



**CALIFORNIA
ENERGY COMMISSION**



California Energy Commission

STAFF REPORT

California Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference

July 9–11, 2019
Summary Report

Gavin Newsom, Governor
May 2020 | CEC-700-2020-XXX

California Energy Commission

Thomas Gates, Ph.D.

Jodean Hernandez

Primary Authors

Eric Knight

Office Manager

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Shawn Pittard

Deputy Director

SITING, TRANSMISSION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Drew Bohan

Executive Director

DISCLAIMER

Staff members of the California Energy Commission prepared this report. As such, it does not necessarily represent the views of the Energy Commission, its employees, or the State of California. The Energy Commission, the State of California, its employees, contractors and subcontractors make no warrant, express or implied, and assume no legal liability for the information in this report; nor does any party represent that the uses of this information will not infringe upon privately owned rights. This report has not been approved or disapproved by the Energy Commission nor has the Commission passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of the information in this report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The California Energy Commission staff acknowledges the Bishop Paiute Tribe's role in hosting the Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference. The Bishop Paiute Tribe's host function was supported by other Owens Valley Paiute tribes: Big Pine Paiute Tribe, Fort Independence Tribe and the Lone Pine Paiute and Shoshone Tribe. The Owens Valley Paiute tribes were further supported by a tribal planning committee that also included representation from the following tribes: Fort Mojave Tribe, Chemehuevi Tribe, Twenty-Nine Palms Tribe, Pala Band of Mission Indians and the United Auburn Indian Community. Energy Commission staff also acknowledges the support of the California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Water Resources, State Lands Commission, Office of Historic Preservation, California Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, the Strategic Growth Council, and the Governor's Office of the Tribal Advisor.

Specifically, Energy Commission staff acknowledges the contributions made to the conference and the review of this report by the following individuals: Brian Adkins, Monty Bengochia, Emily Ontiveros, Sally Manning, Alan Bacock, Danelle Gutierrez, Cheyenne Stone, Kathy Bancroft, Richard Arnold, Matthew Leivas Sr., Nora McDowell, Sarah Bliss, Anthony Madrigal Jr., Yana Garcia, Carmen Milanes, Bennet Lock, Laura August, and Laurie Monserrat.

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes discussions and recommendations from the California Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference held on July 9-11, 2019 in Bishop (Inyo County). The California Energy Commission, Bishop Paiute Tribe, United Auburn Indian Community, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, and California Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment cosponsored the conference, which the Bishop Paiute Tribe hosted. The conference provided a forum for California Native American tribes to engage with fellow tribal governments and California state agencies on topics including renewable energy development, climate change, traditional ecological knowledge, and environmental justice. The conference discussions were documented and are summarized in this report.

Keywords: California Native American tribes, California Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference, renewable energy development, climate change, resiliency, traditional ecological knowledge

Please use the following citation for this report:

Gates, Thomas and Jodean Hernandez. 2019. *Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference July 9–11, 2019 Summary Report*. California Energy Commission. Publication Number: CEC-700-2020-xxx.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Executive Summary	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 1: California Sustaining Tribal Cultural Resources Conference	3
Introduction.....	3
Background	3
CHAPTER 2: Discussion Topics and Summaries	5
Traditional Ecological Knowledge	5
Water Use and Management.....	7
Mitigation	8
Tribal and State Partnerships and Collaboration	9
General Feedback.....	9
Climate and Renewable Energy Research.....	9
Funding/Work Priorities	10
Access to Land/Education	10
Environmental Justice.....	11
CHAPTER 3: Recommendations	13
APPENDIX A: Agenda	A-1
Tuesday, July 9 – Field Trips	A-1
Wednesday, July 10.....	A-1
Thursday, July 11	A-2
APPENDIX B: List of Attendees	B-1
Tribal Participants.....	B-1
State Participants	C-2
Other Participants.....	B-4
APPENDIX C: Evaluation Results	C-1
DAY 1	C-1
DAY 2	C-5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference occurred on July 9–11, 2019, in Bishop (Inyo County). The conference convened 16 California Native American tribes and 12 state agencies. Hosted by the Bishop Paiute Tribe and co-sponsored/organized by the California Energy Commission, the three-day conference included field trips and panel discussions.

The conference facilitated candid dialogue to increase understanding of state and tribal climate change goals and objectives, discuss barriers and opportunities to address climate change, and strategize on how the State of California, state agencies, and tribes can better collaborate on programs, policy, and financial investment.

There were focused discussions on topics including traditional ecological knowledge and the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool, also known as CalEnviroScreen.

This report summarizes conference discussions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 1:

California Sustaining Tribal Cultural Resources Conference

Introduction

The California Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference was held on July 9–11, 2019, in Bishop (Inyo County). The California Energy Commission (CEC) cosponsored the conference with the Bishop Paiute Tribe, United Auburn Indian Community, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, and the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). The Bishop Paiute Tribe hosted the conference.

The conference planning committee included representatives from the CEC, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Pahrump Paiute Tribe, Pala Band of Mission Indians, and Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians.

The conference objective was to advance and broaden dialogue between tribes and the state, concerning past and current state energy-related and climate change projects, plans, and assessments related to tribal cultural and environmental issues.

The first day of the conference included a guided bus tour to Owens Lake, a walking tour guided by the Bishop Paiute Tribe, a visit to the Bishop Paiute Cultural Center, and an overview of Owens Valley water history by Paiute Elder Harry Williams at the Battle Site Monument. The second and third days consisted of presentations and group breakout sessions on topics. There were focused discussions on topics including traditional ecological knowledge, climate change, the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (also known as CalEnviroScreen), and state-tribal relationships and collaboration. The Bishop Paiute Tribe hosted a dinner for conference participants that included performances of traditional songs and dances.

