

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

Anchorage, Alaska, April 27, 2012

A. Proceedings

Chuck Hanson, Econometrica, introduced Alberta Stephan, who then provided the invocation.

Raphael Bostic, HUD's Assistant Secretary of Policy Development and Research: This study is really important, it demonstrates need and helps focus where efforts should be directed. The last survey was conducted in 1996 and that is a long time lapse. We are making decisions on resource allocation based on this outdated understanding. Resource deployment requires information and this study is one important way to get that information. PD&R understands this, Congress understands this and we are glad to have a Congressional mandate to execute this study. I oversee PD&R activities such as research, data collection, and analysis. Sandra Henriquez oversees Indian programs; she is a tireless fighter and warrior in Washington on behalf of tribal interests. In this consultation environment, I want to demonstrate PD&R's commitment and that is why I am here.

Let me set the stage for today's conversation – this is a conversation where everyone can talk; no one should leave with an unanswered question or an unspoken thought. I desire a shared understanding of the study and one another.

What is the study? This is an explicit update to the study conducted in 1996. It is designed to provide information regarding what is going on today with respect to tribal needs. Our charge is to provide a national level estimate of the collective needs across all tribal lands; it is not designed to be a tribal or regional survey but is an aggregate study to understand the magnitude of problems nationally. Information is power and with information, it changes the stories you can tell and what you can do; information is compelling. Hard evidence provides quantifiable foundations and that basis is increasingly important. Congress makes hard decisions with limited funds. Evidence is powerful to make a case.

Again, this is an aggregate level needs study, and is not about the formula. It will not be done in time for formula negotiations and will not inform those. The study is a collective exercise, not a federal government only exercise. It needs to be shared and informed by input from tribal communities and executed in collaboration. Our experience demonstrates that we cannot simply descend upon a tribe, collect information, and leave. We are spending time in advance to get buy-in so that tribes will be engaged, supportive and participate fully to get the best information possible. This will help ensure that we receive complete and accurate information as well so that our results are worthwhile. That is why we continue to engage with tribal leadership from all

over and will continue to work with tribes during survey administration (e.g. tribal members as survey interviewers).

We spent the past 18 months conducting a series of listening sessions. PD&R does not have the funds to do a census of every tribe in America. We don't have the ability to do that so we are sampling tribes. We recognize that some tribes do want to carry out their own surveys and PD&R staff will be supportive in any of those endeavors.

Let me explain the process of the study. First, we develop research questions, a timetable, and such; this is the design phase and we are in that phase now. Next is the implementation phase where we go out in the field with the instrument and ask the questions. Once you have that information, you perform numerical analysis and statistical assessments and write the draft report. Each stage takes time. We have been in the design phase for 18 months already and have several months remaining. Implementation will include a survey of up to 1,600 people and that takes time, though we hope it will not exceed about 6 months. Performing the analysis and writing the draft report also takes time. Overall this is a lengthy process and the goal is to be transparent during the entire process. We have and will continue to seek input throughout this process. One sheet in your packet of materials demonstrates some specific instances of how input has shaped and evolved instruments, the overall study, etc. already. This process will make the study positive, powerful, and strong.

During the next steps, we hope to garner support of leadership from tribes. Again, your packet includes a list of tribes in the draft sample.

Bill Zachares, HUD Office of Native American Programs (ONAP) Regional Administrator: Welcome to this consultation. As you are aware, HUD is committed to the government to government relationship, especially here in Alaska. This is a formal opportunity comment. Today's consultation is a continuation of a commitment that began with outreach sessions here last March. The purpose of the study is to better quantify housing needs nationwide to better assess need. After these brief presentations, the floor will be open to hear your thoughts and address your questions. None of the instruments are final and this is an opportunity to provide feedback that will shape this study.

Chuck Hanson provided a brief overview of the day's agenda and flow.

Jennifer Stoloff, Study Manager, PD&R: As mentioned, there was a session in March 2011 and that session led to changes and this is another opportunity to get your views heard and we can make modifications if needed. I am looking forward to a productive session today. Please remember to sign-in on the sheet. We will make a priority to accept questions and comments first from tribal leaders and elders during the open forum later today.

HUD has a strong interest in undertaking this study and the Congressional mandate provides funding and opportunity. This study is conducted by PD&R, the research wing of HUD. We

work closely with ONAP, our partner in this study. The research team includes contractors, led by the Urban Institute, who has partnered with NORC, Econometrica, and SSI. We are all working together as a team and as you heard; this is a follow up of the 1996 study. The core of this study is the household survey, a key part that differentiates this from other studies. It is very important that we get feedback on these instruments. There will also be case studies about Native Americans in urban areas, a lender survey, and a standalone study for Hawaii.. Regarding the materials in your packet, official questions can be submitted on the sheet provided. This can be completed and submitted at any time today or in the future until the time when consultations are complete.

