion of the Miller Woods unit of the park with the goal of improving Wild Rice habitat.

**Isle Royale National Park (ISRO):** Input on plans that were in progress.

**Jewel Cave National Monument (JECA):** We took in consideration/input prior to starting the proposed water line replacement project. After walking the proposed waterline replacement project site, the tribal members communicated that they had no concerns or issues with the project moving forward.

**Knife River Indian Villages National Historic Site (KNRI):** We provide written summaries of consultations and follow-up via telephone, email, additional consultation, and site visits throughout the year.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** Following input from the Tribes regarding the potential re-designation of the Lolo Trail National Historic Landmark, Lewis and Clark NHT (LECL) decided to enter into a \$50,000 agreement with the Nez Perce Tribe to collect Oral Histories regarding the Tribe's history with the Lolo Trail, and that this information would be used to improve stewardship of the Lolo Trail.

**Midwest Regional Office of American Indian Affairs (MWRO/OAIA):** Four Tribes (Dakota) the Lower Sioux Indian Community, Upper Sioux Indian community, Prairie Island Indian Community and the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community formally requested the Regional Director form a Tribal Leaders Task Force (TLTF) due to ongoing challenging situations. The request originated with the Prairie Island Indian Community and was supported by the Minnesota Tribal Leaders (the four Dakota Tribes in MN). A TLTF, the first in the NPS, was formed and currently is functioning with representatives from the NPS and four Dakota Nations.

The Office of American Indian Affairs along with leaders from THRO, BADL, WICA, & TAPR partnered with the Intertribal Buffalo Council (Federally Recognized Tribal Group) through the regional Bison Leadership team and incorporated significant input into regional park bison operations and management.

**Missouri National Recreational River (MNRR):** Letters addressed to tribal council chairs and CCs to THPOs regarding outcome of completing the Goat Island Management Plan and associated FONSI and offer to provide on-site visit to tribal headquarters for presentation regarding the plan. Periodic written updates and telephone contacts with Tribes regarding the status of repatriation of human remains as first addressed during face-to-face consultation.

**Niobrara National Scenic River (NIOB):** This was a preliminary consultation. Full consultation is planned for March 2020. Following a letter, we got interest from 2 Tribes. After following up by phone, we now have 10 Tribes indicating an interest.

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OZAR):** The park placed greater emphasis on contacting tribal partners earlier in the planning process so we could develop better alternatives as planning documents are finalized. Input from the Osage Nation also assisted greatly during the sentencing in a 2019 ARPA case.

**Pea Ridge National Military Park (PERI):** Any recommendations were incorporated into the project and followed. All requests for additional information was provided.

**Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore (PIRO):** Conducted tribal consultation efforts for 4 separate projects; the park did not receive any feedback on the actions or projects proposed.

**Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway (SACN):** The park incorporated any comments and perspectives expressed by Tribes into the planning documents about which we were consulting.

**Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve (TAPR):** Tribal review was sought on basic management/operations; concurrence letters were filed with other compliance documentation.

**Theodore Roosevelt National Park (THRO):** Considered altering and/or made changes to scope of work, modified paths of travel, changed rock marker configuration, conducted additional surveys, etc. to mitigate or resolve project issues.

**Voyageurs National Park (VOYA):** Recommendations of the Bois Forte Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe were incorporated as changes into the Mukooda Lake Development Environmental Assessment and project plan. Ongoing discussions between VOYA and Tribes help us better understand tribal concerns and interests which in turn broadly informs planning decisions.

**Wind Cave National Park (WICA):** We are using input gathered from meetings and one-on-one discussions to include in our exhibit story. The Regional Tribal Relations Program Manager attended three meetings.

### **Northeast Region**

**Appalachian National Scenic Trail (APPA):** Consultations reported are still on-going.

**Boston National Historical Park (BOST):** We only had informal communications with Tribes recognized by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in FY 18-19. In 2019 a letter was sent to Narragansett, Mohegan Tribe of Connecticut, Stockbridge Munsee, and the Aquinnah and Mashpee Wampanoag representatives to invite participation in planning for the Peddocks Island Redevelopment Plan (BOHA), from which we received no responses.

**Cape Cod National Seashore (CACO):** In one case, tribal input helped develop the work plan for archeological investigations at Great Island with UMASS Boston. In 2 other cases, tribal consultation helped revise the ways the park consults with the tribes (frequency and methods of communication and information sharing).

**Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO):** We asked and tribal partners agreed that we are in a state of perpetual consultation relating to visitor and tribal experience planning at Werowocomoco. NPS made no final decisions regarding Werowocomoco planning in FY 18-19. Meeting notes were distributed to attendees after the meeting.

**Colonial National Historical Park (COLO):** Consultations from 2019 are still in progress. We are trying to coordinate signatures on two MOAs.

**First State National Historical Park (FRST):** Consultation is ongoing. The Tribes helped to determine the archeological testing strategy for the project.

**Fort Monroe National Monument (FOMR):** The Superintendent sent letters and made phone calls.

**Gateway National Recreation Area (GATE):** The Park consulted with Tribes who may have religious and culturally significant sites that projects may affect. We sought their input on these projects as well as inquired about tribal interest in future undertakings in the park.

**George Washington Birthplace National Monument (GEWA):** The Tribes expressed no objection to the NPS's proposed project approvals/permits in these consultations; as follow-up to final NPS decision on the proposals, gratitude for the consultations was extended to the Tribes (by park Easements-Manager/CRM) on behalf of park Superintendent.

**George Washington Birthplace National Monument (GEWA) & Thomas Stone National Historic Site (THST):** Osteological examination of remains for GEWA. GEWA for DSC-- Inclusion of Rappahannock Indian Tribe input into the Northern Neck Heritage Area Study Results--influenced positive finding.

**Green Springs (GRSP) & George Washington's Boyhood Home National Historic Landmark (GWBH):** The Tribes expressed no objection to the NPS' proposed project approvals/permits in these consultations; as follow-up to final NPS decision on the proposals, gratitude for the consultations was extended to the Tribes (by park easements manager/CRM) on behalf of the park superintendent.

**Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site (HOFU):** Tribes are typically contacted via e-mail at the end of projects. If there is a report, they are sent the report for review and comment. Less frequently, Tribes are contacted via phone, and updated on the status of projects.

**Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site (ACAD)/Saint Croix Island International Historic Site (SACR):** Consultation for 2 projects under S106: Tribal response indicated a request to be notified only for inadvertent discovery for the project. Cultural Connections program offered in the summer is developed in collaboration with tribal educators. Tribal input to develop an interpretive exhibit at SACR (petroglyphs). Suggestions offered by THPO to improve final product were adopted.

**Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument (KAWW):** Consultation on projects resulted in NEPA documents signed by the Tribes for each project. Input on the draft Foundation Statement were included in the draft statement now under review.

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** Tribal consultation was the key factor in a decision to suspend two archaeology projects in the park. We had not consulted early in project planning and when consultation occurred, we realized the project was not feasible given time and funding constraints.

**Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA):** For the Partnership Wild and Scenic Rivers Program, Tribes appointed a volunteer representative to serve on the Management Council in development and implementation of the River Management Plan. For the Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, NPS is providing technical assistance and working with tribal members on a Master Plan for the Seneca Nation of Indians.

**Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites (ROVA):** Consultation was considered in determining the assessment of effect on a proposed undertaking.

**Shenandoah National Park (SHEN):** Received a few responses to consultation efforts, none of which voiced concerns for proposed projects. They did indicate an interest in continued communication, which the park complied with via follow-up correspondence.

**Statue of Liberty National Monument (STLI)/ Ellis Island (ELIS):** The general practice for tribal consultation has been for the park to send letters and documents to the Tribes via email and then follow up with a teleconference to discuss any tribal questions or concerns. This input is captured in meeting minutes, which are distributed to all parties for review. Any agreements about project changes or specific requirements that result from these meetings are also documented in the minutes. The park's S106 coordinator and the project manager of the project in question are responsible for ensuring that these agreements are reflected in project plans and carried out. The consultation minutes, notes from any follow-up discussions, and any required documentation proving that the park has implemented the agreed actions are uploaded into PEPC and stored in the park files.

**Steamtown National Historic Site (STEA):** Via letter the Tribes were notified of the National Register of Historic Places. Only one Tribe acknowledged receiving the letter but had no interest.

**Upper Delaware Scenic & Recreational River (UPDE):** In FY19, UPDE identified a need to establish a relationship with our tribal partners in order to fulfill our consultation responsibilities. The park worked with the Regional Lead for tribal affairs to identify our tribal partners and a letter re-introducing the park to the Tribes was sent out in early FY20.

**Valley Forge National Historical Park (VAFO):** Planning and Resource Management/ Archaeology Tribes are typically contacted via E-mail at the end of projects. If there is a report, they are sent the report for review and comment. Less frequently, Tribes are contacted via phone, and updated on the status of projects.

**Western Pennsylvania National Parks:** NPS units of Western Pennsylvania include Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site (ALPO), Flight 93 National Memorial (FLNI), Fort Necessity National Battlefield (FONE), Friendship Hill (FRHI), and Johnstown Flood National Memorial (JOFL). Of the four Tribes consulted, two responded with requests that archeo monitoring occur if there is any major ground disturbance during the JOFL lakebed project. I included this as a mandatory requirement in the Assessment of Effect document which the Supt signed.