There were about 90 participants, representing 16 tribes and 12 state entities. (See Appendix B for List of Attendees.)

Background

Each state agency participating in the conference has a tribal consultation policy intended to meet or exceed the minimal requirements set forth in Executive Orders B-10-11 and N-15-19 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Executive Order B-10-11, signed by former Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. in 2011, recognized and affirmed the inherent right of tribes in California to exercise sovereign authority over their members and territory and asserted that “the State and tribes are better able to adopt and implement mutually-beneficial policies when they cooperate and engage in meaningful consultation.” The Executive Order directed all state agencies and departments under Governor Brown’s executive control to encourage communication and consultation with federally recognized tribes and other California Native Americans and allow tribal government

officials and representatives to provide meaningful input into the development of legislation, regulations, rules, and policies on matters that may affect tribal communities.¹

Executive Order N-15-19, signed by Governor Gavin Newsom in June 2019, affirms and incorporates by reference Executive Order B-10-11 and recognizes that the state has sanctioned prejudicial policies against Native Americans and apologizes for “the many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect California inflicted on tribes.” Among other assertions, the executive order commends and honors California Native Americans for “persisting, carrying on cultural and linguistic traditions, and stewarding and projecting the land we now share.”²

In addition, through 2014 amendments to CEQA, the state Legislature affirmed its commitment to ensuring lead agency consultation with California Native American tribes. The Legislature found and declared that “California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area may have expertise concerning their tribal resources” and therefore CEQA requires lead agencies to provide notice of proposed projects and an opportunity for consultation *before* the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report.³

The conference was an important follow on to California’s first tribal energy summit held in November 2018. The California Tribal Energy Summit was convened to advance dialogue among tribes and the state’s energy agencies on advancing climate change and energy goals and included 120 participants from 30 tribes and five state agencies. Recommendations from the summit included expanding access for tribes to participate in agency processes and funding programs and holding a conference that would focus on cultural and environmental resources as they relate to energy and climate change initiatives.⁴

1 Link to EO-B10-11: <https://www.ca.gov/archive/gov39/2011/09/19/news17223/index.html>.

2 Link to E0-N-15-19: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/6.18.19-Executive-Order.pdf>.

3 Cal. Pub Resources Code, § 21080.3.1.

4 Link to California Tribal Energy Summit Staff Report CEC-700-2019-001:
<https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2019publications/CEC-700-2019-001/CEC-700-2019-001.pdf>

CHAPTER 2:

Discussion Topics and Summaries

The conference allowed for conversation on cross-cutting topics. Guided breakout sessions and panel discussions focused on the following prepared questions:

1. Describe experiences, successes, and/or challenges working with other government and nongovernmental (NGO) entities on research, or on climate adaptation. What did a successful partnership look like? How can partnerships be improved? How can we promote research partnerships between tribes and the State of California?
2. Are there examples of successful integration of traditional ecological knowledge and western science to inform policy or action? What components of the partnership were critical to achieving a successful outcome?
3. What gaps in knowledge are you seeing that are critical to informing climate change research and adaptation efforts?

Key themes emerged as conference participants addressed these questions and other top-of-mind issues. Those themes are summarized below under the following five topical areas:

Traditional Ecological Knowledge

Tribes identified traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) as a significant, cross-cutting topic that underlies all the other topics that would be discussed during the conference. Tribes underscored the necessity of the state recognizing the importance of TEK and the necessity of incorporating it into decision-making, particularly when considering projects impacting natural, cultural, and spiritual resources. While no single definition of TEK is universally accepted, it can be understood as a cumulative body of knowledge, practice, and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission, about the relationship of living beings (including humans) with one another and their environment.⁵

There are multiple facets to TEK, all of which warrant understanding. TEK reflects keen observation, patience, experimentation, and long-term relationships with natural resources within and across cultural landscapes. Cultural landscapes include areas that convey heritage values as defined through elements such as archaeological sites, occupation sites, trails, hunting and gathering areas, sacred places, and the related plants, animals, waterways, geographic landforms, and viewsheds.

Since time immemorial, tribes have managed and used the natural resources available to them. The foundation of tribal stewardship is a collective reserve of knowledge about the natural world, acquired through direct experience and contact with the environment, over

⁵ California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2016. *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*. Adopted by the California Fish and Game Commission on August 24, 2016. Section 1.1, p. 6. Found at <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=112486&inline>.

many generations of practical and spiritual teaching passed down by elders. Carrying on long-standing practices and traditions, California tribes continue to regularly harvest resources within their ancestral territories and maintain relationships with the landscape for ongoing customary uses. Tribes participating at the conference and in breakout groups emphasized that the state recognize and appreciate these practices and traditions is by taking actions that include:

- Looking to TEK and tribal scientists to inform state agency research.
- Recognizing TEK as a component of science, not something separate from science.
- Finding ways for comanagement of wildlife.
- Acknowledging that tribal members collect data in their own ways and those methods are valuable.
- Compensating elders for their time and knowledge.

A panel discussion on bighorn sheep illustrated the importance of TEK in decision-making. As discussed, bighorn sheep are part of indigenous culture; their images are on baskets, pottery, and rock art. They are part of the story and song ways. Because the sheep travel from the high mountains to the valley floor, they interact with various other plants and animals. Therefore they are revered and considered wise. Tribal people talk to the animals, and all the animals talk to one another. Tribal people hold an obligation to be the voice for them. There is a long tradition of tribes hunting sheep, but this tradition is not just about killing for food. Tribal hunters examine and use all parts of the animal. Particularly abhorrent is the thought of killing to mount the skull or head on the wall. In fact, sheep should be provided reverence and respect similar to the reverence and respect provided to humans when they die.

