Laura Platero (00:00:00):

It's changed. This information was shared with me on Friday and then when he looked at it today, it had changed. So in Idaho, it's projected that the peak will occur in 7 days and that's April 16th, and that the peak of that will mean there'll be 4 deaths that day. In Oregon. The peak is projected April 21st, which is in 14 days. And on that day there will be 5 deaths; that's the peak. In Washington, I didn't know this or realize this, that they're projecting that the peak may have passed and that was 11 days ago and the number of deaths that day were 24 deaths. So that looks like, at least for our States, the curve may be flattening. So I think that's really positive news. Well, at least for right now, we have to keep monitoring the data and that link is really helpful so you can access it at any time and see what is going on every day and see if it changes. So just wanted to share that.

At the board we are continuing to have our tribal calls at 10:00 AM and you're all welcome to join those and we are also holding COVID19 clinic calls for providers. So those have been well attended. We've had over 200 participants on those calls. They occur Monday and Wednesdays at 12 noon. This Wednesday one of the topics we'll also include, some of the other things we're seeing as a result with the stay home order, there seems to be an increase in domestic violence and also in drug use. And we sort of want to cover those topics on those calls. And I think it's just really important discussion for our providers to have in terms of trying to address other issues that are coming up. We also developed and we've circulated a funding chart related to the three legislative proposals that have been put forward and links to how to access those funds. Because often as you know, there's tribal consultation involved in after that the funding announcement gets released. We're sort of tracking when those tribal consultations have taken place and when the funding announcement comes out.

The other thing I wanted to highlight that we're working with the National Indian Health Board and the other area health boards to come up with proposals for the fourth legislative package. So I just wanted to share some of the highlights of what that will look like and I did circulate. And all of the chairman should have received that letter from NIHB that had some of those proposals outlined. And I just want to give a few highlights from the proposal of things that are potentially funded. It's divided into four different sections. One is related to critical funding and access needs. So that's increases to purchase and preferred care hospitals and health clinics, a healthcare facility construction; and we included joint venture projects and small ambulatory projects since most of the tribal and IHS facilities won't see any funding under the priority list. Sanitation facilities, maintenance and improvement and equipment purchases. And this is of course all related to hopefully COVID19. And then the other item in here that I think is really important is a lot of our clinics are losing third party reimbursement revenue. So there's actually in this one an emergency third party reimbursement relief fund to address some of those needs losses. It's 1.5 billion being proposed. And then there's some other technical fixes related to Medicaid and Medicare to increase the reimbursements to our Indian health care providers or our clinics. There's also a new provision that we hadn't really, in some of the work that I've done, hadn't done a lot of work in Medicare. So we're looking at parody and Medicare reimbursement and increasing the number of eligible providers that can be reimbursed under Medicare. And then there's a couple other ones I'll just go over these ones quickly. For technical amendments; section 3, expand telehealth capacity and access in Indian country. We did receive a request from one of our tribes to make a priority of our tribes in rural areas to make sure that they have the infrastructure to implement telehealth. And then also there was a focus on implementing a way for inter-agency transfers to occur between IHS and its agencies to tribes. And then to expedite funding mechanisms that are in place to just again, ensure the funding gets to tribes quickly. Then there's also a provision to provide tribes and urban Indian organizations access to
the strategic national stockpile. And I think that one is a really important one and I'm really glad to see that in there. And also provide tribes and urban Indian programs with access to the public health emergency fund. Currently tribes are not able to access to CDC public health emergency fund. And then there's a few other legislative fixes and reauthorizations; request to move contract support costs to mandatory appropriations. A request to move 105 ___ expenditures to mandatory appropriations because as you know, those cut into the services line items every year or have been in the past year. And then permanent authorization of SDPI with the option for tribes to get funds through contracts and compacts. And then there's an item for providing mandatory appropriations for village built clinics. So those are some of the items that are in there. If any of you have any other requests to be included, if you could please let me know as soon as possible. We are having a call with a NIHB to provide additional feedback on these proposals.

Leonard Forsman (00:06:45):
I just haven't got to those emails yet. Okay. Any questions?

Kevin Allis:
Laura if it wasn't, I'm like the chairman, my back emails. If you haven't sent to Nick Courtney or myself, can we get a copy of that? Thank you.

Leonard Forsmans:
I have another question regarding PPE and I know there's been a lot of dissatisfaction in Washington State, I imagine across the nation. But is that a recurring theme still?