Nancy Pindus, Urban Institute: Tom Kingsley, the Principal Investigator, is excited to update the 1996 study and to work again with the tribes. This study presents both an opportunity and a challenge. It is patterned after the 1996 study with major enhancements in coverage and quality including a larger sample size. The 1996 report was the first of its kind. This study has demanding goals including credible and updated information to allow a more effective use of resources.. The project team includes researchers and personnel with experience in housing research, surveys, and especially in working with the Native American population. This includes NORC, Econometrica, and SSI, a native owned firm. The main research topics to be covered include demographic, social and economic conditions on tribal lands and the needs of Native Americans living in urban areas. We will examine the entire country, including all geographies, and will also incorporate census data and data from ONAP. Homeownership, homelessness, and home lending are all included topics. Also included are housing policies and HUD programs, the IHBG grant, and other relevant housing programs.

Chuck Hanson provided the ground rules for the open forum period, and welcomed elders and tribal leaders to first provide comments or ask questions.

B. Questions and Answers

Bill Miller, Dot Lake: What do you consider is a small area versus an urban area?

Jennifer Stoloff: The threshold for inclusion decreased from 250 to 150 tribal members. We use census area counts and that depends on who self-reports as Alaska Native or Native American.

Bill Miller: Suppose the example is 47 tribal members living on a tribal land.

Jennifer Stoloff: That is a small area.

Bill Miller: It is hard to increase the village size when you don't have the funding or land base to support the increase. This results in stagnation.

Raphael Bostic: This survey will not influence how resources are spent across tribes or regions that have access to funds. Is a way to quantify aggregate the total need, after which point we

convince people how large the pot should be. There will be a subsequent conversation to discuss how to allocate across tribes and nothing at this point that will influence that. The survey is not going to answer every question. In fact, it may raise more questions that need to be investigated and explored. I hope a whole set of new informed questions are sparked to address the issues you raise. There are small tribes everywhere; we heard in Albuquerque from small tribes in California. This feeds a larger conversation about how to support tribes with respect to other characteristics (e.g., gaming status, size). Third, it is important that we emphasize that this is a survey of individuals — what the average Native American might experience or not — not a tribe-based survey. That reality has informed how we approached the sampling — no one tribe is any more or less important. The results will be blown up to the count of people, not tribes. I understand the significant concerns you have, but this study will not address those, although we are willing to discuss them.

Joe Williams: I am attending this meeting primarily because of the needs process. What struck me this morning is that this is labeled as a tribal consultation meeting. I was President of tribe for six years and what came out during that time was consultation. You need the council to consult. Alaska has 230 some tribes and today's meeting does not represent that figure. Alaska Federation of Natives has an annual meeting here at another time and that represents many more tribes. Alaska is two-thirds of the size of the mainland and this is the only meeting to be held here. To have the survey done in only one area of Alaska is not doing the rest of Alaska proper. I believe tribal input is absolutely imperative and who better knows what is going on than tribal leaders. I haven't had an opportunity to look over the survey but I am thinking about the kids back home. I am 68 years of age and I have my own home. But kids today do not have that luxury. If it hasn't already been stated, we in Alaska do things different because we are different. There are 231 tribes in Alaska but no tribal lands; there is one reservation in Alaska tied to the ONAP Northwest region. You have a responsibility to have consultations with 231 tribes. The homework needs to be done by HUD to understand how you are trying to make Alaska fit within your cookie cutter approach. Would like to see more federally recognized tribes participating than housing authority directors.

Raphael Bostic: While HUD has a consultation policy, research activities are not obligated to produce a consultation. But it is extraordinary that we have gone this far to conduct these consultations, because the Secretary thinks it is important and we are responding in ways not obligated and doing as much as possible. I am troubled that this is the first time you have seen the survey. Drafts have available for at least 18 months; these were sent to a number of tribes across the country and are also available online. It is your obligation and opportunity to respond with thoughts, comments, and identified issues; we are trying to be as transparent as possible because we share the concern that tribal input is paramount. I cannot visit every one of the 231 tribes but this meeting was advertised with direct letters to every tribe in Alaska. Tribes could deputize a representative and had an obligation and opportunity to respond here or elsewhere at another time. HUD has an obligation to do good research and analysis and studies and this

demands transparency and outreach which is why these consultations are being conducted. It is simply not fair to say HUD hasn't tried to engage tribes. Last, every tribe and every place is different and does things their own way. This is a challenge faced by the Federal Government – to find ways to execute policy and programs in sound ways, while recognizing that they may not fully embrace the broad diversity of this country. But that does not mean we don't understand and value diversities. They inform our approaches as much as possible. As said earlier, we will engage each tribe in the survey sample as we move to implementation to get input on how to best implement at that particular tribe. One reason we are out here is to let you know we are taking this process of asking people seriously. If things we hear make sense, we will make changes. That process will continue beyond this meeting.