Elders recounted stories where women's songs can bring sheep near humans. Another tribal song provided knowledge of the traditional birthing (lambing) places.

Disconnecting tribal people from the places where wildlife congregate limits the ability of tribes to interact with a host of animals and limits their ability to participate in those conversations. These conversations are vital for maintaining TEK that can then inform, enrich, and expand western scientific ways of knowledge. Thus, specific to bighorn sheep, tribes recommend that state agencies:

- Comanage California's bighorn sheep populations with tribes and continually share and discuss their studies, plans, and actions with interested tribes.
- Jointly conduct field studies with tribes and seek tribal cultural information to inform state management decisions.
- Enhance and preserve sheep-watering locations to encourage sheep access.
- Avoid harming sheep predators that are naturally a part of the ecosystem.
- Any programs to allow hunters to take bighorn sheep should be prohibited.
- If any hunting is allowed, it should be done by tribal hunters.
- Contact between domestic sheep and cattle and bighorn sheep should be aggressively managed to avoid further disease transference.

- Studies conducted on deceased bighorn sheep should proceed in consultation with tribes.
- Respect should be afforded to the remains of big horn sheep similar to the respect afforded human remains.

The recommendation for comanagement and inclusion of TEK in state agency decision-making was not limited to bighorn sheep. The discussions more generally addressed the need for animal comanagement with agencies. Many tribes asked to continue collaborating with agencies to protect animals on and off tribal lands. Specifically, tribes asked state agencies and the federal government to work with them to protect endangered species. These endangered species include traditional plants, whose habitats intersect multijurisdictional lands, whether endangerment is from climate change, impacts to traditional food sources, state projects, or other reasons.

Water Use and Management

The breakout discussion of Owens Lake in Inyo County exemplifies how California government has impacted an important cultural and ecological resource and the importance of bringing TEK into front-end decision-making and development of mitigation measures.

Owens Lake, which is now mostly dry, is in a valley known as Payahuunadü to the indigenous people, meaning “the place where water always flows.” The lake, also known as Patsiata, was historically fed by many rivers and streams. The people now known as the Owens Valley Paiute and Western Shoshone lived along the shores of the lake.

Construction of the Los Angeles Aqueduct in 1913 by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) diverted the Owens River away from Patsiata. By the 1920s, Patsiata was pretty much dried up. As dust emitted from the exposed lakebed, it became the largest point source of PM₁₀ pollution⁶ in the nation. The air quality and ecosystem impacts have been significant, and LADWP is under court order to address the dust impacts. Consequently, LADWP has been working with regional tribes to implement dust control and address related impacts from the dry Patsiata. This intergovernmental communication provides a means for tribal perspectives and TEK to inform western science-based approaches toward mitigation.

The Patsiata/Owens Lake discussion revealed tribal interest in more collaboration on state and local public agency water planning decisions that will affect tribes and their environment.

Tribes recommend:

- Updates to the California Water Plan to incorporate TEK.
- Reopening traditional irrigation pathways.
- More collaboration regarding water choices that affect tribes and their environment, including an opportunity to weigh in on restoration, contamination, desalination, and water rights.

The Patsiata/Owens Lake discussion also revealed dynamics in decision-making authority unique to this area of California. The City of Los Angeles owns more than 310,000 acres of

⁶ PM₁₀ refers to airborne particulate matter (PM) that is 10 microns (0.000039 inch) or less in diameter.

land in Owens Valley (96 percent) in Inyo County. LADWP, which manages the land on behalf of Los Angeles, does not abide by Inyo County's general plan since it is a municipality located in a different county. The Owens Valley is home to most of the population of Inyo County. Therefore, decisions made by the City of Los Angeles affect the quality of life for Inyo County citizens, but those decisions do not reflect the constituency of Inyo County. This situation has created an unfair and imbalanced situation between Los Angeles and Inyo County.

The influence of Los Angeles is also felt in the development of state legislation, which may impact the ability of Los Angeles to continue the unfair situation that exists in Owens Valley. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) was created to help California better manage groundwater throughout the state. SGMA requires identified basins to create local agencies that develop local plans for sustainably managing groundwater resources. In late amendments to SGMA, language was inserted to make the Owens Valley an "adjudicated basin." As an adjudicated basin, Owens Valley basin lands managed by LADWP are exempt from SGMA. This exemption has allowed LADWP to continue to control water operations in Owens Valley without oversight from the state or a local agency.

Los Angeles has determined its course to implement a "green new deal" that will enable it to be more sustainable in the future. The green new deal provides a strategy benefiting Los Angeles, and not Owens Valley.

Mitigation

Tribes stressed the importance of the state inquiring first for tribal concerns before assuming or imposing what the state deems are appropriate mitigations. Project impacts to cultural landscapes require consideration of TEK because of the holistic and systemic nature and size of these resources. Further, the potential for land disturbance at or near sacred sites requires extreme caution, and it is imperative for there to be early and ongoing consultation with potentially affected tribes to ensure acknowledgment and mutually agreeable resolution.

Tribes recommended making conservation easements to and on behalf of tribes as a possible mitigation tool. The making, financing, and holding of easements are less costly than requiring the purchase of offset mitigation lands. In addition, landowners retain their land ownership, maintain the land per specific landscape management plans, and receive property tax credits for those encumbrances.