Laura Platero (00:07:42):
Yes it is. Every Area varies just depending on how they're being hit. But yes same issue with PPE and testing supplies whether it's the medium or the slobs that there's just been varying needs that we've been hearing about.

Leonard Forsman (00:08:00):
Yeah, our Emergency Coordinator was venting. We don't have a clinic, but we have a need. It's not as great of course, but we do need some in order to do some of our outreach for first responders, et cetera. IHS hasn't really been performing well apparently. And making that a more seamless process when they do distribute. So I think that's something we need to put on our radar that we need to make sure that there's some tribes that don't have clinics that need to be remembered, like us, so not many of us left, but there are a few and then to some of the real small clinics that may not have the resources to get engaged in this process. So I think it's important that we get that message out as well.

Laura Platero: (00:08:50):
Sure. I will make an effort to remind Ronnie Juan who's been handling the distribution of supplies for our Area today. I will make sure to and I've had exchanges with him, but I'll emphasize that today to him.
Terri Parr:
Any other questions for Laura? Okay, thanks Laura. And once again the Northwest Portland Area Indian Health Board will be conducting their phone call at 10:00 AM this morning. So you can get that information on their website if you'd like to join their call.

Leonard Forsman: (00:09:34):
One more question, sorry. Sorry. I imagine you had somebody on that University of Washington medicine call yesterday?

Laura Platero:
I wasn't on it, but we would've had one of our staff on it.

Leonard Forsman:00:09:46):
Okay. So it was interesting. And I think we'll talk more about it, but it's kind a like the discussion of how we get our economy engaged again. And that's of course a big important question for us; public health first. But we do need to see some light at the end of the tunnel as they say. And they had a lot of interesting, was pretty educated speculation, but really around a lot of testing when the curve goes down. So I think the push for more testing and more testing equipment is going to be key for us to restart our enterprises and all as we move forward. So, I know you're probably heard a little bit about that, but I'll be talking more about that and I'm sure you guys, gotta get through this first, but just think out in the future something that we want to make sure that our tribal governments have the access to that and also encourage the federal government to push that as well. So. All right, thank you.

Terri Parr: (00:10:57):
I saw that Henry just got on Henry. Laura is going to be leaving the call here as soon. Did you have any questions for the health board or in the Hill at the health board?

And now Kevin Allis from NCAI is with us here today to speak a little bit what funding is available to tribes and also part of the implementation.

Kevin Allis:00:11:43):
Thanks Terri. Hi everybody. It's good to see you all and hope you're safe. So I'll talk about four things because there is a lot going on. Some of the answers are still unknown. The silence has been definitely since the last consultation. I've reached out to Tara Sweeney and Mark Cruz and folks in Treasury just to kind of see if I could shake anything loose that I could then float out to Indian country to make them feel a little more comfortable that some things are going in the right direction, but just not getting any traction. gosh, where'd you hear that from? First, there's this $8 billion stabilization fund. You know, as many of you were on that consultation call last Thursday, I did not come away from that feeling real warm and fuzzy. You know, as many of you were on that consultation call last Thursday, I did not come away from that feeling real warm and fuzzy. You know, since that particular time, the gentleman at treasury has maybe gotten a better feeling and understanding for Indian country to the extent that he can, but he's clearly not in the know about what is really happening out here and really what this relationship needs to look like when determining how these funds are going to go out. The one comment that he made that really flies in the face of NCAI's letter that was supported by all the tribal organizations was that revenues that are no longer in existence creates unnecessary, are necessary unbudgeted expense. And his comment that we'll all get along better if we just focus on the expenditure side of the ledger and not get focused on
the loss revenue side, we really have some work to do. So it’d be interesting to see what this consultation on Thursday, where that goes. There’s been a lot of conversations going about speaking to that particular issue, making sure that there’s an understanding on that and also how the funds are going to be distributed. I’ve seen at least 10 different formula models that cover all kinds of different things; tribal population to employment numbers, to land base, per caps, everything imaginable, actual expenditures. There’s a lot of unknowns there. And, and as you know, NCAI cannot endorse any one of those models. I was just on the NAFOA led call, keeping it high level to making sure that treasury allows these expenditures to be determined in the light that tribal governments feel is in the best interest for, their communities. So that, that's all I really have to speak on that. We've completed now nine letters in this collaborative effort that have gone to the Administration, to DOL, to HHS, to Education, to Interior, to Commerce, to SBA, to USDA. All those letters are available on our website for you to glean and read, front page of COVID19 page. Feel free to look at those and reach out to us with any questions or comments on that.