### **Pacific West Region**

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** Input regarding NAGPRA resulted in two tribal site visits and directly affected reburial location, timing, method, and NPS support; for NHPA consultations input resulted in three tribal site visits, and affected protection of adjacent, sensitive resources; cultural resource consultations resulted in tribal participation in fieldwork; two consultation topics were initiated by the Tribe: youth employment and cultural event.



11. Ethnographic Place Names Project on Santa Rosa Island, CA. NPS photo.

**City of Rocks National Reserve (CIRO):** Working with the Tribe to finish new wayside exhibits for CIRO. Superintendent and Section 106 coordinator met with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Cultural review committee to have the waysides approved. Had no further consultation or contact for the project in 2018 with any of the Tribes - closed out consultation after 30 days. The wayside project continued into 2019/2020 working with Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall.

**Crater Lake National Park (CRLA):** Input from Tribe avoided cultural resources and requested a monitor.

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** The Tribes we consult with consider formal, written letters to be consultation, and any in-person meetings, field visits, etc. as important but informal. The Timbisha Shoshone Tribe has sent representatives including the THPO, chair, and environmental officer to meetings including the Cultural and Environmental Review Team (CERT) and field visits for projects. Park staff have attended the monthly Tribal Historic Preservation Committee meetings and at least one Tribal Council meeting. The Park is also obligated to meet with the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe quarterly under the requirements of the Timbisha Homeland Act. These meetings are typically held at Park Headquarters. The informal meetings are especially important to ensure tribal concerns are addressed early in the project management process.

**Devils Postpile National Monument (DEPO):** Listed in Comments and in response to comments in FMP EA. Visited site of proposed prescribed burn and discussed cultural resource protections that would and later on did occur during RX burn.



**Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve (EBEY):** Informed decision on 106 undertakings, natural resource stewardship, and potential for tribal youth engagement

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** Input from Traditional Use Study (TUS) consultation directly affected document content and participation of the Tribes in development of the document; TUS consultation also provided input that affected development of a prairie restoration, invasive species removal and indigenous plants project. Input from Tribes led to additional monitoring requirements for a lead abatement project in the Vancouver Barracks. Consultation on the Unigrad brochure led to edits to the document that were responsive to interpretive messaging that was more inclusive.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** The Park changed the MOA review process to accommodate a request by the Tribe.

**Great Basin National Park (GRBA):** Relayed to Tribes in person at Tribal Council meetings and by phone.

**John Day Fossil Beds National Monument (JODA):** The Tribes agreed with our proposed mitigations.

**Joshua Tree National Park (JOTR):** JOTR works to initiate tribal consultation early in planning efforts, which allows their input to be considered before any unalterable or expensive decisions have been made. As part of this effort, JOTR hosts an annual in-person meeting with its traditionally-associated Native American communities where upcoming projects are discussed and the Tribes can provide initial feedback about what level of involvement they want in the project, and whether there is an ideal format for consultation for those specific problems. JOTR makes significant efforts to incorporate this feedback. JOTR also makes effort to solicit comments and input from the traditionally associated Native American communities regarding projects which might affect resources JOTR staff may be unable to identify (e.g., ethnographic resources) or regarding projects which may have effects outside of the common Western understanding of physical damage. JOTR's traditionally associated Native American communities did request that they be informed of management decisions on projects where they have provided input, and, particularly if the resulting management decision only partially incorporated this input, or when other management concerns required alternate decisions. JOTR has since incorporated this step into consultation.

**Kalaupapa National Historical Park (KALA):** We consult with NHOs, as well as the Patient Residents, whose opinions are paramount.

**Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAME):** For one project, tribal input had a significant impact on cultural resource identification and eligibility determinations.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** Tribal input was requested during all phases of NHPA/Section 106 review (i.e., Determination of the Area of Potential Effects, Identification of Historic Properties and in the Assessment of Effects).

**Lassen Volcanic National Park (LAVO):** The NPS (LAVO) and Redding Rancheria have agreed to enter a MOU to formalize our consultation process and encourage further collaboration on upcoming planning, projects, and events.

**Lava Beds National Monument (LABE):** Suggestions/recommendations made by the Tribes were utilized in NPS decisions and tribal recommendations/stipulations were utilized in NPS implementation.

**Lewis and Clark National Historical Park (LEWI):** During the design phase of projects, Tribes were contacted to solicit information about whether they agreed with the park's plan for archaeological testing and about conclusions reached from archaeological testing.

**Manzanar National Historic Site (MANZ):** All tribal issues and concerns were considered in exhibit and brochure planning (in progress).

**Mojave National Preserve (MOJA):** Continuing consultation is ongoing for a few projects where the Tribes wish to be updated, such as projects looking to evaluate effects to the environment. Recommendations and concerns put forth by the Tribes were addressed through email and certified mail. More information was provided to the Tribes whenever requested.

**Mount Rainer National Park (MORA):** Tribal input generated collaboration with the Nisqually THPO and the park in two archaeological field projects in the Nisqually watershed. Tribal input on interpretation/education training has improved interpretive program development.

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** Tribal comment was taken in light of comment from other Tribes and NPS staff. In case of NEPA documents, consideration was also given to public comment. Tribal comment was given high priority in decisions related to interpretation.

**North Cascades National Park (NOCA):** Tribal input changed the scope of some of our projects.

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** The input from Tribes was considered in multiple ways in FY 18-19. Most of the input was in-person dialog between the Park Superintendent and respective Tribal Councils from the Yurok Tribe, Elk Valley Rancheria, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, Trinidad Rancheria, and Hoopa Valley Tribe. Regarding Invasive Plant Management Planning and a planned programmatic agreement, edits to the programmatic agreement document have been incorporated as requested by the Tribes. The Yurok Tribe, Elk Valley Rancheria, and Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation had direct input in the decision made for the method to demolish the former Redwood Hostel at Wilson Creek. One proposal the park considered was to burn down the structure, but input from the Tribes was that they were opposed to this method, due to possible subsurface cultural resources that could be damaged by intense fire. Additional input suggested that as much of the building materials should be recycled as possible. Finally, the Yurok Tribe requested to be the entity that did the demolition. The NPS then entered into an agreement with the Yurok Tribe to dismantle the building and clean up the site using a project statement under the Annual Funding Agreement.



12. Former Redwood Hostel Site following removal of the building and evidence of the reoccupation of the site by Roosevelt Elk almost immediately after project completion, January 2020. NPS Photo, Redwood National Park

Input from multiple Tribes on the California Condor Restoration project was incorporated into the NEPA and NHPA documents as well as in the drafting of the proposed 10(j) rule under the Endangered Species Act. Concerns about protecting sensitivity of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) for Yurok people regarding a Case Study on TEK and Elk Management resulted in the development of a data sharing agreement among the NPS, Yurok Tribe and Humboldt State University Sponsored Programs Foundation through which the Primary Investigator was reached in a CESU agreement for the project. The Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation is trying to build capacity for its trail program, the NPS with our collaborative managers of Redwood National and State Parks, California State Parks, have been working directly with the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation to find a way for that Tribe to construct a trail in their ancestral territory. This year the Trinidad Rancheria asked for a government-to-government meeting for the first time, and the NPS Superintendent met with the Council to hear from the Tribe and discuss issues at a general level. No project specific issues were raised, but the Tribe continues to appreciate the work that NPS does to keep them informed of projects in their claimed ancestral areas.

**San Juan Island National Historical Park (SAJH):** Input from the Tribes was considered for the following NPS decisions: Section 106 determination of effects, content development and interpretation for new visitor center, planning documents for invasive species management, and actions involving in-progress NAGPRA compliance.

**Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SAMO):** Tribal consultation drove monitoring decisions for NHPA projects, particularly the Woolsey fire.

**Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks (SEKI):** Concerns were address and action taken on suggestions. Content for exhibits was incorporated.

**Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (WHIS):** Tribal input was incorporated in decision making and positively affected outcomes that were then reported to the tribal point of contact.

### **Southeast Region**

**Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park (ABLI):** All communication took place in writing or email. A natural gas pipeline was proposed for placement along the main highway (31 E) adjacent to the park boundary. As part of the compliance process the park reached out to Tribes to ask for their input/approval/concerns for the placement of the pipeline. Only one response was received from the Cherokee Nation, requesting inclusion if any archaeological artifacts or human remains were found during the project. No artifacts or remains were found during the gas/natural gas line construction. The pipeline was approved through the compliance process and work has been completed.

**Big South Fork National Park (BISO):** All comments received during the consultation efforts were taken into consideration during management decisions. For some projects, BISO management receives little or no feedback from Tribes during the process.

**Biscayne (BISC), Dry Tortugas (DRTO) and Everglades National Parks (EVER):** We present proposed projects, seek input and modify projects/proposals as requested by the Tribes. Engage with the Tribe as the project is underway and at completion.

**Cane River Creole National Historical Park (CARI):** Since 2019, CARI has involved five park-affiliated Tribes in all requests for Section 106 concurrence with the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office. Prior to that point, CARI consulted with Tribes regarding projects involving subsurface construction and situational requirements only. CARI now includes the THPO of each Tribe in the cc: line of all cover letters to the LA SHPO and in distribution of all supporting documentation via email submittals. Of all 10 instances of consultation in FY 2018-19, only two Tribes responded to CARI, both of which indicated a No Adverse Effect determination.

**Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park (CHCH):** Park and Tribe followed the Section 106 process to discuss any issue a Tribe had until the Tribe's concern was addressed. NPS sponsored researchers also reached out to Tribes for ethnographical information.

**Congaree National Park (CONG):** Thirty-four letters were sent to contacts from 16 Tribes regarding a suite of facilities/infrastructure projects entered into PEPC. The park received four responses. None of the four responses indicated significant concerns with the project work as described, but all four responses did ask that if cultural material or human remains are discovered then work should stop immediately and they should be notified.

**Fort Donelson National Battlefield (FODO):** Invitations for consultation and participation were via formal letter-correspondence, and telephone calls and/or email (based upon expressed tribal govt preference) to respective representatives for follow-up to invitation, if a response had not been received. The input provided by the respective nations is highly respected and of great

consideration to ensure that possible activities/projects are appropriate. For ground disturbance or other potential effect upon a landscape, the input, suggestions, or requests in planning an activity are utilized to avoid potential adverse effect.

**Great Smoky Mountains National Park (GRSM):** Tribal input was used to guide decision-making and alternatives for infrastructure projects, management of natural resources, plant gathering, and various restoration projects. Input was also used to guide educational programs, to verify culturally-appropriate content.

**Gulf Islands National Seashore (GUIS):** Two of our communiques with the Tribes have involved inadvertent discoveries within the park. Tribes were notified of one by letter, and the second by phone call, email, and letter. The park is still in consultation with the Tribes regarding the second inadvertent discovery. The other four communiques have been regarding proposed Section 110 archaeological surveys and took place by letter and email. Typically, the park sends out a formal consultation letter, and the Tribes reply either by email or letter. Considering our communications with them have regarded archaeological surveys, their input on what to do in the event of an inadvertent discovery has always factored in largely in the survey plan moving forward.

**Mammoth Cave National Park (MACA):** In all consultations, tribal representatives either did not make contact with the park following the park's request for consultation, or a request was made for reporting information and a notification was given to proceed. In all correspondence from tribal representatives, requests were made for sharing information about any inadvertent discoveries affecting historic properties that a Tribe may attach religious and cultural significance. This process has been followed, according to 36 CFR 800.13.

**Natchez Trace Parkway (NATR):** Parkway staff communicated directly with Tribes on how their input guided the repatriation and treatment of NAGPRA collections.

**Southeast Archeological Center (SEAC)/SER NAGPRA Program:** All Tribes consulted with were provided consultation minute notes, which documented conversations, concerns raised, and how NPS would consider requests from Tribes upon making decisions.

**Southeast Region (SER) Partnerships/Recreation Programs Branch:** The stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) program communicates with the Federally Recognized Tribes in writing to invite them to consult on each project grant that is seeking financial assistance for acquisition, development, or renovation of a state or local park/recreation area for NHPA Section 106 purposes. Though 30 days are allowed for comments, Tribes can make comments at any time and engage in consultation. Any input is taken into consideration and depending on its significance may lead to a special condition in the project agreement.

## APPENDIX I: REPORTED CONSULTATION LOCATION

### Regional Overview

#### In-Person Consultation Meetings Reported in FY 2018-2019

City, State	Year	NPS Location	Tribal Location	Other
Alaska Region	2017	47	91	2
	2018-2019	46	79	11
Intermountain Region	2017	86	85	56
	2018-2019	189	111	207
Midwest Region	2017	54	110	6
	2018-2019	147	96	32
Northeast Region	2017	14	11	3
	2018-2019	18	13	11
Pacific West Region	2017	47	86	7
	2018-2019	47	142	37
Southeast Region	2017	17	31	0
	2018-2019	12	4	0
Totals	2017	265	414	74
	2018-2019	459	445	298

#### Location of In-Person Consultation Details

The following location information is presented as reported from NPS parks, regional offices, and programs.

Reporting Program/Office/Park	City of Consultation	State of Consultation	NPS Location? (X)	Tribal Location? (X)	Other (X)	# of In-Person Consultations Held at This Location
<b>Alaska Legacy Region (serving DOI Unified Region 11)</b>						
Glacier Bay NP	Gustavus	Alaska	X			12
Glacier Bay NP	Yakutat	Alaska	X			12
Klondike Gold Rush NHP	Skagway	Alaska		X		7
Lake Clark NPP	Anchorage	Alaska			X	2
Lake Clark NPP	Nondalton	Alaska		X		1

Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Northway	Alaska		X		1
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Chistochina	Alaska		X		2
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Glennallen	Alaska			X (corpor ation office)	3
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Copper Center	Alaska	X			3
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Tazlina	Alaska		X		1
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Anchorage	Alaska			X (corpor ation office)	1
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Yakutat	Alaska	X	X		2
Wrangell-St. Elias NPP	Mentasta Lake Village	Alaska		X		1
Kenai Fjords NP	Port Graham	Alaska		X		35
Kenai Fjords NP	Seward	Alaska	X			8
Kenai Fjords NP	Anchorage	Alaska				4
Kenai Fjords NP	Port Graham	Alaska				4
Sitka NHP	Sitka	Alaska	X	X		Not Reported
Denali NPP	Nenana	Alaska		X		25
Western Arctic National Parklands	Noatak	Alaska		X		3
Western Arctic National Parklands	Kiana	Alaska		X		1
Katmai NP	King Salmon	Alaska	X			2
Katmai NP	Brooks Camp	Alaska	X			1

Gates of the Arctic NP	Fairbanks	Alaska			X	1
Gates of the Arctic NP	Fairbanks	Alaska	X			1
Gates of the Arctic NP	Allakaket	Alaska		X		1
<b>Intermountain Legacy Region (serving DOI Unified Regions 6, 7, and 8)</b>						
Guadalupe Mountains	Salt Flat	TX	X			1
Southern Arizona Office	Phoenix	AZ	X			3
Southern Arizona Office	Camp Verde	AZ	X	X		2
Taos Pueblo New Mexico	Taos N.M.	NM		X		1
Great Sand Dunes	Great Sand Dunes	CO	X			4
Florissant Fossil Beds	Florissant	CO	X			15
Yellowstone	Emigrant	MT	X			2
Yellowstone	Bozeman	MT	X			2
Yellowstone	West Yellowstone	MT	X			2
Bryce Canyon	Cedar City	UT		X		4
Grand Teton	Fort Hall	ID		X		1
Grand Teton	Moose	WY	X			1
Little Bighorn Battlefield	Crow Agency	MT	X			25
Bighorn Canyon	Fort Smith	MT	X			16
Organ Pipe Cactus	ORPI Headquarters	AZ	X			10
Organ Pipe Cactus	ORPI	AZ	X			5



Heritage Partnerships Program	Phoenix	AZ			X	1
Glacier	Browning	MT		X		10
Glacier	Pablo	MT		X		3
Glacier	Kalispell	MT			X	1
Glacier	West Glacier	MT	X			2
Pecos	Pecos	NM	X			8
Flagstaff Group	Flagstaff	AZ			X	6
Flagstaff Group		AZ	X			1
Flagstaff Group	Camp Verde	AZ		X		1
Flagstaff Group	Fountain Hills	AZ		X		1
Fort Laramie	Rapid City	SD			X	16
Fort Laramie	Rapid City	SD			X	27
Fort Laramie	Rapid City	SD			X	34
Fort Laramie	Rapid City	SD			X	61
Fort Laramie	Rapid City	SD			X	9
Aztec Ruins/Chaco Cultural	Mesa Verde, CO; Farmington, NM	CO, NM	X (FY18)		X (FY19)	2
Bandelier	Los Alamos	NM	X			3
Bandelier	Pueblo of San Ildefonso	NM		X		3
Bandelier	Pueblo of San Felipe	NM		X		1
Bandelier	Pueblo of Cochiti	NM		X		1
Fort Union	Watrous	NM	X			1

Colorado	Fruita	CO	X			15
Chamizal	El Paso	TX	X (FY 18 and FY 19)	X (FY 18 and FY 19)		6
Mesa Verde	Cortez	CO	X			1
Mesa Verde	Mesa Verde	CO	X			3
Mesa Verde	Towaoc	CO		X		2
Mesa Verde	Santa Fe	NM		X		1
Mesa Verde	Espanola	NM		X		1
Mesa Verde	Farmington	NM	X			1
White Sands	Las Cruces	NM	X (FY 18 and FY 19)			2
Casa Grande	Sacaton	AZ	X (FY 18 and 19)	X		5
Casa Grande	San Miguel, TO Nation	AZ	X (FY 18)	X		1
Casa Grande	Gu Vu, TO Nation	AZ	X (FY19)	X		1
Casa Grande	Scottsdale, SRPMIC	AZ	X (FY18)	X	X	1
Casa Grande	Phoenix	AZ	X(FY18)		X	1
Casa Grande	Coolidge	AZ	X(FY19)		X	4
Casa Grande	Camp Verde	AZ			X	1
Petroglyph	Albuquerque	NM			X	14
Petroglyph	Santa Ana Pueblo	NM		X		1
Petroglyph	Pueblo of Acoma	NM		X		1
Petroglyph	Albuquerque	NM			X	19
Petroglyph	Pueblo of Sandia	NM		X		1