Dale Williams: Thank you Mr. Secretary for going above and beyond. Information is power as you said. The tribes' uniqueness is that we lived in that area before the Russians arrived, before the Americans. Native people make up 17% of total population and are mostly landless. We do have a lot of housing needs. People compete for housing in the community and it has always been in quite short supply. I have a question regarding urban communities; does Sitka fit into that profile? We are 8500 people.

Raphael Bostic: This is the most difficult part of doing this household survey. We are charged with identifying needs on tribal lands specifically. People who do not live on tribal lands are not included in the scope of the study.

Jennifer Stoloff: The urban designation is for larger cities. We are doing a thorough analysis of census data for the country and in that piece of study; all towns in Alaska will be included. However Sitka is not likely to be included in the household survey or urban case study. There is a weakness because we cannot cover every community in every piece of the study.

Raphael Bostic: The study is comprised of mixed methods and approaches; it includes several components such as household interviews, case studies, census data, and a survey of TDHEs. That last component is sufficiently open so that every organization can participate via web based survey. We are trying as much as possible with limited resources to reach out and get in touch with as many voices in the housing space as possible. We are hopeful for outreach. Organizations in Sitka should participate in everything they have access to.

Benjamin Miyasatos: 1996 is 16 years ago and that is the date of the last native housing needs study. Is this lag because of politics? If so, it shouldn't be. This should be done every 5-10 years regardless of the political environment. Is there at least one tribe from the 1996 study included in this sample this time?

Jennifer Stoloff: Because the sample is a random draw, there may or may not be any replication from 1996.

Raphael Bostic: That is a great question, and we will investigate and get an answer out. I agree it is bad that this study took 16 years to be completed again. This starts the conversation about the need for data and evidence to inform policy making. We are thinking of convening a conference when the study is finalized where results can be shared and meaning can be discussed to drive actions for the period until the next study is completed. In Washington, crises often drive agenda and mindset. Without a conversation between the community and Washington, the 1996 study results probably fell by the wayside as the next focus arose. This time, we want to invest resources to keep the conversation flowing.

Tim Gilmartin: I noticed on the study heading that it includes Hawaii? How is Hawaii treated?

Raphael Bostic: They are treated the same in terms of strategy, however, they are funded with separate money.

Tim Gilmartin: Is Hawaii being aggregated?

Raphael Bostic: No, there will be a separate Hawaii report.

Tim Gilmartin: So why isn't Alaska a separate report?

Raphael Bostic: The issue is about the formulas in some ways; this impacts the sampling frame. Hawaii is different, with a long history of different policy treatment.

Tim Gilmartin: Geographic difference is the issue. For example, it may be 300 miles to the nearest Home Depot. I can't see why we aren't treated separate for geography alone. Is the data from Alaska only available to Alaska or will it be all aggregate? We need the results for the power.

Raphael Bostic: That is a difficult request. The sampling frame is designed to blow up to the entire population of the country, and is not regionally representative. A second issue is that since we aren't surveying every tribe, there would have to be some agreement to make the results publicly available.

Tim Gilmartin: Would local surveys be included in a possible conference?

Raphael Bostic: Yes, and also the TDHE surveys. One idea for the conference is to think about interesting special topics as breakout sessions. I have no evidence to support this, but on some level I think there may be surprises about nature of the similarities of challenges. These may be more than expected and there is a value in comparative assessments. Remember that there are remote places in the continental US as well.

Tim Gilmartin: The results from Alaska may skew the overall results.

Bill Miller: What is considered a tribal land in Alaska?

Raphael Bostic: Villages.

Bill Miller: But they are not tribal lands.

Raphael Bostic: Agreed, and I apologize for mistake.

Bill Miller: The majority of the land base here belongs to corporations.

Dan Duame: We serve some 180 tribes associated with TDHEs. I appreciate the efforts HUD is making to be open and transparent. We tend to be a little protective, perhaps paranoid, of our interests. We have honest concerns about the study and its potential use, but we are here to help. There is a strong interest in seeing that the study is well executed and used for the right purposes. We are also a solution oriented group and not here to simply complain. We want to provide what we can to help this be a better process. In that way, take this on the ground experience and comments seriously. We know how far into this process you are and we know you are sincere. We acknowledge that past comments have been taken into consideration although not all responded to 100% satisfaction. On the bigger picture, we understand the methodological random sampling protocols, however we hope you are willing to acknowledge that the process, as well as intended, is not perfect. In particular, as to sampling, if there are openings, consider the limited sampling of household surveys in Alaska. Three tribes in Alaska are part of the sample. The three village sample does not really give you a representative sampling of Alaska. As to how that fits into the national picture, it is not representative of Alaska. It will not provide good data. I've also had discussions with Jennifer Stoloff about the use of the data and access to it. We understand it is a national survey; however, to the extent we can use and look at the data, that would be good. Perhaps there is a possibility of opening up some sort of web based survey for additional participation. This could get to the issue of representative sampling. I would like to hear a comment on the opportunity for web based participation. If we organized our own well-orchestrated effort with a high level of participation, could that data then be used not as a footnote or appendix but part of official data for Alaska?