I want to address the one issue with the SBA with respect to this ____tech protection program, as you know, maybe you don’t know, the 7A loan program has ineligible businesses, which include gaming operations. And that will derive a large amount of resources from gaming enterprises. Well that’s very problematic to us in Indian country for obvious reasons because a lot of tribes that employ folks in the gaming business and to not be eligible for that is a real problem for tribes. We have been on a full court press on that issue. We’ve been engaging on the Hill on both sides to be sending letters. We have a large, and it’s not just NCAI, this is NIGA, NAFOA, everybody, you know, getting our local representatives to say, wait a minute the congressional intent on the on the paycheck protection program is paychecks. These are loans to allow employers to make sure that employees have paychecks. This is not about business operations or funding infrastructure to business or anything like that. It’s not about borrowing money to buy gaming machines; this is about putting food on the table and by missing the point on that your, your wrongfully eliminating a lot of employees from the ability of their employer to participate in this program and that's not the intent of Congress. So that's a real struggle every day there, there was just a guidance from SBA and treasury that came out literally five minutes ago. I haven't read it. We're waiting to see if, if that's catching any traction but it's certainly something that needs to be flagged and we need to be aware of. In addition, we sent a letter to DOL clarifying something that was in the last bill you know, with respect to paid sick leave and FMLA leave and available tax credits, credits that are available to employers that take advantage of that. As you, as you knew, know that in that bill, there was no reference to tribal governments on eligibility for that program. And, you know, under this program state and local governments are not eligible because they don’t when participate in the insurance program that this is centered around, social security. Unlike States many tribal employers do participate in that and there’s nothing in the IRS code that would suggest that a tribe should be treated similarly to States on this issue. And therefore tribal governments and their business should be eligible for that. We’re asking for tribal consultation on that so they can see the nuances. I feel very strongly that we need to work on a correction on this and make sure that solid and if it’s not it needs to be. Maybe in COVID4 if we’re still uncomfortable with and it’s not clear. My opinion from a legal point, 418 does speak to States not participating in this program; they can opt in if they choose to. 418A, which is something NCAI was involved in years ago, speaks to tribal government leaders, elected officials where the tribe can opt in to have those individuals participate in the insurance program. That would suggest to anybody that tribes are not treated the same as States because there’s a sub-provision that applies to only a small group of individuals, tribal leaders. That’s the only time tribes have to request and work and get an agreement to have them opt in, which leads that everybody else, all the other tribal employees are in the program and tribes have their employees in that program. So we’re trying to make sure we
work on that. The other issue around economic development and these funds is how is this money going to get pushed out? Is it going to be just a check that, whenever they figure out what the methodology is going to be, is it a check that goes dry to tribes or is it going to be through 638 or self-governance compact? Some of the concerning stuff that we're hearing about that has to do with if they use current vehicles that there may need to be an amendment to that and that amendment process is a negotiated process between the tribe and BIA. That's always a time consuming process. We are trying to get clarification on if that is a concern. We were kind of tipped off on that in a kind of confidential manner. I've been trying to shake the tree with the Assistant Secretary and Deputy to engage in a conversation with me that suggests that they're doing that because I would point to certain language in the bill that they could hang their hook on that and they don't need to engage in this amendment process to compact and self-determination agreements in order to begin to push the money out. So that's an unresolved issue right now. Again, not certain where they are on that and what the solutions would be. But that's one of the things that we're working on. I know it's important to the Northwest and also the rest of the country. We did put out a letter to Commerce speaking to what we thought about rapid disbursement, the relief funding for tribal fishery participants under section 12005; that's on our website and you can check into that. Those are the kind of the big ticket items right now.