Petroglyph	Albuquerque	NM			X	19
Petroglyph	Pueblo of Zuni	NM		X		1
Petroglyph	Pueblo of Santa Clara	NM		X		1
Sand Creek Massacre	Chivington,	CO	X (FY19)			1
Sand Creek Massacre	Denver	CO	X (FY19)		X	1
Gila Cliff Dwellings	Silver City	NM	X (FY18)			1
Rocky Mountain	Estes Park	CO	X			2
Rocky Mountain	Lakewood	CO	X			1
Rocky Mountain	Ignacio	CO		X		1
Rocky Mountain	Towaoc	CO		X		1
Dinosaur	Duschene	UT		X		2
Dinosaur	Fruita	CO	X			1
Rocky Mountain	Fruita	CO			X	1
Rocky Mountain	Concho	OK		X		1
Rocky Mountain	Duschene	UT		X		1
Southeast Utah Group	Fruita	CO			X	1
Southeast Utah Group	Acoma Village	NM		X		1
Southeast Utah Group	Kykotsmovi	AZ		X		1
Southeast Utah Group	Window Rock	AZ		X		1
Southeast Utah Group	Zuni	NM		X		1
Southeast Utah Group	Cortez	CO			X	1

Southeast Utah Group	Moab	UT	X			1
Natural Bridges	Lake Powell	UT	X			6
Hovenweep	Cortez	CO	X			2
Tonto	Phoenix	AZ	X	X		4
Tonto	Camp Verde	AZ			X	1
El Malpais	Grants	NM	X (FY19)			1
El Morro	Ramah	NM	X (FY18 & 19)			2
Canyon de Chelly	Tucson	AZ	X			1
Canyon de Chelly	Chinle	AZ	X	X		1
Canyon de Chelly	Chinle	AZ		X		7
Canyon de Chelly	Chinle	AZ		X		5
Salinas Pueblos	Quarai	NM	X (FY19)			1
Cedar Breaks	Cedar City	UT		X		1
Valles Caldera	Jemez Pueblo	NM		X		5
Valles Caldera	Jemez Springs	NM	X			5
Valles Caldera	Espanola	NM		X		1
Grand Canyon	Headquarters	AZ	X			2
Grand Canyon	Flagstaff	AZ	X			5
Grand Canyon	Window Rock	AZ		X		1
Grand Canyon	Kykotsmovi	AZ		X		1
Grand Canyon	Desert View Watchtower	AZ	X			1
Grand Canyon	Lake Mead	AZ	X			1
Grand Canyon	Field Visit	AZ	X			3
Grand Canyon	Pipe Springs	AZ		X		1

Grand Canyon	Zuni	NM		X		1
Grand Canyon	Supai	AZ		X		2
Grand Canyon	Cameron	AZ		X		1
Grand Canyon	Page	AZ	X			1
Lake Meredith, Alibates Flint Quarries	Anadarko	OK		X		1
Devils Tower	Devils Tower	WY	X(FY18)	X	X	3
Pipe Spring	Kaibab	AZ		X		12
Chickasaw	Sulphur	OK		X		10
Chickasaw	Sulphur	OK		X		10
Chickasaw	Ada	OK		X		2
Chickasaw	Sulphur	OK	X			1
Saguaro	Sells	AZ		X		1
Glen Canyon (Air Tour)	Page	AZ	X			1
Glen Canyon (Quad)	Window Rock; Flagstaff	AZ		X	X	2
Glen Canyon (AP)	Window Rock; Flagstaff	AZ		X	X	2
Glen Canyon (PA)	Zuni;Pipe Springs;Page	NM; AZ	X	X		3
Glen Canyon (NACC)	Page	AZ	X			2
Glen Canyon (DSP)	Pipe Springs	AZ		X		1
Glen Canyon (VC)	Pipe Springs	AZ	X	X		1
<b>Midwestern Region (Serving DOI Unified Regions 3, 4, 5)</b>						
APIS	Bayfield	Wisconsin	Apostle Islands NL			64

APIS	Ashland	Wisconsin			xUSFS	12
APIS	Bayfield	Wisconsin	Apostle Islands NL			4
APIS	Onamia	Minnesota		Mille Lacs Band- Minnesota Chippewa Tribe		14
APIS	Bayfield	Wisconsin	Apostle Islands NL			10
APIS	Bayfield	Wisconsin	Apostle Islands NL			4
APIS	Bayfield	Wisconsin	Apostle Islands NL			7
BADL	Pine Ridge	South Dakota		X OST HQ		5
BADL	Interior	South Dakota			X	1
BADL	White River VC	South Dakota	X			1
BADL	Rapid City	South Dakota			X	1
BUFF	Wyandotte	Oklahoma	Harrison, AR	Caddo (OKC)		1
BUFF	Pruitt	Arkansas	Harrison, AR	Caddo, Oklahoma City, OK		1
BUFF	Wyandotte	Oklahoma		Osage, Pawhuska, OK		1
BUFF	Wyandotte	Oklahoma		Cherokee, Tahlequah, OK		1
BUFF	Tulsa	Oklahoma		Osage, Cherokee, Shawnee, Absentee		8

				Shawnee, United Keetoowah, Quapaw, Eastern Shawnee, Caddo		
BUFF	Harrison	Arkansas		Osage, Pawhuska, OK		1
BUFF	Pawhuska	Oklahoma		Osage, Pawhuska, OK		1
BUFF	Shawnee	Oklahoma		Absentee Shawnee, Shawnee, OK		1
EFMO	Harpers Ferry	Iowa	X			4
EFMO	Tomah	Wisconsin		X		1
EFMO	Harpers Ferry	Iowa	Effigy Mounds NM			4
EFMO	Black River Falls	Wisconsin		Ho-Chunk Nation		1
FOSC	Fort Scott	KS	X			1
FOSC	Fort Scott	Kansas	Fort Scott National Historic Site			1
FOUS	Williston	North Dakota	Fort Union Trading Post NHS			1
FOUS	Poplar	Montana		Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation		1
GRPO	Grand Portage	Minnesota		Grand Portage Reservation		30

				Tribal Council Office		
GRPO	Grand Portage	Minnesota	GRPO			8
HOCU	Wyandotte	OK		X		1
HOCU	Columbus	OH			X	1
HOME	Beatrice	Nebraska	X			
IATR	Wisconsin Dells	Wisconsin		Ho-Chunk Casino		1
INDU	Porter	Indiana	X			11
INDU	Fort Wayne	Indiana		X		1
INDU	Dowagiac	Michigan		X		1
INDU	South Bend	Indiana			X	1
ISRO	Duluth	Minnesota			Hotel	1
JECA	Custer	South Dakota	Jewel Cave National Monument			2
KNRI	Stanton	North Dakota	Knife River Indian Villages NHS			3
LECL	Lapwai	Idaho			Northern Idaho Indian Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs Building	1
LECL	Missoula	Montana			North Rockies Heritage Center, Fort	1



					Missoula	
MIMI	Interior	South Dakota			X	1
MNRR	Yankton	South Dakota			X	1
MNRR	Wagner	South Dakota		Yankton Sioux Tribe of SD		1
MWRO/OAIA	Prairie Island Indian Community	Minnesota		Prairie Island Indian Community		1
MWRO/OAIA	Lower Sioux Indian Community			Lower Sioux Indian Community		1
MWRO/OAIA	Las Vegas	Nevada		ITBC Members Meeting		1
MWRO/OAIA	Rapid City	South Dakota			South Dakota Fish & Game	1
MWRO/OAIA	Rapid City	South Dakota	NPS I&M Building			1
NIOB	Velentine	Nebraska		Niobrara		1
PIPE	Flandreau	SD		X		1
PIPE	Prior Lake	MN		X		1
PIPE	Wagner	SD		X		1
PIPE	Morton	MN		X		1
PIPE	Pipestone	MN	X			2
PIPE	Pipestone	MN	X			1
PIPE	Pipestone	MN	X			9

PIPE	Pipestone	Minnesota	Pipestone National Monument			11
PIPE	Prior Lake	Minnesota		Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota		1
PIPE	Granite Falls	Minnesota		Upper Sioux Community, Minnesota		1
PIPE	Wagner	South Dakota		Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota		1
PIPE	Flandreau	South Dakota		Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota		1
PIPE	Morton	Minnesota		Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota		1
SACN	Granite Falls	Minnesota		Upper Sioux Community		1
SACN	Morton	Minnesota		Lower Sioux Community		1
THRO	Poplar	MT		X		1
THRO	Fort Yates	ND		X		1
THRO	New Town	ND		X		1
THRO	Bismarck	ND			X	4
THRO	Medora	ND	X			4
VOYA	International Falls	Minnesota	X			2
VOYA	Tower	Minnesota		X		1

WICA	Hot Springs	South Dakota				Not Reported
<b>Northeast Region (Serving DOI Unified Region 1)</b>						
Acadia National Park	Winter Harbor	ME	X			3
Boston Harbor Islands National Park	Boston	MA	X			1
Cape Cod NS	Mashpee	MA		X		1
Cape Cod NS	Wellfleet	MA	X			2
Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT	Gloucester	VA			X	1
Colonial National Historic Park	Gloucester County	VA			X	1
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area	Milford	PA	X			1
GEWA for DSC Northern Neck Heritage Area	Colonial Beach	VA	X			1
Hopewell Furnace NHS/ Planning and Resource Management/ Archeology	Elverson	PA	X			1
Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	T3R7 W.E.L.S.	ME	X			1
Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	Indian Island	ME		X		2
Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	Jackman	ME			X	1
Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	Littleton	ME		X		1
Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	Presque Isle	ME		X		1

Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	Calais	ME		X		1
Katahdin Woods and Waters NM	Patten	ME	X			1
Marsh Billings Rockefeller	Woodstock	VT	X			2
Martin Van Buren NHS	Kinderhook	NY	X			1
Martin Van Buren NHS	Troy	NY			X	1
Partnership Wild and Scenic Rivers Program	Hope Valley	RI			X	1
Partnership Wild and Scenic Rivers Program	Tauton	MA			X	1
Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance	Salamanca	NY		X		1
Roger Williams National Historic Park	Charlestown	RI		X		2
Saint Croix Island International Historic Site	Calais	ME	X			4
Saint Croix Island International Historic Site	Pleasant Point (Sipayik)	ME		X		1
Statue of Liberty NM and Ellis Island	New York	NY	X			1
Tribal and Cultural Affairs Program	Mashpee	MA		X		2
Tribal and Cultural Affairs Program	Norwich	CT		X		2

Valley Forge NHP/ Planning and Resource Management/ Archeology	King of Prussia	PA	X			2
<b>Pacific West Region (Serving DOI Unified Regions 8, 9, 10, and 12)</b>						
Channel Islands National Park	Santa Ynez	CA		X		25
Channel Islands National Park	N/A	CA	X			Not Reported
City of Rocks National Reserve	Fort Hall	ID		X		1
City of Rocks National Reserve	Almo	ID	X			1
Craters of the Moon NP & M	Fort Hall	ID		X		Not Reported
Devils Postpile National Monument	Big Pine	CA		X		1
Devils Postpile National Monument	Bishop	CA		X		1
Devils Postpile National Monument	Devils Postpile NM	CA	X			1
Ebey's Landing NHR	Coupeville	WA	X			2
Fort Vancouver NHS	Vancouver	WA	X			8
Great Basin National Park	Ely	NV		X		1
Great Basin National Park	Ibapah	UT		X		1
Hagerman Fossil Beds National Monument	Fort Hall	ID		X		1
Hawaii Volcanoes Natl Park	Hawaii National Park	HI	X		X	5

Joshua Tree National Park	Twentynine Palms	CA	X			3
Kalaupapa National Historical Park	Kalaupapa	Hawaii	X			Not Reported
Lake Mead National Recreation Area	Boulder City	NV	X			1
Lassen Volcanic National Park	Mineral	CA	X			2
Lassen Volcanic National Park	Susanville	CA		X		2
Lassen Volcanic National Park	Susanville	CA			X	2
Lassen Volcanic National Park	Redding	CA		X		5
Lassen Volcanic National Park	Quincy	CA			X	2
Manzanar NHS	Big Pine	CA		X		1
Manzanar NHS	Bishop	CA		X		1
Manzanar NHS	Fort Independence	CA		X		1
Manzanar NHS	Lone Pine	CA		X		1
Manzanar NHS	Death Valley	CA		X		1
Manzanar NHS	Independence	CA	X			1
Minidoka National Historic Site	Fort Hall	ID		X		1
Mount Rainier National Park	Longmire	WA	X			6
Mount Rainier National Park	Toppenish	WA		X		1
Mount Rainier National Park	Longview	WA		X		1

Mount Rainer National Park	Yelm	WA		X		4
Nez Perce NHP	Lapwai	ID		X		21
Nez Perce NHP	Nespelem	WA		X		7
Nez Perce NHP	Mission	OR		X		8
Nez Perce NHP	Walla Walla	WA	X			4
Nez Perce NHP	Wallowa	OR			X	1
Nez Perce NHP	Spalding	ID	X			2
Nez Perce NHP	Joseph	OR			X	2
North Cascades NP	Sedro-Woolley	WA		X		4
North Cascades NP	Ross Lake (Diablo)	WA	X			5
Oregon Caves NM and Preserve	Grants Pass	OR			X	2
Redwood National Park	Klamath	CA		X		34
Redwood National Park	Crescent City	CA		X		16
Redwood National Park	Orick	CA	X			2
Redwood National Park	Smith River	CA		X		20
Redwood National Park	Hoopa	CA		X		2
Redwood National Park	Trinidad	CA		X		2
San Juan Island NHP	Friday Harbor	WA	X			5
San Juan Island NHP	Bellingham	WA		X		1
Whiskeytown NRA	Weaverville	CA		x		1

Southeast Region (Serving DOI Unified Regions 2 and 4)						
Biscayne, Dry Tortugas and Everglades National Parks	Homestead	Florida	X			2
Biscayne, Dry Tortugas and Everglades National Parks	Ochopee	Florida		X		2
Biscayne, Dry Tortugas and Everglades National Parks	Clewiston	Florida		X		1
Blue Ridge Parkway	Cherokee	North Carolina		X		1
Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Gatlinburg	Tennessee	X			2
Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Cherokee	Tennessee	X			8
Southeast Archeological Center, SER NAGPRA Program	Bridgeport	Alabama	X			1



## **APPENDIX J: SECRETARIAL ORDER 3342: OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL REPORTING ON COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS WITH TRIBES**

Secretarial Order 3342, “Identifying Opportunities for Cooperative and Collaborative Partnerships with Federally Recognized Indian Tribes in the Management of Federal Lands and Resources,” was signed in October 2016. The purposes of [Secretarial Order 3342](#) (SO 3342) are to a) encourage cooperative management agreements and other collaborative partnerships between Department of the Interior resource managers and Tribes that will further interests in the management of Federal lands and resources; and b) establish a process and provide institutional support to ensure that land and resource managers evaluate and develop opportunities to further establish partnerships that benefit Tribes and Federal agencies.

The Secretarial Order established an annual requirement to report to the Deputy Secretary on:

*Completed arrangements between the bureaus and tribes, as well as on any arrangements then under consideration. Annual reports should also include any arrangements that were declined and the reasons for such declination. Annual reports should include any benefits the public receives from the arrangements entered into by the bureaus beyond monetary benefits, including, but not limited to, benefits resulting from the use of traditional ecological knowledge, and tribal resources.*

The summary below also identifies efforts currently underway for engaging in new cooperative management opportunities and collaborative partnerships with Tribes. See section V. above for the agreement summary and list of associated Tribes.

### **Alaska Region**

#### ***Current Agreements:***

**Glacier Bay Park and Preserve (GLBA):** Cooperative Agreement to manage the Huna Tribal House with the Hoonah Indian Association. Cooperative Agreement with the Yakutat Tlingit Tribe to offer Journey to Homeland programs. General Agreement with the Hoonah Indian Association and Alaska Native Voices (non-profit arm of Huna Totem ANCSA Corp) to provide interpretive services on cruise ships in the park.

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):** Cooperative Agreement P18AC00205 “Manage Travel for Tribal Consultants and Subsistence Resource Council Members Associated with Katmai National Park and Preserve.” This agreement moves arranging Invitational Travel to a partnering agency (Bristol Bay Native Association, the non-profit arm of Bristol Bay Native Corporation) for five years.

**Kenai Fjords National Park (KEFJ):** “Sugpiaq Significant Places, Oral Histories, and Qayak Building for Kenai Fjords National Park” is an agreement with Chugachmiut, the non-profit arm of Chugach Alaska Corporation. Signed 9/10/2019.

**Lake Clark National Park and Preserve (LACL):** Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Interior National Park Service, Lake Clark National Park and Preserve and

Nondalton Tribal Council and Kijik Corporation. 2/13/2017. P18AC00373 Quk' Taz'un Outdoor Culture Camp at Lake Clark National Park & Preserve with Nondalton Tribal Council 8/17/2018. P18AC00235 Connecting Lake Clark Dena'ina to Archeological Work on Kontrashibuna and Upper Tazimina Lakes at Lake Clark National Park and Preserve with Nondalton Tribal Council 7/28/2018.

**Noatak National Preserve/Western Arctic National Parklands (NOAT/WEAR):** Maniilaq Subsistence Resource Commission Agreement.

**Sitka National Historic Park (SITK):** The park entered into an Annual Funding Agreement with the Sitka Tribe of Alaska for both FY18 and FY19 to provide interpretive services for the park.

***Pending Agreements:***

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):**

Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to restore and mitigate cultural resource damage from an unplanned undertaking under Section 106 in fall of 2014. Three signatories include Paug-Vik Ltd., Inc., King Salmon Tribe, and Bristol Bay Native Corporation (BBNC). All parties are aligned in removing the short section of road that adversely affected an ancient archeological site at Brooks Camp. All parties are nearly in agreement for the mechanisms required to complete the work.

Programmatic Agreement (PA) for NAGPRA protocol; originally signed by several Tribes in 2011-12, now expired. The park has attempted to initiate consultation on this agreement but to date has not received an official response from any federally recognized tribe.