Regarding fires, tribes shared the importance of reinstating traditional burning practices to assist fire management. Tribes recommended burning to help develop necessary resources, exemplified by revegetation of native plants. Many tribes expressed the need to incorporate TEK to help manage fire risk. For example, tribes know that native oak species provide food and other uses for various wildlife and humans and are more drought-tolerant and fire-resistant. However, some oak groves can be improved with traditional burning practices through occasional low-level fires. Tribes also recommended that the state establish a wildfire emergency response program to help inform tribal members of emergency situations.

Many tribes expressed interest in working with agencies to replant traditional vegetation in high-fire risk or recently burned areas or both, incorporating TEK to create successful replanting projects. Tribes also expressed the need for the state to update management plans regarding tribal cultural resources and include tribes in that planning process.

Tribal and State Partnerships and Collaboration

General Feedback

Tribes expressed willingness and trepidation to partner with state agencies and departments on climate change and renewable energy development (and other topics). Establishing trust will be essential moving forward.

Tribal expectations of state agencies in this regard include:

- Seeing tribal communities as valuable coequal entities.
- Respecting and welcoming tribal input and ecological knowledge and involving tribes early in planning.
- Increasing visits by high-ranking state agency officials to tribal communities and engagement with tribal leaders.
- Treating consultations as an opportunity for meaningful communication and to understand tribal perspectives; the objective should be building a continuous relationship, not a temporary alliance.
- Following through on commitments.
- Treating tribes as equals and provide them a true seat at the decision-making table, early and often in the decision-making process.
- Fostering and ensuring direct communication among state agencies, academic researchers, and tribes to avoid misinformation and misunderstanding.
- Being informed about the unique interests and circumstances of the different tribes with whom state agencies collaborate.
- Establishing equal, comanagement relationships, instead of state agencies and consultants merely supervising tribes during projects.
- Ensuring the sharing of information among state agencies and tribes, instead of state agencies just requesting information from tribes.
- Recognizing tribal needs for flexible deadlines to provide requested information.
- Investing in and committing to succession planning to ensure that turnover among state agency staff does not set back relationships and communication.

Climate and Renewable Energy Research

Numerous tribes affirmed their interest in doing research and projects. Several tribes asserted a desire to incorporate TEK into decisions informed by “western” science. However, tribes maintain that state government should reciprocate this interest by including TEK in state-sponsored research. Many tribes showed concerns with agencies separating culture and environmental issues while tribes believe they are inextricably linked and inseparable.

Tribes explained that cultural features like songs and storytelling can be used to compare current climate to past climate. Tribes want to discern among changes that occur cyclically, changes that occur because of cumulative climate change trends, and changes resulting from immediate nonindigenous projects and related practices.

While there are challenges in distinguishing climate changes from other influences, climate change continues to alter the environment. For instance, plants and animals are being found in more remote areas. Other climate-related concerns discussed were erosion, local weather events, and sea-level rise that are affecting tribes living on the coast. One consistent message from tribes was for the state to understand that the desert is an important key to understanding the connection of people to the land, and the vast ecosystem of the desert should be protected from destructive human uses.

Funding/Work Priorities

Many conversations centered on matters related to funding and work priorities. Topics included funding accessibility, purposing funds, prioritizing work, communication, and technical assistance. In the tribes' experience, these issues overlap, which complicates problem solving. On accessibility, conference attendees asserted that state agencies should better publicize their funding opportunities for tribal planning and research programs. Furthermore, tribes find that too often, available funding does not match tribal needs. Funds are commonly available for implementing projects of various kinds, less so for tribal planning and research phases. Tribes hold that better communication from state agencies could resolve these and other issues related to funding and work priorities. If agency personnel discuss with tribes in what areas to allocate funds instead of assigning resources without tribal input, then parties could enjoy a better match of funds to needs. Improved lines of communication would also pay dividends in prioritizing work and requests in that tribes could more effectively use their limited resources. Another area for advancement is technical assistance. Here, emphasis was on understanding the implications of and obligations stemming from agency-provided funds. Tribes also asked for assistance with writing proposals, a task that demands considerable resources from applicants.

There was a discussion in the afternoon on July 10, 2019 regarding the adopted (then proposed) California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Tribal Land Transfer Policy during the Investor-Owned Utility (IOU) Real Property-Land Disposition facilitated discussion. The CPUC policy sets forth a process where IOUs are to provide a first right of refusal to the appropriate California Native American tribe prior to disposing of IOU surplus lands. There were questions regarding whether publicly owned utilities would be looking to adopt similar policies, what lands would be available, and how the policy would be implemented. The CPUC is developing guidelines for implementation of the policy.

Access to Land/Education

Discussion on education and training focused on traditional teachings for tribal youth. For tribes, intergenerational education — and overcoming practical barriers to the exercise of it — is paramount. Tribes' connection with their ancestral lands is central to traditional instruction on more than one level, including resource stewardship and spiritual acumen. Therefore, access to their landscapes is critical to traditional education, and tribal land bases are a fraction of their pre-European abundance. Public lands, such as national and state parks, provide numerous tribes with their only legal access to resource-gathering areas. In addition, plant collection is often restricted on such lands, further constraining traditional practices and education of tribal youth. Furthermore, on state-owned lands, entrance fees pose a barrier to

traditional teachings. Conference attendees suggested that state government could fund a youth education program, focused on state lands, to prevent the loss of long-established teachings. Tribes also suggested involving youth in conferences and meetings.

Environmental Justice

Staff of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) gave a presentation about the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) 3.0. CalEnviroScreen is a statewide mapping tool that helps identify California communities disproportionately affected by pollution and especially vulnerable to the effects of pollution.

CalEPA maintains CalEnviroScreen for statewide multiagency planning and decision making, investments, funding, and preparing elements of local government general plans. Many state agencies awarding funds are legislatively required to assure that significant funding amounts are awarded to disadvantaged communities, which are defined as the top 25 percent (75th percentile and above) scoring areas from CalEnviroScreen along with other areas with high amounts of pollution and low populations.