I'm very interested in seeing what Laura put together; we have begun mobilizing our workgroups again to look at C4. As I mentioned before we develop spreadsheets that lay out what our initial asks were and also lay out what we did get with the Delta is between what we asked and what we did get so we could identify areas to plus up and say, 'look we appreciate what you gave us, but it's not enough and this is why'. We've also identified all the things that we didn't get funded and we're also trying to get as much information as we can from tribal communities on other things that we didn't think of, you know, or wasn't in the first comprehensive list of asks that we initially put out. It was 42 of them. Are there any more that we really need to consider in COVID4 and 5? We've also dusted off the infrastructure booklet that NCAI put together on Indian country needs with respect to Indian country, all the different line items. Since we're hearing a lot of conversation that C4 and maybe a C5, there's going to be a heavy emphasis on infrastructure. Now let me just make a footnote on that; I've heard a couple things on that. I heard 'yes' and then I heard the Senate wasn't necessarily in agreement with that, the House really big infrastructure push. I did read something in Bloomberg Gov a few days ago where Speaker Pelosi is backing off the emphasis on infrastructure. I don't know where that's going right now, but to the extent that it does our working groups that are in this space are using as a map to begin to chart out what we need to have in the next bill with respect to infrastructure needs in Indian country related COVID19. We're going to be using that as a foundational guideline to begin to shape what our ask are moving forward. I was talking with somebody yesterday we've got a little bit of time to do this. You know, it's not the fire drill that it was 2 weeks ago and somebody reminded me that we're already in the second week of April. I'm like 'Oh my God it is'. They are supposedly coming back April 20th; so we want to, through this massive effort, with these 3 work groups and I think it's 9 different sub work groups that spin off from them, to have a good idea of what we will want to go in COVID4 by the end of the week. So again, NCAI, is just kind of organizing in doing this and we are signing onto these letters. There just needed to be an organization to kind of keep it, you know, to the extent possible focused and not all over the place. But anything ATNI and, and any of you have that you think is really necessary oppressing please, let me know or your government relations specialists that are working in these in-groups, let them know so we can make sure that it's reflected in the next one.
Kevin, I've got a question. This is a Chairman Wooten from Samish. Is there any funds identified for the next wave? I was on the UW call and they're predicting this fall we'll have another resurgence in this outbreak. Is there funds set aside to address any of that? Thank you.

Kevin Allis (00:27:21):

Yeah, and that's a great question and we've been talking about that. When we build in what we need in plus ops on this stabilization fund, we've got to figure out what that looks like. The initial ask was 20 billion and that was based on what we knew two or three weeks ago. You know, in the short period of time. So many things have changed that, you know, this concern about a flare up in the fall and in the winter certainly needs to be reflected in the money. So the answer is yes. On the NAFOA call, there was a conversation about, and this is kind of touches on this, on the how we have to be careful and strategize for what that amount needs to be in that stabilization fund in addition to more flexibility and better language that lets tribes really backfill lost revenues that fund tribal programs. What if the $8 billion is oversubscribed, right? What if Treasury instead of getting 8 billion gets 12 or 15 billion, the question is, what's treasury going to do with that? And we don't know what they're going to do with that. I think there's groups that are suggesting what they should do with that. I have yet to see anything in concrete. But what impact will that have on additional monies that we ask for later? My concern is that say there's, I'm just using these numbers, no idea if they're real or not. Say 15 billion comes in for Indian country for to top the stabilization fund. Will Treasury view that, you know, if we ask him for 20 billion in the next one, they're going to say, well, wait a minute, we only got a request for 15 billion. Why are you now asking for 20 billion? You know, that 20 plus eight is 28 billion. If those are accurate numbers, you should be asking for 28 billion total, not some other number. We've got to take this, Chairman, into consideration, your point that we've got to prepare for, for a second influx. So the answer is yes, we're talking about that. That's a good point. And we need to keep that circulating in the mix.

Henry Cagey: (00:29:52):

We're getting some issues around the jail releases. We had 15 prisoners released, they're getting released tomorrow. So we've got two rapist and at least 10 drug dealers. Have you heard anything else about getting this problem?

Kevin Allis (00:30:18):

Yeah, so a great, great question, Henry. Good to see you. We're having a call this afternoon may Virginia Davis and Jake just on these kinds of issues. What tribes are facing on law enforcement, public justice, those kinds of things. What do we need to be making sure that Capitol Hill understands in the next bill on funding to address this. I was receiving some information just yesterday from down in Arizona where almost 80% of the folks that are being booked into a detention facility are enrolled members of tribes and some of them have the virus, some don't. There's some virus outbreaks internal, what are the tribes going to do about that? So there's that and there's the issue of release. What kinds of additional resources do tribes need to handle these, criminals that are back in the community and also the stay at home orders. When you have domestic violence situations where you have people in confined now to homes where there's been abuse going on, how do tribes handle these. So we're hearing a lot of that. We're going to brainstorm internally and what kind of information we need to push out to these work groups to make sure in the next bill there's a more specific language that addresses these public safety issues. In addition to what we saw in the 453 million that's in the TPA funding that BIA is pushing out
Henry Cagey:
So we're having a huge spike in drug use. We've had nine overdoses in one week and one death yesterday. So what's happening is the drug dealers are not being arrested. So the drug dealers are just running around the Rez like crazy; getting rid of their drugs and it's causing a lot of overdoses in the community.