***Declined Agreements:***

N/A

***Public Benefit:***

**Denali National Park (DNA):** In conjunction with Nenana Tribal Council, the Denali National Park Subsistence Resource Commission met on August 28, 2018 in Nenana, AK at the Mitch Demientieff Tribal Hall. The main highlight from the August meeting was a discussion about opportunities for creating partnerships between the Park and the Nenana Tribal Council. Together the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission and the Nenana Tribal Council suggested the Park support the following partnerships:

- Share traditional knowledge with Park interpreters (including JV staff) and the visiting public;
- Engage Native partners in culturally significant projects;
- Develop a video depicting Nenana peoples' traditional subsistence lifestyle;
- Participate actively in annual Nenana "Culture Camp" that is scheduled in July;
- Obtain moose data in NW and Cantwell areas, including outside the Park boundary;
- Offer interpretative bus tours to Nenana for Park staff and students to get more familiar with local subsistence culture;
- Hire more local tribal people at the Park; and
- Develop more integrated projects that look at things like climate, big game, and changes in the ecosystem.

**Katmai National Park and Preserve (KATM):** Cooperative Agreement P18AC00205 “Manage Travel for Tribal Consultants and Subsistence Resource Council Members Associated with Katmai National Park and Preserve.” The agreement facilitates tribal members and members of subsistence resource commissions to travel to consultation and resource meetings.

**Lake Clark National Park and Preserve (LACL):** P18AC00235 directly supports an archeological survey project that will contribute to greater public understanding of the cultural importance of the Kontrashibuna and Upper Tazimina Lakes region. It also allows direct participation in the project by the descendants of the people whose cultural remains will be documented by the survey work. P18AC00373 The culture camp has been a key element of the NPS strengthening relationships with the local communities, working together toward a common goal of educating and re-connecting the local people to their ancestral homelands.

**Noatak National Preserve/Western Arctic National Parklands (NOAT/WEAR):** The involvement of tribal entities, such as Maniilaq, stimulates stakeholder interest in resource stewardship and subsistence activities involving federal lands.

**Sitka National Historic Park (SITK):** Detailed local and traditional knowledge and tribal perspectives were provided to park visitors in summer 2018 and summer 2019.

### **Intermountain Region**

#### ***Current Agreements:***

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** The park engaged an Ancestral Lands crew through an existing Master Task Agreement with Southwest Conservation Corps. The agreement was with the Southwest Conservation Corps and not the Tribes.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** MOA Extension No. 4 with the Crow Nation expired, and NPS extended it to No. 5.

**Canyon de Chelly National Monument (CACH):** The Strategic Agreement Between the Navajo Nation, National Park Service, and Bureau of Indian Affairs for the Cooperative Stewardship of Canyon de Chelly, signed June 22, 2018, outlined the legal roles and management responsibilities in the park.

**Canyonlands National Park (CANY):** The Southeast Utah Group Vegetation Management team used the Ancestral Lands crew through an existing Master Task Agreement with the Southwest Conservation Corps. Funding came from a grant received by the Corps.

**Chickasaw National Recreation Area (CHIC):** Memorandum of Cooperation between the U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Chickasaw National Recreation Area, and The Chickasaw Nation, February 2, 2017.

**Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve (GRSA):** San Luis Valley Inter-agency NAGPRA MOU.

**Hovenweep National Monument (HOVE):** Preservation Maintenance of Prehistoric Structures at Mule Canyon Ruin and Hovenweep National Monument. Task Agreement Number P19AC00287 dated 4/9/2019.

**Mesa Verde National Park Colorado (MEVE):** "General Agreement Between Aztec Ruins National Monument, Chaco Culture National Historical Park, Mesa Verde National Park and Tribes" was renewed 10/11/2017.

**Natural Bridges National Monument (NABR):** Ethnographic Overview and Assessment for Natural Bridges National Monument - P18AC00878, 7/5/2018.

**Pecos National Historical Park (PECO):** The park has an MOU with the Pueblo of Jemez.

**Pipe Spring National Monument (PISP):** Cooperative Agreement between NPS and Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians - Pipe Spring National Monument/Kaibab Reservation Visitor Center and Administrative Facility, dated 10/16/2001 and modified 11/01/2007 (25-year term agreement).

**Southeast Utah Group (SEUG):** Comprehensive Agreement to Address Inadvertent Discoveries under NAGPRA at the parks of the Southeast Utah Group (Arches and Canyonlands National Parks, Hovenweep and Natural Bridges National Monuments) - P17AC00471, signed 5/4/2017

**Valles Caldera National Preserve (VALL):** Pueblo of Jemez Scientific Research Permit for AIRNET Sampling FY 2017-2022, VALL-2017-SCI-0013. Signed April 4, 2017

**White Sands National Park (WNSA):** White Sands National Monument Comprehensive Agreement for Inadvertent Discoveries under NAGPRA.

***Pending Agreements:***

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** NPS Cooperative Agreement between each of the three Tribes stated in our enabling legislation. We do not have the final, signed document, however, it is on file with the NPS IMR Contracting Office.

***Declined Agreements:***

N/A

***Public Benefit:***

**Arches National Park (ARCH):** The Ancestral Lands program requested work opportunities at parks of Southeast Utah Group in order to reconnect youth to their traditional cultural landscape.

**Bandelier National Monument (BAND):** The park consulted with the Pueblo of San Ildefonso on a cultural landscape report, which has resulted in a great collaboration with them on the management of their ancestral village and our detached unit, Tsankawi. The collaboration will lead to specific changes in management practices, which will benefit both the Tribe and the resources we manage there.

**Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area (BICA):** Crow Tribal Chairman is required to present any and all decisions to the elected Legislative Branch; the Legislative Branch then takes this information to the Districts [the people] that they represent.

**Canyon de Chelly National Monument (CACH):** The development of the Strategic Agreement provided clarity on management responsibilities within the park. This agreement also required all parties to execute their responsibilities in a cooperative manner. Moreover, the Agreement serves as the basis for future comprehensive joint management planning. Joint planning should allow the park to be managed through a common vision instead of through conflicting exercises of legal authorities. The public will benefit from a comprehensive plan that leverages, deploys and advocates for resources to promote the shared stewardship of agreed-upon Canyon values.

**Canyonlands National Park (CANY):** Tribes used the Ancestral Lands program to reconnect their youth to the lands and resources important for promoting traditional ecological knowledge.

**Chickasaw National Recreation Area (CHIC):** Joint projects between The Chickasaw Nation and Chickasaw National Recreation Area, such as the Inkana Trail, the Chickasaw Arts Show, Candlelight Tour, Eagle Watch, and interpretive programs, all benefit the public.

**Fort Laramie National Historic Site (FOLA):** There has been an increase in the knowledge and awareness of tribal perspectives to the park's education and interpretation of the resource.

**Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (GLCA):** The public benefit derived from tribal/park consultations has been increased education on cultural resource importance from tribal perspectives, trainings related to federal employment, and awareness of economic opportunities in the park.

**Grand Teton National Park (GRTA):** The park has provided the Tribes with greater transparency in how the park manages its resources, which has resulted in better relationships between park staff and tribal partners.

**Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve (GRSA):** The park communicated with the Tribes on bison management, documented in the Great Sand Dunes Ungulate Management Plan (ROD 2019).

**Hovenweep National Monument (HOVE):** Preservation Maintenance of Prehistoric Structures at Mule Canyon Ruin and Hovenweep National Monument, Task Agreement Number P19AC00287 dated 4/9/2019. In addition to achieving valuable cultural resource preservation maintenance goals, this project fulfilled an important public purpose by engaging Native American participants in shared environmental and cultural resource stewardship. The experience provided hands-on work experience on multiple cultural-resource preservation projects, while facilitating a greater understanding of natural and cultural aspects of national parks.

**Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (LIBI):** For FY 2019, the Bighorn Canyon NRA increased their social media with history and stories of the Crow culture and the preservation of natural and cultural resources.

**Natural Bridges National Monument (NABR):** Ethnographic Overview and Assessment for Natural Bridges National Monument - P18AC00878, 7/5/2018. This agreement engaged the Tribes in shared environmental and cultural stewardship of park resources and promoted greater public participation in cultural heritage preservation programs.



13. Natural Bridges NM: Members of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe with researchers from the Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology of the University of Arizona at Natural Bridges National Monument. Photo courtesy of the University of Arizona.

**Pipe Spring National Monument (PISP):** The park worked with the Tribe regarding access to recreation on tribal resources, education through shared traditional knowledge, preservation of tribal cultural objects in museum storage/exhibits.

**Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (SAND):** The park continually consulted three Tribes about the content of interpretation and public education that the public heard when they visited the park site. This is designed by our enabling legislation.

**Southeast Utah Group (SEUG):** Tribes engaged in shared environmental and cultural stewardship of cultural landscapes and benefitted from their participation in cultural heritage preservation at the Southeast Utah Group parks. Transferring traditional knowledge facilitated the appropriate disposition of ancestors and their belongings.

**Tumacácori National Historical Park (TUMA):** The public gained a better and richer interpretation of the park through consultation. The public, Tribes, and staff benefitted from partnerships. The Tribes benefitted from knowing treatment strategies, and the park benefitted from discussions.

**Valles Caldera National Preserve (VALL):** Pueblo of Jemez Scientific Research Permit for AIRNET Sampling FY 2017-2022, VALL-2017-SCI-0013, signed April 4, 2017. The agreement provided the surrounding tribal communities with scientific research opportunities.

## **Midwest Region**

### ***Current Agreements:***

**Apostle Islands National Seashore (APIS):** General Agreement- exercising treaty rights on ceded territories within lakeshore. General Agreement- Interagency & Intertribal Piping Plover Protection.

**Badlands National Park (BADL):** 1976 MOA for management of South Unit signed by Secretary of Interior and Tribal President. Park Superintendent opinion is that this agreement should be carefully reviewed and jointly updated.