OEHHA acknowledged that CalEnviroScreen has data gaps with respect to California Native American tribes. Data gaps for tribes include exposure to pesticide use, drinking water contamination, exposure to mine pollution, wildfire risk, and tribal health. CalEPA stated the next steps to close these gaps are to incorporate tribal drinking water and other types of environmental data, continue to coordinate with the CalEPA Tribal Advisory Committee, and work with tribes to identify other indicators CalEPA should use in CalEnviroScreen.

Questions deliberated during an open forum were the following:

- How can CalEnviroScreen better reflect tribal concerns with respect to the types of data included or the method?
 - For example, does your tribe track any of the CalEnviroScreen indicators? Do you report that to a federal entity like the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Health Service, or other government entity?
- What other type of data would you like to be included in CalEnviroScreen either to pollution, health, or socioeconomic vulnerability?
- Other than CalEnviroScreen, what kinds of tools or data could be used to identify tribes or tribal areas for funding eligibility?
- What could a tribal specific cumulative impacts tool look like?

In response to the presentation and related discussion questions, tribes stated that their housing authorities and environmental departments might have their own data sets suitable to identifying tribes and sources for funding eligibility. Tribes suggested that CalEnviroScreen account for and compare reservation unemployment rates to those of surrounding areas. Another tribal-specific cumulative impact tool discussed during the forum was including the frequency of health clinic visits on high PM₁₀ days. Participants discussed Mono and Owens Lakes as precise focusses to evaluate for the causes of high PM in the areas.

Tribes were interested in better understanding how CalEnviroScreen would work for individual tribes and how to qualify for funding opportunities. A concern for many tribes is having a secure place to transfer data to CalEPA. Another concern that tribes expressed was how to raise tribal population numbers in data-tracking tools. Tribes asked CalEPA to strategize with large and small tribes alike regarding analyzing gaps in tribal data. A big concern from tribes was how to qualify for grant funding. Many tribes affirmed that they qualified for grant funds in the past and maintained that they still should. The CalEPA presenter stated that other, more flexible grant opportunities would be available through CalEPA in upcoming months.

CHAPTER 3:

Recommendations

The Sustaining Tribal Resources Conference covered an array of topics of concern to California Native American tribes and state agencies alike, as detailed in Chapter 2 of this report. Following are key recommendations for state agencies to consider and act on, in addition to more specific recommendations presented in Chapter 2:

1. Improve understanding of the underlying issues related to tribal energy access, reliability, sustainability, and tribal needs for climate change resiliency.
2. Share recommendations, strategies, implementation guidelines, and best practices among state agencies and tribes.
3. Develop replicable plans or strategies that will help tribes implement plans or access funding opportunities.
4. Advance the use of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) in state programs and incorporate TEK principles across state programs as applicable, including the direct funding of tribal science and research.
5. State agencies need to support and be involved in education concerning tribal resources.
6. Given turnover in agency personnel, maintaining institutional knowledge is critical for state government efforts.

Make a long-term commitment to relationship building with tribes.

Seek and use data that leads to a more accurate depiction and scoring of tribal disadvantaged communities than CalEnviroScreen.

Provide funding for a climate change/tribal adaptation/resiliency program.

Support annual tribal environmental conferences.

Establish a statewide tribal advisory body (and task forces) on tribal renewable energy goals and the protection of tribal resources that includes state agencies and tribes.

APPENDIX A:

Agenda

Tuesday, July 9 – Field Trips

1. Owens Lake

A guided bus tour will take conference participants south with a stop at the Fort Independence Tribe Travel Center, to learn about and commemorate the Forced March which began on this date in 1863. After a short break, the bus tour will continue to Owens Lake where the history and current management of the Owens Lake Dust Mitigation Project will be discussed from a Tribal perspective. Lunch will be provided at the LADWP Sulfate Facility where LADWP staff will give a presentation. After lunch, the bus will complete its tour around Owens Lake and return to Bishop.

2. Bishop Paiute Tribe Walking Tour

A walking tour, guided by staff of the Bishop Paiute Tribe, will take conference participants on a short stroll to view several features of the Tribe's efforts to achieve sustainability food sovereignty, water monitoring, Paiute culture, solar, etc.

3. Bishop Paiute Cultural Center – Battle Site Monument and Paiute Elder Harry Williams Water and History

The group will proceed by bus and car to the nearby site of historic battle where the surrounding valley floor and ancient agricultural fields of the Bishop Paiute can be viewed. Tribal Elder and Environmental Activist Harry Williams and Tribal Historical Preservation Officer Monty Bengochia will lead an overview and discussion of the history of food, water and traditional Paiute sustainability.

Wednesday, July 10

8:30 a.m. Registration

9:00 a.m. Traditional Blessing

Opening Comments

Chairperson Allen Summers Sr., Bishop Paiute Tribe

Chair David Hochschild, California Energy Commission

Commissioner Karen Douglas, California Energy Commission

Christina Snider, Governor's Tribal Advisor

Elizabeth Williamson, California Natural Resources Agency

Amanda Hansen, California Natural Resources Agency

Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer

- 9:30 a.m. Introductions by Conference Participants
Conference Facilitators: Richard Arnold and Thomas Gates
- 10:00 a.m. Owens Lake Recap (Water Management)
Brian Poncho, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Kathy Bancroft, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
Alan Bacock, Big Pine Paiute Tribe
Jennifer Mattox, State Lands Commission
Timothy Ross, Department of Water Resources
- 10:30 a.m. Break
- 10:45 a.m. Exploring Tribal and State Partnerships on Climate Research
Nuin-Tara Key, Governor's Office of Planning and Research
Leah Fisher, Strategic Growth Council
Bennett Lock, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Laurie Monserrat, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
- 11:15 a.m. Exploring Tribal and State Partnerships on Climate Research
Breakout Discussion Session
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch
Water video
- 1:30 p.m. Conservation Easement Panel
Panel Moderator: Matt Leivas Sr., Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Panelists: California Wilderness Coalition, Mojave Desert Land Trust, Native American Land Conservancy, National Parks Conservation Association
Facilitated Dialogue
- 2:45 p.m. Break
- 3:00 p.m. Investor-Owned Utility Real Property-Land Disposition
Darcie Houck, California Public Utilities Commission
Facilitated Dialogue