Kevin Allis (00:32:31):
So Henry, I also know that Stacy at NIHB is attacking this from another angle and we will coordinate that. Stacy is taking it from a behavioral health standpoint and what this is causing to happen in communities when people are home and depressed there's increased use of alcohol and drugs and depression and impacts on suicide. So we're going to marry these two together to paint a picture that addresses both sides of this time.

Henry Cagey (00:33:14):
Okay. Thank you. Can we get on that work group?

Kevin Allis:
Absolutely. Reach out to Nick Courtney; Nick is the lead on this health care nutrition education workgroup; NIHB is on it and everything. So make sure Nick has your email.

Terri Parr:
Nick is on the phone are on the call, so if you want to put anything in the chat box for Nick email address or I can get it to him.

Sharon Goudy (00:34:08):
I have a couple of comments. This is Sharon Goudy, I'm on the ATNI board as well as from Yakima. I have a couple of issues. I don't know if you can answer or if anyone's even asked it on the stimulus payments. We heard recently that for those elders that didn't file that they're going to be able to use their social security, 1099 or other information for them to receive payments. But we also have a large population of folks who don't file income tax because they're always on TANF or GA or other subsidized income for their living costs through the year. So we find those that have the most need for a stimulus are not going to receive it because they don't file income tax returns and how that would be addressed, especially with the population the size of ours. And secondly, the homeless issue is heightened because of those folks that are still roaming the streets, so to speak and the ability to put them somewhere where they're not only shelter safe, but they're also not being an epidemic to the other people around them. But we have a large group of students that are in high school or middle school that are homeless as well and school was their refuge. They went to school because they had a place to go and they had a meal and et cetera. Now that schools are going to be closed for the rest of the school year and up until now, those kids not only are homeless, but they have no access to technology, to internet or to computers or any type of equipment to maintain their education while they're not in school. So we've got two very extreme population, the poverty stricken as well as those that are homeless and especially our kids for educational needs.
Kevin Allis (00:35:59):
So Sharon, on the issue of individuals applying for that relief funding that's going out to individual citizens; I have to defer to NOFOA on that. I'm not as plugged into the nuances of that. I've been working on some of the other stuff. I know that Dante and NAFOA have walked through that pretty intensively and they were speaking to it on this call earlier today. I'll reach out to them, but I also make commitment to have one of my policy analysts respond and send something to Terri on that and do a little research on how you maneuver through that. With respect to second thing you spoke about; certainly we strongly believe that addressing whether it be homelessness, the issue that with the kids not being in school, any expenditure that the tribe has or will have I suppose cause this money from the $8 billion stimulus stabilization fund is supposed to be out by April 24th is something that falls in the language of the bill as it's written. If the tribe has to spend any money to keep their community safe in a way and addressing this homelessness situation, whatever infrastructure they have to build or convert or renovate to provide housing and services to these folks in your community, in order to keep not only them safe, but your entire community safe from the COVID19 virus is an expenditure that the tribe; it's a necessary expenditure. It's not something you anticipated before and it incurs in this timeframe we're fairly confident that you'll be able to tap these funds for that. Now if the situation is bigger than we expected, and again if this fund is oversubscribed, which we expect, these are the kinds of stories and things that we have to make sure are properly funded in the next bill.

Sharon Goudy: (00:38:33):
Including the educational needs of internet or computer technology and equipment and supplies for the school kids that are having to do school at home now.

Kevin Allis:
Absolutely, just using the scenario if I understand it right, if the school had internet access and the kids get a large amount of their learning and programming by use of the internet while they're in school and now they have to, because schools aren't open and kids have to stay home and there is not any access to the internet, if the tribes has to expend one dime towards providing that kinds of infrastructure that didn't necessarily have an immediate need. There's always a need for everybody to have access to the internet. But, you're needing to do this so the kids can still engage with their educators and that certainly is a necessary expenditure resulting from this virus that you didn't plan to spend in your current budget.