**Buffalo National River (BUFF):** Plant Gathering Agreement

**Grand Portage National Monument (GRPO):** FY 2020 Annual Funding Agreement

**Homestead National Monument of America (HOME):** Programmatic Agreement among the NPS (DOI), the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office, the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma, and the Ponca Tribe of Oklahoma regarding implementation of 36 CFR 800 for activities related to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act at HOME March 6, 2019.

**Isle Royale National Annual (ISRO):** 1 Funding Agreement through Tribal Self Governance Act.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** Is currently engaged in a contract with the Nez Perce Tribe entitled, "An Oral History and Traditional Use Study of the Lolo Trail/Lewis and Clark Historic Trail System" that was awarded on April 6, 2019.

### ***Pending Agreements:***

**Fort Scott National Historic Site (FOSC):** FOSC is developing a NHPA/106 Programmatic Agreement in collaboration with The Osage Nation.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** Pending - an agreement with the Pokagon Band of the Potawatomi for seed and plant collection for traditional purposes.

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** Is currently working with the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe to develop a collaborative partnership for a summer YCC program. A Memorandum of Agreement was circulated to Tribes for possible signature as concurring parties as part of the Museum Exhibit Replacement Project consultation.

**River Raisin National Historic Battlefield (RIRA):** Annual funding agreement

### ***Declined Agreements:***

N/A

***Public Benefit:***

**Apostle Islands National Seashore (APIS):** Ongoing TEK project with Red Cliff & Bad River Bands of Lake Superior Chippewa Piping plover monitors on Long Island. Ojibwe interpreter provides public programs in park and at schools. **Badlands National Park (BADL):** Tribal participation in cultural and heritage celebration events for the education and enjoyment of park visitors. Tribal input on management and protection of resources benefits the park and by extension the public. Tribal input on projects and planning benefits the park and by extension the public.

**Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO):** The park cannot function in an authentic way without extensive tribal cooperation. Every service we provide to the public has been enriched by tribal input, or tribal content. Through tribal consultation, our new Long-Range Interpretive Plan, when fully implemented, will provide visitors with far more compelling and provocative content than previously offered.

**Fort Scott National Historic Site (FOSS):** Benefits to the public include deeper understanding of historic events and traditional Native American culture and knowledge expressed through educational curriculum developed in collaboration with tribal partners. Additional benefits include improved projects because of tribal perspectives gained through NHPA/106 consultation.

**Grand Portage National Monument (GRPO):** Reservation community member employment, mentoring and skill development opportunities through several park programs including the park maintenance division, the Grand Portage Conservation Crew, and the teen ranger and mentorship programs. Technical assistance with the tribal prescribed fire and forestry programs. Assistance with tribal cultural resource management, including section 106 review of tribal projects. Enhanced interpretation for park visitors on Lake Superior Ojibwe culture, the fur trade and natural resources. Working together to upgrade the park and community sewer system. Protecting historic resources. The NPS and Grand Portage Band co-manage GRPO and consistently have visitor satisfaction scores for near 100 percent. Every visitor to GRPO benefits from our co-management agreement.

**Indiana Dunes National Park (INDU):** The public will benefit from the new waysides, exhibits, and programming that will be developed for the Native American Cultural Trail project, and from the new waysides along the Bailly/Chellberg Trail.

**Knife River Indian Villages National Historic Site (KNRI):** The park, and therefore the public, benefits from our close relationship with the MHA Nation (Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota). We work closely with the Tribe to guide interpretation, management, and research projects.





14. Mary Baker (on the right), Deputy THPO, Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation (MHA Nation), at Sakakawea Village during summer field investigations. Photo courtesy of Alisha Deegan, KNRI.

**Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (LECL):** The primary benefits of the existing agreements are the preservation and dissemination of traditional knowledge regarding the stewardship of the Lolo Trail, a National Historic Landmark, as well as increased understanding of traditional tribal practices and how those can be better adapted to modern stewardship of national resources in the area.

**Missouri National Recreational River (MNRR):** The Park's (MNRR) first ever visitor educational film features contributions and footage from three contributing culturally affiliated Tribes. The information conveyed from tribal members included in the film imparts the traditional connectivity to the river (resources) by the Tribes over eons of time, which gives the visitor a better perspective and understanding of Indian culture in general.

**Pipestone National Monument (PIPE):** Tribes affiliated with PIPE provide first person accounts of the park's significance to native communities. PIPE is significant for its traditional cultural use. Tribal involvement is central to identifying, protecting, and interpreting all park resources.

**Wind Cave National Park (WICA):** Our new exhibits will tell a broader and more accurate story as a result of our meetings.

## **Northeast Region**

### ***Current Agreements:***

**Statue of Liberty National Monument (STLI):** Memorandum of Agreement Among the National Park Service, Statue of Liberty National Monument; New York State Historic Preservation Officer; New Jersey State Historic Preservation Officer; Regarding the Proposed Construction of a Secondary Screening Facility on Liberty Island in New York. Signed: 3/28/17; Memorandum of Agreement Among the National Park Service, Statue of Liberty National Monument; New York State Historic Preservation Officer; New Jersey State Historic Preservation Officer; and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Proposed Construction of Liberty Island Museum in New York. Signed: 10/14/17

### ***Pending:***

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** Memorandum of Agreement for Consultations, Treatment, and Disposition of Human Remains and Cultural Items That May Be Discovered Inadvertently During Planned Activities at Martin Van Buren National Historic Site was signed by the Superintendent November 18, 2019. The document is with the Stockbridge Munsee Community awaiting review and signature. It will be sent to the Delaware Tribe of Indians and the Delaware Nation for review and signature.

### ***Declined:***

**Colonial National Historical Park (COLO):** Formal letters were sent inviting Tribes to consult on an archeological project that was contracted inside of COLO at a site that is eroding from the shoreline. They agreed and expressed interest to participate. A MOA was sent to them and the park waited for responses. When the Park met with tribal representatives in Nov 2019 to discuss projects at Werowocomoco they did not sign.

**Statue Of Liberty National Monument (STLI):** The Stockbridge-Munsee Community declined to sign the above listed MOA for Construction of a Secondary Screening Facility citing that they were satisfied with the consultation up to that point; did not feel the project would impact resources that they were concerned about, and no longer wished to be included in consultation on that specific project.

### ***Public Benefit:***

**Cape Cod National Seashore (CACO):** Past consultations with Tribes assisted with exhibit development, and past tribal festivals and other special events held at CACO have engaged the local community with tribal heritage and history.

**Katahdin Woods and Waters NM (KAWO):** The Tribes have presented Flint Knapping to the public in the monument and to school groups in the monument.

**Martin Van Buren National Historic Site (MAVA):** Public benefit has not yet been realized. Tribal consultation on the execution and development of projects will yield enhanced understanding of tribal resources when planned archeology projects occur.

**Northeast Regional Office (NERO) Conservation and Recreation Assistance Division:** Trail/recreation access; traditional knowledge of river management practices.

**Statue of Liberty National Monument and Ellis Island:** The arrangements currently in force with the Tribes were critical pieces of the park's efforts to greatly improve visitor experiences on Liberty Island and Ellis Island. The agreements to consult and cooperate on the construction of a new museum and a new screening facility benefitted the public by increasing access to the resources of the park and improving the experience for those members of the public who visit the park. Major improvements included: increased access to the museum exhibits, including the original torch of the statue; more efficient security screening, resulting in decreased wait times and a more comfortable experience; improved appearance of the main approach to the statue through the removal of the existing screening tent. Additionally, the tribal consultation regarding a project to beautify Liberty Island through plantings and landscape changes was a major part of this effort to improve the visitor experience in the landscape of Liberty Island. The tribal input that was incorporated into the project was invaluable in ensuring a successful result that has been positively received by visitors to the park.

### **Pacific West Region**

#### ***Current Agreements:***

**Great Basin National Park (GRBA):** Information sharing agreement in place with three Tribes since 2016, will be updated this year.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** 5-Party Agreement, 1990; FCRPS Systemwide Programmatic Agreement, 2015.