Raphael Bostic: The survey as designed is not supposed to try to be representative of Alaska. It is supposed to be a national picture and Alaska is part of that nation. The way it has been constructed is that the nation has been divided into a set of fairly large regions and, within those regions, tribes are divided according to size. These are sort of "buckets" of region/size. Then we perform random draws from those buckets. The randomness is part of what makes this exercise statistically valid.

I am interested in trying to pursue to a way to make it possible for anyone who is interested (individual or consortium) to respond. All of the survey instruments will be available and can be used to execute any local studies as desired. HUD will help train people to administer surveys. This is a challenge HUD has, that is we have no discretionary money. The money we have will be spent on a survey as designed and mandated by Congress. We are trying to minimize cost as much as possible so that local survey efforts are affordable. I am not sure Alaska representative

data can be included as part of the main study. However, I would be comfortable issuing a statement supporting the validity of an Alaska survey and its findings.

Dan Duame: Is there extra money to do this?

Raphael Bostic: No, Congress appropriated only enough money for this survey as designed and these consultations. However a training program will be developed and made broadly available. Design of instruments is authorized.

Dan Duame: What you are saying?

Raphael Bostic: The final survey instruments will be made available to everyone.

Dan Duame: So you would make the survey available, we would have to execute and analyze it ourselves, and then HUD would issue a supporting statement. But that information would not be included in the official study.

Raphael Bostic: That is correct. Another resource that people have access to and rarely tap into is academic institutions. Students look for opportunities to take data and clean, analyze, etc. Please reach out to institutions in Alaska and beyond, and see if you can get technical people to support and engage with the exercise.

Dan Duame: I would like to see some avenue for additional data input into the survey. Even though we understand it's a national survey, if the input is not representative the national study is flawed.

Raphael Bostic: No, it is not. Any national study can be made from a very small subset of the population. For example, political surveys that have data inputs from New York and not Alaska. This is not flawed; it is just a different measurement. We are trying to say something for the nation.

Dan Duame: I don't disagree that the survey is valid and good. However, I believe it is statistically valid but will not truly show the needs of Alaska.

Raphael Bostic: This is the beginning of a conversation, not the end. Once we see the national numbers then it drives local efforts. This will tell us one thing and we need to understand many other things as well. There will be an opportunity then to have those conversations and move forward.

Dan Duame: Regarding the instruments, there is a question on tribal affiliation and tying it to enrollment. This doesn't work in Alaska, and is not appropriate. Do not ask about enrollment. Alaska Natives are not an intended beneficiary of this program; they have been served before and since NAHASDA. It serves no purpose for the study and does not give accurate, good information. Enrollment may be to a corporation, not a tribe. Enrollment here is not utilized in

the same way as the lower 48 – resources have never been provided to accurately maintain enrollment. It is not Congress's intent. Questions as to home ownership and culturally responsive housing could be improved. We know that most people want to own their own homes. We plan to submit written follow up with additional details. Regarding the question concerning attitudes toward tribally assisted housing, this is a particularly bad and irrelevant question and we would like to see this question revisited.

Raphael Bostic: Questions have to be broadly applicable. We have taken input and feedback from hundreds of people and weigh the merits and difficulties of various modules themselves as well as the questions individually. We are not going to be able to make everyone happy on every question/module. There are diverse perspectives and views in America. If we don't respond to the comment, we are not dismissive.

Dan Duame: You won't get good answers.

Raphael Bostic: That is your belief.

Dan Duame: Let's be clear about the question. This question does not make a distinction between home ownership and rental units. Homeownership contracts (mutual help) leave 100% of the responsibility to the homeowner to perform maintenance by contract.

Raphael Bostic: We value feedback from people.

Dan Duame: The question you need to ask in these instances if the owner has resources to be a homeowner.

Raphael Bostic: There are many different ways to approach this to elicit information.

Dan Duame: What is the resistance to modifying this question?

Raphael Bostic: Let's move on.

Dan Duame: Regarding household income and housing costs, there is a similar issue. One of the specific purposes of the study is to determine operating challenges. It is suggested that you ask some questions related to this in the nature of getting NAHASDA subsidies. We are looking at hitting a brick wall down the road in terms of our ability to produce units that are sustainable without an operating subsidy. How are we going to continue to develop and operate units? This is an opportunity to address this question. We have issues with those questions and there seems to be resistance for unknown reasons to address this issue. We are happy to work with you to provide specific questions that would enhance the data, get at need, and address specific questions. These are serious issues and if we want to get at need, put every question to the test – is the question really addressing the purpose.? If a question doesn't address the purpose, remove it. If there are better questions, consider those for inclusion.