Thursday, July 11

- 9:00 a.m. Introductory Remarks
Conference Facilitators
- 9:30 a.m. Wildlife Co-management (Big Horn Sheep) Panel
Paige Prentice, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Tribal speaker, Bishop Paiute Tribe
Facilitated Dialogue

10:30 a.m.	<p>Cultural Landscapes</p> <p><i>Thomas Gates, California Energy Commission</i></p> <p><i>Joseph Ontiveros, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians</i></p> <p><i>Facilitated Dialogue</i></p>
12:00 p.m.	<p>Lunch</p> <p><i>Cultural Landscape video</i></p>
1:00 p.m.	<p>CalEnviroScreen, Disadvantaged Communities, and Environmental Justice</p> <p><i>Yana Garcia, California Environmental Protection Agency</i></p> <p><i>Laura August, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Brian Adkins, Bishop Paiute Tribe</i></p> <p><i>Facilitated Dialogue</i></p>
2:00 p.m.	<p>State/Tribal Collaborative Environmental Review <i>[Presentation Cancelled]</i></p> <p><i>Sally Manning, Big Pine Paiute Tribe</i></p> <p><i>Thomas Gates, California Energy Commission</i></p> <p><i>Scott Morgan, Office of Planning and Research</i></p> <p><i>Facilitated Dialogue</i></p>
3:00 p.m.	<p>Closing</p>

APPENDIX B:

List of Attendees

Tribal Participants

Bear River Band of Rohnerville Rancheria

Sarah Stawasz

Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley

Alan Bacock

Danelle Gutierrez

Sally Manning

Emily Ontiveros

Ross Stone

Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians

Pedro Miguel

Bishop Paiute Tribe

Chairperson Allen Summers Sr.

Vice Chairperson Tilford Denver

Councilmember Brian Poncho

Councilmember Jeff Romero

Brian Adkins

Gloriana Bailey

Josh Barlow

Sabrina Barlow

Hunter Begay

Monty Bengochia

Nathan Blacksheep

Jared Hess

Charlene Keller

Ceecia O'Dell

Emma Ruppell

Harry Williams

Wadell Williams

Chemehuevi Tribe

Matthew Leivas Sr. (also represented Native American Land Conservancy)

Elem Indian Colony

Alix Tyler

Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians

Jairo Avila

Fort Independence Indian Reservation

Lynn Flanigan

Jonathan Hogul

Phoebe Nicholls

Cheyenne Stone

Sarah Titus

Fort Mojave Indian Tribe

Dawn Hubbs

Nora McDowell

Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe

Kathy Bancroft

April Zrelak

Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Tribe

Charlotte Lange

Angela Williams-Eddy

Pahrump Paiute Tribe

Richard Arnold

Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation

Ernestina Noriega

Manfred Scott

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians

Joe Ontiveros

Timbisha Shoshone Tribe

Robert Vance

United Auburn Indian Community

Cherilyn Neider

Anna Starkey

Creed Stedman

Dehulan Stedman

Tracy Stuart

State Participants

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Heidi Calvert

Paige Prentice

Nathan Voegeli

California Department of Water Resources

Barbara Cross

Brandon Fore

Timothy Ross

Jennifer Wong

California Energy Commission

Chair David Hochschild

Commissioner Karen Douglas

Hilarie Anderson

Jessica Bonitz

Lindsay Buckley

Thomas Gates

Eli Harland

Jodean Hernandez

Dorothy Murimi

California Environmental Protection Agency

Yana Garcia

California Natural Resources Agency

Elizabeth Williamson

California Public Utilities Commission

Darcie Houck

California State Historic Preservation Office

Julianne Polanco

California State Lands Commission

Jennifer Mattox

California Strategic Growth Council

Leah Fisher

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Nuin-Tara Key

Governor's Office of the Tribal Advisor

Christina Snider

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment

Laura August

Bennett Lock

Laurie Monserrat

Other Participants

California State University, Chico
Jesse Dizard

California Wilderness Coalition
Linda Castro

Davis-King & Associates
Shelly Davis-King

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Joseph Flies-Away

Mojave Desert Land Trust
Michael Mora
Peter Satin

National Parks Conservation Association
Chris Clarke

Native American Land Conservancy
Nicole Johnson
Matthew Leivas Sr. (also represented Chemehuevi Tribe)

Owens Valley Indian Water Commission
Kyndall Noah

APPENDIX C:

Evaluation Results

DAY 1

Owens Lake Recap (Water Management)

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?
Not useful 1 2 3(2) 4(3) 5(8) Very useful
2. How would you rate the presenters' knowledge in the subject?
Not useful 1 2 3 4(4) 5(10) Very useful
3. How would you rate the presenters' style?
Not useful 1 2 3 4 5 Very useful
4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?
Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(3) 5(10) Very useful

Comments:

- Interesting, but did not apply to personal work and projects
- It was very good
- This session plus the field trip was excellent
- Too many on panel, would love to have a question-and-answer period
- Water—it is life

Exploring Tribal and State Partnerships on Climate Research

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?
Not useful 1 2 3 4(9) 5(5) Very useful
2. How would you rate the presenters' knowledge in the subject?
Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(6) 5(5) Very useful
3. How would you rate the presenters' style?
Not useful 1 2 3(2) 4(6) 5(6) Very useful
4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?
Not useful 1 2(1) 3(1) 4(6) 5(6) Very useful

Comments:

- I don't know that the questions were answered but I found listening to the participants to be very informative and the facilitators did a good job allowing conversation. Could the facilitators have been more proactive in getting input from more people?
- Question 1: Not extremely relevant to my work with a nongovernmental organization (NGO)
- The breakout session was not too relevant for agency representatives and was a bit long
- Question 4: Pace was too fast. I wish they would have gone through the actual outcomes of their studies and what they highlight as critical issues
- Breakout groups were great for having productive dialogue
- Breakouts were great for fuller conversation.
- Sometimes difficult to distinguish effects of current environmental manipulations from those caused by "climate change." But really, the solutions are the same. Listen to the tribal people. Think like traditional people — care for all the things that are connected: land, air, water, food, wildlife

Exploring Tribal and State Partnerships on Climate Research – Breakout Sessions

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 indicating "not relevant" and 5 indicating "very relevant" please rate the relevancy of the questions to the climate change issues facing your tribe/agency/organization.

- Question #1: Describe experiences, successes, and/or challenges working with other government and NGO entities on research, or on climate adaptation. What did a successful partnership look like? How can partnerships be improved? How can we facilitate research partnerships between tribes and the State?

Not Relevant 1 2(1) 3(7) 4 5(12) Very Relevant

- Question #2: Are there examples of successful integration of traditional ecological knowledge and western science to inform policy or action? What components of the partnership were critical to achieving a successful outcome?

Not Relevant 1(1) 2(1) 3(3) 4(4) 5(12) Very Relevant

- Question #3: What gaps in knowledge are you seeing that are critical to inform climate change research and adaptation efforts?

Not Relevant 1 2(1) 3(4) 4(6) 5(10) Very Relevant

- Question #4: The climate change indicators are based on observations of climate change and its impacts. Based on what you have observed (from tribal research, traditional ecological knowledge, and other sources), what are the ways climate change has been impacting your tribe? What are your suggestions for incorporating these impacts into the next indicator report?

Not Relevant 1(1) 2(1) 3(4) 4(4) 5(5) Very Relevant

2. Following the session, will you be more likely to collaborate with a state agency on climate change adaptation?

Yes (13) No (1 possibly)

Please explain:

- More information is needed, including an assessment done on reservation. What should it contain?
- This was a short session and only one government agency was present, so yes, I would collaborate with CEC, but I am not sure of other state agencies
- Possibly interested in consultation policies with agencies
- Not sure which agency offers grants for this collaboration
- Would love to. California is still the best state. Provide resources to tribes and listen to tribes
- Trust and respect: do not culminate after one conversation
- Climate change adaptation takes a village
- It seems as if there is an honest interest in collaborating with tribes
- People need to come together and work as a team
- Climate change should collaborate with the creator
- Keeping contact is very important to build a relationship with agency
- Currently, state agencies have an increased awareness of tribal perspective
- I hope the tribes will be more likely to collaborate with us (agencies)
- I gained much from the conversation of the tribal participants and these perspectives and histories

3. Do you have anything to add to discussion that was not mentioned?

Please explain:

- Flooding increases snow melt of the arctic
- Coordination, funding, integrated management (cultural/biological), overgrowth of invasive species (climate change)
- I thought this was a very valuable discussion and I am grateful to have attended this great conference
- Just not many opportunities to date in Owens Valley. We are different over here. Agencies need to meet with and listen to tribes. It is difficult sometimes to distinguish changes due to current management and those due to climate change
- More need to value and save landscapes
- Imbalance of resources. Tribes have too much to do but often not enough support
- It is equally important to research past anthropogenic environmental effects in addition to climate effects, and how those historical effects may compound climate effects as well as mitigate climate effects if addressed
- Barriers exist, and it is hard to get to success without addressing barriers

- Great discussion continuing to education; life is water
- From what I have seen it is very important to start with tribes as a major player, possibly even before counties and cities. This is because they are in a similar position as the state, consulting with countries, cities, state and federal agencies, and universities, etc. In addition, tribes have a perspective that will help inform the conversation when it comes to addressing issues of the country and city level. For example, the United Auburn Indian Community consults in over 10 countries and each city water agency, in addition to seven state agencies in each of these areas
- Enter act with Indians

4. Please provide any additional suggestions for future conferences:

- Be informed of different conferences pertaining to water, climate change, etc.
- Hold this conference annually
- Someone told me that under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), TEK is validated. I had been wondering how organizations relying on “scientific” data would incorporate TEK so this would be a good point to provide. Increasing volume of sound system and making PowerPoints more visible would be really helpful. Having a GRID alternatives representative speak would be great
- How do we hear the tribal voice? Agency people need to get out to Indian Country. Can we give CEQA and Assembly Bill 52 “teeth”? Can California fund some of its tribes’ needs? More land (or all the land), offer Owens Valley tribes and the senior water rights. How do we reverse this long term injustice?
- Respect each other, listen to each other
- Gentle suggestion for State Lands Commission staff who so vigorously spoke on behalf of Tribal perspectives—tone it down. She appears to speak for tribes
- Facilitator spent ½ hour on Question 1; other questions were rushed
- Play it by ear