**Mount Rainier National Park (MORA):** Memorandum of Understanding between U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Mount Rainier National Park and Cowlitz Indian Tribe, 03/21/2016; Memorandum of Understanding between U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Mount Rainier National Park and Nisqually Indian Tribe, 08/29/2019; Mount Rainier National Park Special Use Permit Nisqually Designated Tribal Use Area, 12/07/2017; Mount Rainier National Park Special Use Permit Cowlitz Designated Tribal Use Area, 05/01/2019

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** General Agreement among the National Park Service, Redwood National Park; California Department of Parks and Recreation, Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park; and the Yurok Tribe. G8480150002 Signed 07/04/2015; Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Annual Funding Agreement between the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service and the Yurok Tribe. G84801701. Signed 09/27/2016; General Agreement between the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service and the Yurok Tribe to Operate the National Park Service Water System at Requa. Modification Signed 10/15/2015, Modification 01 extended period of performance to 07/20/2020; Memorandum of Understanding between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Ventana Wildlife Society, and the Yurok Tribe on California Condor Conservation. Signed April 11, 2014; AFA Project Statement for Demolish Former Hostel signed 08/13/2019, P19AC00678, G848017001, 124,029.54; AFA Project Statement for Air Quality Monitoring signed 09/05/2017 P17AC01123, G848017001, \$4000. Closed 06/30/2018; AFA Project Statement for Air Quality Monitoring signed 11/29/2018 P18AC01414, G848017001, \$4000. Closed 09/30/2019; AFA Project Statement for Air Quality

Monitoring signed 09/20/2019 P19AC00888, G848017001, \$4000; AFA Project Statement Lower B500 Road Removal signed 09/10/2019 P19AC01047, G848017001 \$188,800.00; AFA Project Statement for Perform Trail Repairs with Yurok Youth signed 09/01/2019 P19AC00959, G848017001 \$49,207.00; Memorandum of Understanding among the NPS, Yurok Tribe, and Humboldt State University Sponsored Programs Foundation for a Case Study in Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Elk Management at Redwood National Park, G848U0001 signed 3/9/2018; General Agreement among the National Park Service, Redwood National Park; California Department of Parks and Recreation, Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Park, Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park, Tolowa Dunes State Park, Pelican Beach State Park; and the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation. G8480-16-0001 Signed 11/30/2015.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** Yosemite permitted and coordinated tribal monitoring of construction projects under cooperative agreements during 2019 (El Portal Sewer System Phase II and Traffic Loop Counters). Utilized CHIPS crew (local Native American forestry/training crew) to perform over 8 specific projects including timber/brush clearing, meadow restoration and other projects.

***Pending Agreements:***

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** Timbisha Homeland Act includes cooperative management areas. The MOAs with the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe have expired, and the Park and Tribe are working to update and reinstate them.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** Agreement Among the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), National Park Service, and the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) Regarding Tribal Consultation Protocols for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Agreement in draft form as of close of FY19.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** FCRPS Grand Coulee Dam Historic Property Management Plan, 2019 (unsigned)

**Lassen Volcanic National Park (LAVO):** Draft MOU currently being written by NPS staff and will be sent to tribal council for their additions and edits.

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** Park has prioritized updating agreements and anticipates signed agreements in FY20. Currently park has multiple expired agreements.

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** NPS is process of negotiating a new Annual Funding Agreement with the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, under the Indian Self Determination Education Assistance Act; NPS is in the incipient stages of developing a General Agreement with the Elk Valley Rancheria in partnership with California State Parks to outline the government-to-government relationship among the three parties; NPS and Yurok Tribe in process of discussing Natural Resources System Unit Agreement for approximately 1400 acres of lands of REDW that overlap with the Yurok Reservation Boundary.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** Yosemite continues to negotiate with seven traditionally associated Tribes and groups for their respective input and review of the draft Programmatic Agreement for streamlined Section 106 Consultation between NPS, CA, SHPO and ACHP.

***Declined Agreements:***

N/A

***Public Benefit:***

**Channel Islands National Park (CHIS):** Public (visitor and staff) opportunity to witness tribal cultural event: Tomol Celebration; collaboration on California Islands Symposium program (education) has direct public benefit by including tribal perspectives and opportunities to share knowledge.

**City of Rocks National Reserve (CIRO):** The new waysides will tell the full story of City of Rocks to the park's visitors, this will include for the first time, the American Indian story of the Reserve and surrounding areas in their own words.

**Death Valley National Park (DEVA):** The Timbisha Shoshone Tribe has been actively involved in designing the main Visitor Center and Scotty's Castle Visitor Center exhibits. These exhibits include information and objects that show the public the Tribe's history, as well as involvement with both the Park and the building of Scotty's Castle.

**Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve (EBEY):** The public is very interested in Native American affiliations with the area and incorporating this into interpretive media enriches the visitor experience. Several Tribes are very interested in native prairie restoration occurring within the Reserve and have visited NPS and non-tribal partners to get additional information, see restoration sites, and explore further collaboration on native plant recovery especially plants that were a traditional food (e.g. camas, wild carrot).

**Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (FOVA):** Tribal input into the traditional use study and interpretive media influenced park interpretation of cultural and natural resources of interest and significance to American Indian communities. This has provided the visitor with a more expansive understanding of the park and its significance to a large variety of stakeholders. Increased interest in restoration of remnant native habitats has provided an impetus to begin to better document and implement cultural landscape plans.

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA):** The public has benefited by the Tribe's participation in Indigenous Land Acknowledgements and in Interpretive Training for several park partner organizations whose missions include site-based park resource education for local schools. The public has also benefited from the Tribe's participation in the development of new waysides and visitor center exhibits.

**Great Basin National Park (GRBA):** Improved communication and tribal input.

**Joshua Tree National Park (JOTR):** JOTR is working to incorporate indigenous language and information into the park's interpretive materials and site names. This is a benefit to the general public, in terms of education, and for the Tribes, in terms of cultural acknowledgement and environmental justice. JOTR is also working with traditionally associated groups to bring tribal members to the park and is working towards established connections between the park's Education staff and the traditionally associated Tribes' youth organizations.

**Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (LARO):** Fuller understanding of the cultural history of Lake Roosevelt which provides for better management of the cultural resources within the LRNRA.

**Mount Rainier National Park (MORA):** The Nisqually Indian Tribe is currently collaborating with Mount Rainier National Park to publish the report *Plants, Tribal Traditions, and the Mountain Practices and Effects of the Nisqually Tribal Plant Gathering at Mount Rainier National Park*. The report will contain the results of five years of traditional plant gathering research on three species traditionally harvested by Nisqually tribal members on Mount Rainier. It will offer summary considerations and recommendations for administering traditional plant gathering activities in a manner that minimizes impact to harvested plants and associated plant communities. We hope that by doing so, Tribes and the park will be able to work together to strike a balance that will provide for continuation of traditional Native American plant gathering practices while remaining consistent with National Park Service mandates to administer park lands and resources in a manner that maintains them unimpaired for generations to come. The park's consultation with the Cowlitz Tribe and Yakama Nation in developing the Ohanapecosh Visitor Center Exhibits will give visitors historical and contemporary context of the traditionally associated Taidnapam. The park's consultation with the Nisqually on interpretive programs has resulted in the document "Mount Rainier Interpretive Themes and the Nisqually Tribe" which will be a great resource for developing interpretive programs.

**Nez Perce National Historical Park (NEPE):** The public purpose is compliance with laws requiring federal agencies to consult with Tribes on various issues affecting them (which includes nearly every activity engaged in by WHMI, NEPE, or BIHO) and which requires substantial investment of time and funding by Tribes to accomplish, and fulfillment of three park missions (and various other NPS objectives) which rely upon tribal knowledge, representation, and perspective to accomplish. Additional public benefit results from NPS access to information and accuracy regarding tribal culture, history, or cultural resources held only by Tribes, cost-savings achieved through cost-sharing and access to physical or human resources held by Tribes but not by NPS which are then applied to projects within the NPS managed lands. Tribes are also landholders of multiple park sites.

**Redwood National and State Parks (REDW):** Some examples of public benefit from government-to-government consultations with Tribes and resulting agreements includes the following: The Yurok Tribe's watershed department demolished the former Redwood Hostel under a project statement that was prepared under the Annual Funding Agreement between the NPS and the Yurok Tribe. This provided training and technical job experience to tribal members. In addition, the project removed a public hazard. It was a benefit to members of three federally recognized Tribes that had long wanted to see the building come down, due to its proximity to nearby cultural resources. It also served a public benefit by fulfilling the interest of the family that had previously owned the property who supported removing the building.

Air quality monitoring provides a public benefit to understanding more about local and regional changes that may be occurring with Air Quality. The Yurok Tribe has been conducting this work for the NPS under Annual Funding agreement for many years now. Restoration of old logging roads improves habitat for threatened and endangered fish species, which can bring more visitors to the parks to see restoration activities and improvements to fish and wildlife. And the

General Agreement with the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation has improved the frequency of collaboration among the Superintendent and the Tribal Council, this is leading to better inclusion of the Tolowa in projects and education and interpretative experiences for the public in their ancestral territory. This collaboration resulted in radio news stories about the effects of climate change on archeological resources along the northern California coast that were picked up nationally. In addition, the NPS, Yurok Tribe, and Tolowa Dee-ni conducted a panel presentation at the California Indian Conference in April of 2018 to discuss General Agreements for Government-to-Government consultations that was attended by conference attendees and students, leading to more awareness about how such agreements work, their challenges, and some successes.

**San Juan Island National Historical Park (SAJH):** Protection of historic properties of cultural and religious significance to American Indian Tribes. Enrichment of public interpretation programs from tribal participation in content development.

**Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SAMO):** Tribal monitoring and project feedback maintains transparent management of public lands.

**Yosemite National Park (YOSE):** The public greatly benefits from various tribal activities and projects including traditional celebrations, construction of traditional round house in the park, and consultations regarding Yosemite museum exhibits and interpretive programs. The public gains and increases general awareness of tribal history and accurate information. Park programs with tribal consultation and cooperation greatly benefits inclusivity of underrepresented groups.

### **Southeast Region**

#### ***Current Agreements:***

**Great Smoky Mountain National Park (GRSM):** The park has a general agreement for Sochan Gathering for Traditional Purposes by the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

#### ***Pending Agreements:***

N/A

#### ***Declined Agreements:***

N/A

#### ***Public Benefit:***

**Great Smoky Mountain National Park (GRSM):** Culturally appropriate and accurate education programs resulting from consultation. Collaboration on protection of natural resources (elk management, air quality, restoration).