Raphael Bostic: The question and review process will be ongoing. I can't guarantee agreement on things but we will give everything a fair hearing.

Ted Wright: I am having flashbacks because of my past involvement in other studies focused on other areas such as alcohol and education. I understand the point of this study. But Alaska is different. One way, for instance, is that there are not really any casinos. There is no question about this in the TDHE survey which is actually a good way to increase the pie, but not to slice it. As you go into negotiated rulemaking, you need to consider this and means testing. The realities are that tribes are competing with one another and this creates a difference in how to provide for tribal members.

Raphael Bostic: I do not take part in the negotiations but the concept makes sense to me. Negotiations are complicated but I will mention this to the Assistant Secretary.

Carol Gore: I come from a family of subsistence farmers and hunters who lived with a large family in a 2 bedroom home. My father met my mother here in 1949. Aleut is not on a census list. Nor is Tlingit or Haida. We are self-identified native people, not on a list of federally recognized tribes. We are pleased to have you here. I have been privileged to serve as an elected official for more than 20 years but I am not serving in that capacity here. Instead I am here as the Cook Inlet CEO; Cook Inlet is the TDHE for Cook Inlet region. We deliver money but are not listed as a federally recognized tribe. There is a complicated political system here. We think Alaska got it right and we hope you can learn from us.

In 2004-2005, Harvard did a study of public housing, focused on Allowable Expense Level, a cost indicator. This was not intended to impact funding but it had an impact in Alaska. One public housing authority serves the entire state. Alaska became an asterisk, and as a result our public housing was subject to almost a 50% cut in funding and we had to fight to regain some of that. I don't expect you to be an expert on that study but it makes us nervous and reflects the way we are misunderstood. I have no opinion of that study but we don't want to be an asterisk again or for our state to suffer any unintended consequences, hence our attitude today.

Regarding tribal affiliation, the Census has the same provision so many self-identified as "other than enrolled or federally recognized" will not be counted as Alaska Natives. I am a shareholder – not just of a region but of village, and this is not common in the lower 48 states. In the Alaska settlement Act, 13 regional corporations and over 200 village corporations were created. Independent of that, in the 1990s, Congress approved the federally recognized list. Land claims in 1972, settled in 1974, created twelve regional housing authorities established to deliver housing. When NAHASDA was created, it became an opportunity to serve in a self-determined way, such as choosing to work cooperatively in a housing authority or to self-deliver.

Regarding "Indian land," we have one reservation in Alaska. The lack of that type of land base is misunderstood. Even in the Congressional language for this study, it excludes Alaska and Hawaii since it refers specifically to reservations. That is good evidence that we are not understood as

we should be. We have an opportunity to help Congress better understand our political setup and delivery system but it is difficult to participate in surveys when there exists a lack of understanding of geography, land systems, and politics. I gave a presentation that showed that if you lay Alaska over the 48 continuous states; it stretches from coast to coast. You can only access our state capital by flight or boat. If you are to travel to areas that have a need, you must travel rivers or fly, as there are no road systems. These are conversations for the future and cost barriers. Regarding urban studies, Anchorage is urban for Alaska. While it might not meet the population test, over 40,000 Alaska Natives live in Anchorage. I understand the need for a random survey but these people will go missed. The population of Alaska Natives in Anchorage doubled in 10 years because of housing conditions outside of Anchorage. To survey them you might learn of housing conditions elsewhere; it is a missed opportunity if you don't capture those stories. 40% of the population of Alaska Natives in the state is in Anchorage. Virtually every tribe is represented in this region.

I am very supportive of a conference to continue conversation and perhaps consider what other conversations we should be having. I am concerned that the 1996 study basis was for a different purpose. I request, in the spirit of tribal consultation, before the study is released, that tribes should have a comment period so there are no unintended consequences or impacts. There will be an opportunity to learn more after analysis.

Raphael Bostic: We will share drafts before they are public. There are two types of comments. One regarding factual errors and any issues with those will be addressed before finalized. Comments regarding meaning are more subjective and will not be incorporated in to the report. Because this is a descriptive report, it shouldn't have colored phrases that imply values, etc. So any instances of those will be removed. Regarding the notion of a formal response to the report-these sorts of reports don't have a formal comment period. Very few reports have that response as part of formal process. But again, we are sharing drafts in advance for review. If a tribe chose to issue a formal response, we will accept those and they can be dialogue beginnings. I do really hope that this has sparked beginning of a conversation and leads to more discussion on how to move forward. One difficulty is that so many things need to be done; we don't want to try and pack it all into one tool or vehicle which can result in doing many things half way as opposed to doing a few things well. We have to walk a line deciding how much to do now versus later. We have seen an evolution of the survey and of these meetings and consultations. We used the 1996 study as frame since it's what we had but the new questionnaire has benefited from the input of many people and will continue to do so.