Leonard Forsman (00:39:48):
As far as the COVID4, I don’t know if you guys have talked about maybe trying to fix some of the language in reference to the treasury. Do you think that's feasible to get that done? Because there's so much confusion here and everything that was said on that call by Treasury was irrelevant to what we're dealing with. So it just seemed like what really happened is that our friends in Congress put this money in the budget and Treasury didn't want to do it. We know they didn't want to do it. So now it seems like they've got this problem, they see this 8 billion as a problem, and it seems like they're being more restrictive and irrelevant, like I said, rather than looking at ways to help our tribal economies.

Kevin Allis (00:40:40):
You know, Chairman, it's such a great point. The side of me that doesn't trust the government wants to say that this was the design okay. To make it as difficult as possible to spend the money. And that way the federal government, Treasury wouldn't have to spend the 8 billion if tribes can't figure out how to
do it because they’ve made it very hard to do it. And another way that I’m also concerned of, well we gave them 8 billion dollars and they couldn't spend it all, so there's no more money we need to give them right. I mean, those are two things that are sitting in the back of my head. This is very difficult situation for us. I have made contact with the National Governors Association. I had a call with them yesterday and we’re going to be working with them in tandem to the extent possible. We need to figure out more about what they want in COVID4. But they have a very similar argument that this is too hyperfocused on the expenditure side of the ledger and not the lost revenue side. And I said absolutely I’m glad we think the same on that. We need our President to engage with a conversation with governor Hogan, who is the head of NGA right now and figure out how we can message that the next bill addresses the lost revenues as being a critically important source of funding for tribal programs. And that for tribes it's even more important because we all know we don’t have a tax base. And so we will kind of see how that plays out because chairman, you’re exactly right. This language needs to be cleaned up. I mean, when it first came across the wire late that afternoon, about six hours before the Senate passed that. When I read this provision, my heart sank. I said, this is awful. This speaks to unbudgeted necessary expenditures. It doesn't speak to budgeted line items in a tribal budget that are no longer funded by revenues. It looks at something different. And what the heck does this mean? Why can anybody think that this is right? So States have some similar arguments with us. We're going to see if we can figure out some way to ride the coattails there a little bit, if you will and have a unified message on cleaning up this language. So this lost revenue source is taken care of.

___ (00:43:35):

Leonard, I'm in a 100% agreement with Kevin. I've been of that thought process since this came out that this is all just ploy by the Administration to say we gave tribes all these monies and they couldn't use it, therefore they didn't need it and we don't have to do any more. We're kind of set. But that's me falling back on what history has taught us. And so here we are in a pandemic that we've never seen before. It’s a whole new way of doing things. You’ve got a short timeframe to get this dollars out there going through the process to try and come up with, take comments on some formula that they have to miraculously put together in the next few weeks of how they're going to distribute this money. My gut is telling me they’re going to fall back on what they know. They're going to pick a system that they already have in place. They're going to divide the money because that's the easiest thing to do and they're going to be stuck with a conundrum because I think some of them do believe that there should be economic based. And so where’s the economic benefit in any one of the federal formulas that they have out there. There is no one that deals with the economies or deals with the number of employees that you have laid off or any of that. And so it really behooves us to still keep going through the motion; pushing Treasury to add that economic component at a greater strength than what's being brought forward because we're talking and we're all falling back into the same old formulas ourselves. We've got to have land base, we got to have a population base, our membership base, it's economically driven. That's what our impacts are that fund all of our government. And how do we tie that back? What percentage of our employees should be factored into a distribution of these dollars and at what portion? I mean it’s so complicated because does Washington state get a pot of money that gets divided up? Does every tribe get a pot of money that somehow gets divided up or shared out or is it an area distribution or do they divide the whole pot X amount for a number of employees, X amount for land base, X amount where, I don’t know, pick a factor. To think that they're going to come up with this formula in the next two weeks and get the money out by the 24th I don’t see how that's going to happen unless they're going to use a formula they already have in place that somehow can be tweaked to add this component. But we're on the outside looking in trying to guess what's happening. So it's somewhat frustrating and uncertain, but I know that we can't stop trying to get it done or the reality will happen based on our
fears of how we've always been treated. Tribe's got money, they didn't use it or we wasted it somehow because we used it in a manner that wasn't authorized under the app.

