

Tribal Nations Grant Fund
Tribal Consultation Summary
Coyote Valley Casino – June 8, 2017

The following questions/comments are a summary of the TNGF Tribal Consultation held at the Coyote Valley Casino. While we have done our best to accurately capture the comments made by the participants, we encourage all participants to provide written comments by July 13, 2017. There were twenty-one people in attendance representing eleven tribes.

Decision Making Committee/ Panel:

- Panel membership should be weighted to ensure that tribes with the greatest needs have the most representation on the panel. For instance, selection criteria could be based on whether a tribe has land, a gaming facility and/or the number of slots at the facility.
- See the United Pomo Nation's Council (UPNC) letter.
- The panel should only include tribal elected leaders.

Conflict of Interest:

- Conflicts of interest need to be addressed, as they would be in other similar programs.
- One idea was to divide the State into three regions and have panelists review applications from other regions. It wasn't clear how the funding would be allocated if, for instance, more eligible tribes or applicants were from one region than another.
- One idea was to develop objective criteria to evaluate applications since a strong points system could eliminate the recusal process.
- Another idea was to add more people (for instance, a panel of 9 members) and/or include members who are not on tribal council to the panel to eliminate conflict.

Administration/ Audits:

- There were questions regarding compliance with program restrictions.
- The program summary indicates that there will be a limited waiver of sovereign immunity to resolve disputes about compliance but attendees expressed concern and commented that a limited waiver of sovereign immunity was not necessary.
- Is there an administrative line item? There was a concern with taking money from eligible tribes to administer the program.

Grants Process:

- The application process will be very difficult for small tribes.
- Will there be a cap on funding?
- True non gaming tribes should be the only eligible recipients. The limited gaming tribes don't need it as much, would rather see it go to the no gaming tribes.
- Opportunities for landless and non gaming tribes should be a priority.
- Grants should create economic self sufficiency and building tribe's viability.

- Should be a points system to evaluate grants.
- After receiving a grant, those tribes should not be eligible for one-two years.
- Concerns about “needs” as a criterion. Needs should be self identified by the tribe and not by a committee.
- Educational grants are important.
- Housing assistance is important.
- Grants should be given to the tribes’ priorities, not the panel’s view if it is a sustainable project or not. Sustainability should not a factor in evaluating an application for funding.
- The neediest tribes should be given the priority for funding.
- The grant process should provide a grant range.
- Everyone should have access to the grants.
- Possibly have different tiers of grants for small (i.e., regalia grants) to larger economic development projects (i.e., gas station/housing).
- Funeral expenses should be considered.
- Emergency fund (setting aside funds that might be available outside the normal grant cycle for urgent needs) is a good idea.
- Criteria for the grant process and application requirements should be developed with further consultation with tribes.
- Can tribes encumber funds if they can’t spend the entire grant award in one year?
- Can we give a portion to all tribes and have the remainder competitive?

Revenue Sharing Trust Fund (RSTF):

- Shouldn’t the funding stay in the RSTF in case there is no funding the following year?