I understand the fear, I really do. Statistics can go many ways. They are most effectively misused and abused when the reality is unknown. False facts overshadow real facts; so through these efforts, we are trying to level the playing field so there is open access to information and it is widely known. This will create a new baseline of shared understanding. We will start with the same understanding of what is real on the ground. These studies can help created shared understanding but that is only a beginning. More openness and transparency fights the fear.

Liane Burns: With regard to communication, the internet is slow at best and during winter, it is nonexistent. Even phone connections can be nonexistent and mail service is often delayed. In grant writing, I follow Census data, which is inaccurate in regard to housing. For instance, the Census says we [the Husira Tribe] have 14 available homes. However, they are falling over the river bank. Before 2010 Census data, there were 210 people living there, most native. 35 and older is 37% of the population while 63% is 0 to 4 years old. Housing is a big concern. Only 36% of the population is employed. Air transport mainly and from June to September we have river transport. 2 barges arrive in the spring and 2 arrive in the fall. Fuel is \$4.20 galloon. Supplies arrive on barge. Air transport cost is about .80/pound. So \$200 worth of groceries cost about \$70 to deliver. It is a \$400 roundtrip airfare to Fairbanks. Will people who live in a village be considered native if they build a house there?

Jennifer Stoloff: No, like NAHASDA, this study is about self-identified tribal members. So only those who self-identify as native will be considered as such. Although the funds would of course remain eligible for use in housing non-natives if desired.

Liane Burns: There is a resistance in getting tribal members to answer surveys. I do want the data for grant purposes e.g. ICDBG. Can I do this in my own community for use in grants?

Raphael Bostic: Yes.

Jennifer Stoloff: You can use this survey as a template but you should ensure you collect the information that ICDBG wants.

Liane Burns: I have concerns regarding trust. [Ms. Burns described her own living conditions in log home in subsistence lifestyle.] I am concerned how I might be judged by interviewers. So the question is who would be interviewing me? A state, local, or federal person?

Raphael Bostic: We can't answer that with a blanket response because we are going to ask each tribe to answer that. The answer will depend on their answer as to who is the best interviewer, including possibly a local tribal member. It is important to note that this is a descriptive study so no values or judgments should be incorporated into the data. Some tribes want someone outside to interview tribal members so that personal information is not shared between tribal members. We are discussing two stages here. The first is the descriptive aspect, the facts, conditions and such. The second is what you do about it. PD&R is making no judgments, HUD is making no judgments. That is a local decision. Descriptive methods are used to understand conditions; resource deployment can then be informed but is not determined by these findings.

Irene Catalone: There are a lot of differences between Alaskan Native and Native Americans/American Indians. Congress even identified Alaska as different via the Land Settlement Claims Act. That was about oil/energy but also about the fact that we are shareholders. There were proceedings to determine if after-bornes (those born after the Claims Act) are entitled to shareholder status, etc. [Ms. Catalone described her own upbringing and

lifestyle as well as exposure to other tribes during her lifetime.] I think that what is missing from this survey is the impact of climate change. We are impacted more than the lower 48 here states; properties are deteriorating and disappearing at accelerated rate and exacerbating existing issues. It is causing a lot of damage to roofs for example.

Bart Meyer: I'd like to comment on the limited sample size of households, the three tribes included in sample population. I would like to restate that some considerations should be given to looking at whether you can have an accurate, representative sampling with just the randomness as currently existing. Can that be adjusted for the fact that there are 231 tribes? It would seem that 3 out of 231 is not going to get the level of information needed for half of the nation's tribes, even with the understanding that only 80,000 total tribal members reside in state. Alaska, because of limited sample, will not have a full complete measure of need. Can the survey accurately adjust the sample size given the geographic diversity, magnitude and diversity? Also the newness of the state affects the housing dynamics over the last 30-40 years whereas the structure has been long established in the lower 48 states. I recognize that this is not a regional study but extrapolating data to nation from such a small sample will be problematic.

Raphael Bostic: This is a population based sample and results are population oriented, not tribe oriented. No distribution change would ultimately affect the total draws from the 'buckets'. For instance, stratifying by economic condition wouldn't include more Alaskan tribes. The only way to be fully representative is to have random draws, but once you begin selective inclusion, it becomes more political and less accurate. This study is not capturing the full range of dynamics in any location, and no technique would make that the case. But the national estimate will have a level of precision with a confidence that is very close to accurate. You could employ 20 different methods and all point estimates would derive a relatively narrow band of results. We are not charged to describe need in any one place. Diversity sort of washes out in a national level study. This survey will not answer all of the questions including some raised here today. There are many questions and issues raised in Indian Country but we have to remain true to our charge from Congress. We will not have complete happiness with this from 100% of the population no matter what. The United States is big and each place within it has its own story, uniqueness and factors but we are trying to rationalize that, as with any study, and account for it — that causes difficulties and frustration. One measure of success is if nobody is happy but everyone can see something of value. We get pulled in every direction and are never going to please all. But it is useful to hear all of the concerns and discern zero sum concerns (addressing one will raise new issues for another) or Pareto optimal, where improving where one group improves and no one else loses. Zero sum issues are very difficult to address but Pareto issues are more likely to yield change.