Conservation Easement Panel

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?
Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(4) 5(4) Very useful
2. How would you rate the presenters’ knowledge in the subject?
Not useful 1 2 3 4(4) 5(7) Very useful
3. How would you rate the presenters’ style?
Not useful 1 2 3 4(6) 5(5) Very useful
4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?
Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(5) 5(4) Very useful

Comments:

- As a presenter, more structure and advanced notice would have been helpful
- I was on this panel so I will not respond
- Overall the session was very eye opening
- More coordination across panelists
- Still not sure how to get started or how to leverage land out of Department of Water and Power

Investor-Owned Utility Real Property-Land Disposition

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?
Not useful 1 2 3(4) 4(3) 5(4) Very useful
2. How would you rate the presenters' knowledge in the subject?
Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(3) 5(7) Very useful
3. How would you rate the presenters' style?
Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(5) 5(5) Very useful
4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?
Not useful 1 2 3(2) 4(4) 5(5) Very useful

Comments:

- I have no recollection of this event—perhaps it occurred too late in the day?
- Not relevant to my work with an NGO
- Question 4: Wanted more, ran out of time
- Question 1: Rated at "3" due to LADWP
- Question 4: Rated at "3" because it was very fast, looked interesting
- This is a hopeful new way to go in California. It seems like there is a way to go on this. It applies to investor-owned utilities. For those of us on public or municipal utilities we hope to see the day they will have such policies

DAY 2

Wildlife Comanagement (Big Horn Sheep) Panel

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?
Not useful 1 2(1) 3(1) 4(8) 5(11) Very useful
2. How would you rate the presenters' knowledge in the subject?
Not useful 1 2 3 4(6) 5(15) Very useful

3. How would you rate the presenters' style

Not useful 1 2 3(3) 4(7) 5(11) Very useful

4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?

Not useful 1 2 3(3) 4(10) 5(8) Very useful

Comments:

- The anecdotal presentations are difficult to contextualize
- Too fast—take more time
- I would have liked some of the presenters to be a bit more organized; some of the presentations were difficult to follow
- Thank you for tying in the wildlife component
- Very interesting and I was glad to hear tribal and Department of Fish and Wildlife perspectives
- O.K.
- I learned a lot from the stories shared and study

Cultural Landscape

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?

Not useful 1 2 3(1) 4(6) 5(13) Very useful

2. How would you rate the presenters' knowledge in the subject?

Not useful 1 2 3 4(3) 5(17) Very useful

3. How would you rate the presenters' style?

Not useful 1 2 3(2) 4(4) 5(14) Very useful

4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?

Not useful 1 2 3(3) 4(5) 5(11) Very useful

Comments:

- Loved the talks, presentation! Follow-up presentation was too text heavy
- Very interesting & informative
- Great job
- Great presentation, good material
- Too fast; take more time
- Slides were too wordy
- This definitely helped my understanding
- Would be helpful to have main point/benefit of presentation stated first
- Very informative
- This presentation was vital and informative. I was presented with new perspective, which is primarily why I am here. The film was moving and inspiring

- Very good information. Very much needed. How do we give it more teeth?

CalEnviroScreen, Disadvantaged Communities, and Environmental Justice

Overall, how would you rate this discussion session?

1. How would you rate the usefulness of the content?
Not useful 1(**1**) 2(**1**) 3(**3**) 4(**5**) 5(**7**) Very useful
2. How would you rate the presenters' knowledge in the subject?
Not useful 1 2 3 4(**5**) 5(**12**) Very useful
3. How would you rate the presenters' style?
Not useful 1 2 3(**3**) 4(**7**) 5(**7**) Very useful
4. How would you rate the pace of the presentation?
Not useful 1 2(**1**) 3(**2**) 4(**8**) 5(**6**) Very useful

Comments:

- Question 1: I work for an NGO (rate 1)
- Very interested in Assembly Bill 617
- Good interaction and information
- It was difficult to hear at times
- This is a compilation of a lot of work and a lot of good work, but it should not be used for everything—just when it is a useful tool

State/Tribal Collaborative Environmental Review

N/A

Please provide any overall impressions and comments regarding the conference:

- Panels often seemed unfocused. Emphasis on concrete action moving forward would be very helpful
- This was a great learning experience. The field trip was excellent and all the panelists did a great job. It was a good opportunity to see the environment and to talk to the tribal members
- Great conference. Great job, everyone
- Conference was great. Need more participation from other tribes and more presentations from tribes. Need to develop a state-wide tribal commission for heritage preservation and protection of cultural resources and environment similar to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act committee, where a heritage and cultural resources commission (panel) would go to tribes to listen to issues which could then be given to California government for implementing legislative changes. Consider a rotating appointment lasting so many years

- Overall, having planned breaks would reduce side conversations, especially since we were all in one common room. I enjoyed the videos throughout the conference. Very impactful
- Overall, this was a fantastic conference and a great starting point to a long-term conversation. Thank you Great organization. Thank you, Bishop Paiute Thank you for bringing us all together. This experience was invaluable in the knowledge shared and broadened perspective gained The presenters were difficult to hear due to the echo in the room Comment Card

Name: C. Neider

Organization:

Commenting on: Common jargon—YES, so important

- Have regional focus groups with tribes to identify local/regional concerns:
 - Visit tribal lands
 - Find out what tribes' capacity is for a region
 - Identify priorities, government and community structures
 - Local relationship with agency, BGO, ETC
 - Identify who has environmental programs
 - Who does and does not accept grants
 - Work with tribes before working with local agencies—tribes are already working with these agencies and can inform the perspective
 - Start with research on what is and isn't working at policy and relationship level
 - Then move on to indicators (this is still research-related)