Kevin Allis: (00:46:46):
I know those are great points and adds to my concern that if the methodology isn't, it's problematic because it's all based on the language that's in this bill. Because if you just give tribes lump sum amounts or something like that, they're at risk of at the back end when there's an audit of being in an uncomfortable spot, right? That someone makes a decision, well, wait a minute, that wasn't authorized so there's a lot of potholes in our way that we need to be conscious of. So tribal leaders really need to make sure, no matter what the methodology is, that everything is documented down to the most minute detail. Because I, I hate to say that I, I just don't trust the mindset behind this. We have to remember that not only do we have their historical context of the schizophrenia behavior this government has towards Indian country, but the White House didn't want to give us anything, you know that afternoon, less than eight hours before this thing was approved by the Senate. White House had zero on the table. So we know where their head is on this, that they don't want to give us anything. And it was like pulling teeth to get the 8 billion and then the 8 billion is, you know, Pigeonholed or caught in this really kind of weird language that just doesn't address the need. States aren’t running through these hoops. They're not running through these hoops like we are right now. They do have the issue with lost revenues, but they're not being tasked with all this kind of, its tying our stomach in knots, trying to figure out what this should look like and they're not struggling as much as we are in this. And we've got to get through this somehow. But these are all good concerns. It's all part of the conversations of this work group.

Leonard Forsman (00:48:55):
In that context, Kevin, is there really a strategy for the call on Thursday or is it pretty much a testimony again?

Kevin Allis: (00:49:06):
Yeah, so you know that that goes back to my point that the silence has been deafening, you know, can't kind of get an idea of what they're thinking about and what they're playing with other than the little stuff that leaks out to us that has nothing to do with how they're thinking about what the methodology should look like. I can't stress it enough that tribal leaders across the country need the stress on this call, that unbudgeted expenses associated with COVID19 or everything under the sun that would have been funded to keep our tribal programs alive had it not been for a loss of our revenues. Yes, we are focusing on the expenditures. The bill tells us we have to focus on our expenditures, but as we focus on our expenditures, we have to be mindful of why we have these expenditures and the expenditures are because we don't have the revenues anymore. So to tell us to focus on expenditures and not pay attention to revenues makes no sense. And that tribal governments, you know, have to make these expenditures and we would make these to run our programs. We're not funding lost profits, we're just funding revenues that went into funding these programs. We really got to use their language; come in it from an expenditure standpoint that does touch on the lost revenues. But instead of coming in it from the revenue door, come in it from the necessary expenditure door, noting that you need these necessary expenditures because there's lost revenues. If we come in the other way, it looks like we're too hyper-focused on the lost revenues and there, and they'll hang a hook on that and say, 'no, no, no,'
Henry Cagey: (00:51:19):
So another point is that we were under funded to begin with. So we got to make sure that, the funding we were getting still wasn’t enough to with. So we’ve been back filling these programs for years. So again, you need to also look at the baseline that we’ve been getting for the last 20 some years and we’ve been back-filling their trust responsibility.

Kevin Allis: (00:51:48):
Yes. And, and that's a great point. And I know this is hard to hear, but I've got to just put it into context because it was made clear to us by our friends who went to bat for us on the $20 billion on both sides of the aisle and to those that really helped us. We have to keep the language for them to be able to help us to this particular situation. If we try to tie it too much to well you need to make up for stuff that you didn't give us last year and last decade and the decade before. Or if we tie it too much to what you should be funding us, it had this not happen over the next three or four years, we're going to lose them. Okay, so Henry we just had to be strategic about that and take your point into consideration. But, they've made it very clear that we do not want to hear about what are tribes going to face between now and the end of the year? And, and until they open that door and Nancy Pelosi started to, okay, and we've got to watch that about what happens next year, the year after the year after with respect to infrastructure and backfilling past inequity in appropriations for infrastructure. If she opens that door, then we've got to take that argument and run with it. But they made it, Henry they made it so clear to us, do not couch it in that kind of language or you won't get any traction. I know it's hard to hear and I'm not disagreeing with you. There is a way to do it to make sure we don't lose.