Dan Duame: I'd like to follow up to my earlier comments. I understand the idea that this is a national survey and the data is being accumulated from random sampling on a national level. One of the things we are concerned about is that Alaska is not adequately represented to demonstrate need. If we don't get that, so be it and we can find another way internally such as a

needs survey with the state housing authority. But, one of our fears about the study is that it not only won't show our needs but potentially may show a story that is not representative and will have a negative impact on us. When the survey is completed, is all of the information in it truly going to be truly nationally representative and compiled so that no region, entity or special interest is going to be able to dice and slice information to make arguments one way or another so they can't position themselves? If it is truly national data that we can't dice and slice, we would have less of a fear about the end result. Can you specify that this will be truly national?

Raphael Bostic: I understand your concern and it makes sense. My impression is that it is a national study and not locally representative and cannot be parsed out into any region to draw conclusions. There are multiple surveys, though, and the aforementioned statement is true for the household survey. The TDHE survey has the potential to be a full census. The Census data will also be examined, with its well-known and recognized challenges. There is a goal of multiple perspectives. But the household survey is national and there is no parsing out of it. The information can't be used in that way. Maybe there needs to be a section of the report that explicitly details this fact and the limitations of use. When we present the data, the weights associated with findings will be useless for anything but national level estimates. We will do all we can to ensure these limitations are widely known.

Carol Gore: Alaska's formula is very complicated and one underlying element is a conversation going on nationally between census versus tribal enrollment and that is why tribal affiliation is an issue. The tribal affiliation conversation with census folks concerns the fact that individuals are not being counted by virtue of our manner of self-identification. It is critical whether the report has an impact to formula or not that if it relies on tribal enrollment, it may drive a conversation that we don't want to have with the lower 48 states. This is unintentionally divisive as Alaska sees itself as one people.

Raphael Bostic: There is an error in your materials. We have removed the affiliation question and ask only if someone is enrolled, not where. This is a clerical error in materials distributed today.

Carol Gore: Since Hawaii has a separate study, and they haven't yet settled their aboriginal rights, how will this be addressed in their study? Blood quantum questions are not answered by their own people.

Raphael Bostic: The Hawaii situation is complicated. It is even more difficult because there is not a 1:1 correspondence between tribe and village. Identifying who to even survey is an intellectual challenge. What we are doing there is a political issue because the Chairman is a Senator from Hawaii. We understood the challenge and had an approach that was not well received. So in Hawaii we are accessing lists that DHHL keeps of people who feel they have a claim to native status. It is the best we can do given the institutional challenges that exist on these islands.

Dale Williams: As an elected tribal leader, I look at things in a political perspective but in this tribe to government consultation I'll present the perspective that comes across to me from what I have heard of testimony thus far. In Alaska there have been talks about the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act. Because of that, the corporate governments are not responsive. There are issues with electing representatives. It seems there should be a separate template to gauge the survey here.

Raphael Bostic: I understand the Settlement Act much better now and realize there are issues worth exploring in it. I understand the challenge and perhaps the survey can be a tool to refocus some of the corporations to the tribes and villages and obligations.

Bill Miller: I have a comment regarding the survey questions about maintenance and repairs; since NAHASDA, these kinds of activities are no longer covered in some homes. This is a drawback to NAHASDA, that it didn't consider preexisting agreements. Regarding a possible change to the survey to ask about "enrollment", the terminology now reads "enrollment or eligible for enrollment" in other federal agreements. The tribe, a sovereign government, has right to establish quorum for enrollment.

Gabe Layman: If you look at the sampling document, the tribes selected for the TDHE and Household survey is notably absent of ANSCA regional corporation represented. Is that intentional or an oversight?

Nancy Pindus: The sample is based on the census; tribal areas were used to select the sample.

Gabe Layman: NAHASDA includes regional corporations within the definition of tribes. Was Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated (CIRI), for example, included in the pool? If not, this is an oversight.

Jennifer Stoloff: People must be living in the geography sampled, so villages served by corporation are what are sampled on.

Gabe Layman: Census includes certain geographies but massive areas outside of tribes are also served, for example, Anchorage.

Jennifer Stoloff: This doesn't affect all 120 areas but within Alaska, we would have to go back and check who was included. We will go back and ensure appropriate coverage.

Carol Gore: How is gaming analyzed?

Jennifer Stoloff: Economic conditions will be examined in a comparative analysis. We will use Native American gaming data to compare.

Raphael Bostic: Gaming doesn't show up in the TDHE or household data but will overlay with Census data. There is an obvious implication for housing and this is a separate part of the exercise.

Nancy Pindus: Regarding demographics, we will examine trends since 1996, 2000 Census, 2010 Census data. For example, we will look at economic status, population. Essentially we review global changes on a national picture, but these questions are not in the survey.

Ted Wright: This will be skewed if this is compared against Alaska where there is no gaming.

Raphael Bostic: Actually the opposite is true. The relative need is higher because you have fewer resources. To be clear, that is a different part of this study, based on Census data. We will include language to fully explain the purpose of this particular aspect.

Ted Wright: Census data has economic information about assets in communities. If this is about size of pie not how it is sliced, Census data begins to discuss slices.

Raphael Bostic: The idea is that if you include gaming, those places appear to have less need than other tribes in the pot as those without gaming don't have the offsets.

Ted Wright: It might appear that nationally "Indian people" have more assets than they used to.

Jennifer Stoloff: No, these findings will be presented regionally because it is Census data.

Raphael Bostic: There should be tribes that have gaming in the sample because there are tribes that have gaming in the US. There will be variation within the groups sampled; the sampling frame and weights are such that gaming realities are not overstated in how we characterize things. How this is articulated in parts of studies will vary – and we will write up an explanation of that. We will include gaming tribes but will ensure data is treated appropriately.

Marsha Sloan: I feel that this national story will now have regional components. I am also concerned that 120 households will come from 3 tribes, not many more tribes. Is there a way to put our story in perspective for Alaska since other areas will receive a personal story? Also, if Hawaii has a separate story, we should as well.

Raphael Bostic: You are exactly right regarding 120 people. In the best case, we would draw 120 random people from the state – but we don't have the money for that. This is clearly a 2nd or 3rd best method but it's what the funding allows. This is a reality that we should have acknowledged earlier. Let's table conversations about census versus household survey for this reason – they tell us different things. The census is flawed. We know that. But it is the only tool that tries to do a comprehensive assessment. Researchers never throw information away; you use it as best you can and couch it as needed. Census also doesn't ask a lot of questions we care about at a fundamental level; it's extremely limited but it is there – so we at least need to use it to say what it does. Those realities drove us to create a household survey that offers something more – more coverage and more details about more things we need to know. Adding the TDHE component further expands the perspective. The household survey as created lasts about an hour and this is the limit to the time people are really willing to spend answering questions. But this means another limitation on how many questions we can ask.

Benjamin Miyasato: Regarding funding for this survey, have you examined the possibility to work through any colleges that have a program to get students help in the field? This could lead to a bigger coverage area when using students as you pay travel only.

Raphael Bostic: HUD has not looked into this possibility for this study but I suggested it earlier for local level efforts. We face challenges in this regard – we are the federal government and sometimes the use of students could be construed as a way to fly beneath radar and be less transparent. Also we are trying to get community buy-in. For example, if we sampled 120 persons all from different tribes, we would have to get 120 tribal leaders to sign off on the study. That is almost half of the entire tribal population. It is also difficult to execute this type of activity from afar, especially the aspect of gaining trust from communities. We may want to incorporate that approach in future rounds after a baseline is established. It is hard to have these less formal relationships when its conducted once every 16 years; if this was a survey every 3 or 5 years and people were accustomed to anticipating someone coming out to ask questions, it would be more familiar and easier to approach with this method for lower cost with same quality. This time, though, it is more important to be careful and accurate.

Liane Burns: Will politics in November affect this study or its funding?

Raphael Bostic: The study is fully funded today. Every dime is available to execute the study and we should be in the field before the election with data collection well underway. Most of these activities will be under the political radar and depending on who wins; more or less attention will be paid to the results. There may be a bigger issue regarding the report and its release. It will be written in any case; the tribes will see drafts – without regard to politics. We are pushing to ensure these reports are written in a way that they are accessible to everyone which will help. I can guarantee work will be done and the study will go on, but there are no guarantees on what happens after. The notion of a conference to push findings will help build pressure to release the report to the public.

Raphael Bostic: I like consultations, I like engaging with the public, and I like hearing what they think and cutting through politeness and niceties. I want to reemphasize that this study is important and has the potential to change the nature of the conversation around housing needs in Washington and across the country. It is critical that we take all the steps we can to design, administer and analyze in the best possible way with highest quality. It is our commitment that we are going to make this as positive a tool as possible; we have been operating for too long without information and we need to do better. Armed with this information we can make a case for more resources and the ability to use resources in different ways that address today's needs. Please talk to others and tell them what you heard today; encourage them to submit questions or concerns. Our goal is to be open and transparent with no secrets or misunderstandings so when we go into the field we have your support and trust. Thank you again and we hope this was worth your while and interesting.