___ (00:53:34):
When we did the NAHASDA rulemaking formula for housing, and you already knew a number of factors, that took almost a year for a federal process to meet with all tribes to come up with that formula. Now you've got ten times the amount of money and you've got to figure out how are you going to divide it up through some formula in three weeks? It's dumbfounding to think that's going to happen. That’s why I think they're gonna fall back on to something they already know. And so how do we tweak that, which we don't know yet, what system they want to use, whether it’s housing or IHS or 638 or through some process. How do we tweak that and come across with a message that keeps it focused on what the act was. It was a economic stimulus as a result of Corona virus. So we need to focus on the economy. Our message needs to be to treasury on Thursday that same thing. We believe you have the latitude to interpret this language that addresses those revenue losses that we have. I didn't get a comfort level on that call when he says we can't create language, we’re going to use our latitude to try and interpret it, but we can’t do anything that’s not written in there. And we need to encourage them to use their latitude to interpret this because I think they do have that authority. It's just whether they choose to use it or not and keep focused. We need to have a unified message. It needs to be economically driven because those economies are our tax base that fund our governments.

Henry Cagey: (00:55:21):
So Leonard, are we meeting with Senator Murray and Senator Cantwell and Kilmer? On our side?

Leonard Forsman: (00:55:33):
I don't think ATNI has made a proposal to do that yet, but there's no reason we wouldn't. Are you thinking about COVID4 as far as getting language in there to fix it.
Henry Cagey: (00:55:51):
It sounds like they're going to clean up some of this language in round three but into round four, but we need to be meeting with Senator Murray, Cantwell and Kilmer to find out where they're at.

Leonard Forman (00:56:04):
Well, I think they're on our side. How much influence they have over Treasury is the question and interior. You would think Interior would be our representative in this discussion but, apparently, I can see Kevin shaking his head no. I am just fantasizing thinking Tara would look out for Indian country

Henry Cagey:
They have a no contact order there. They been shut down by Tara so they're not even allowed to talk to anybody.

(00:56:50):
I think we just need to be realistic in that if we can't get this money out and get it put to work, you think we're going to get included in anything else in the next passive package?

Kevin Allis: (00:57:09):
Yeah, well the bills will overlap. They may be pushing the next one through as these monies are starting to come out. I don't know the timing on all this. We're kind of playing pin the tail on the donkey. I mean we are voluntarily. You know, we're trying to find the sweet spot. We don't know all the rules here. We're dealt with a bad hand to deal with. And again I can't stress enough that however we message this to Treasury and the NCAI letter is drafted that way; is approach it from the expenditure side consistent with the language that footnotes that we have these expenditures because of revenue. That's the only way. And then we got to try to work with the States in cleaning up this language in COVID4. If it doesn't come out the way we want in COVID3, which I don't feel warm and fuzzy about it, I really don't. That COVID4 recognizes lost revenues and I know the States are fighting for that. That's a big deal with them. And, and we've got to align with them on that. If we can, if there aren't any other reasons that causes us not to.

Leonard Forsman: (00:58:39):
Well I'll reach out to the Governor Inslee's office and try to get a call together with them just to kind of get a feel for what he's hearing and then we can follow up. One thing I think that's going on here obviously is that there's 8 billion stimulus and under the prescription that Treasury seems to be following, there's not going to be $8 billion worth of need. And it almost like you said, kind of feeds into your conspiracy theory. So my first feeling is like, okay, we're going to get some money and it's going to be hopefully a relevant amount. If they get this all out the door, like they say they're going to, and then they're going to try to claw back and take it back from us because they're going to be, they're going to send an inspector general out there and I don't think it's going to be Trump's Inspector General and maybe it will be unfortunately. But they may interpret this loosely; they may not. But I'm just thinking outside the box. Like we've said in the call, we're going to spend this the way we believe it should be spent and then have to fight that battle later on down the road. I guess it's up to every individual tribe to just decide,
Kevin Allis: (01:00:10):
Yeah. And you're right, chairman. And my concerns with, you know, the, then, then there's these formulas and these models that I'm seeing, you know, and where I've seen models up at high that every tribe's going to get a base amount of seven to $10 million. There might be tribes that can't spend $10 million. Their budgets aren't that big. They're just, there are, and what does that look like on the back end for the tribes and for Indian country? If there is some kind of audit or GAO report later, after all this is over and we have tribes that just got sideways with it, you know, whether it wasn't used the right way or all that kind of stuff. What's the long term damage there? There's so many things I'm worried that we're being set up for that are harmful that we just have to be mindful of and really need leadership to be as strong as it's always been and being honest. Look, everybody wants to get a bunch of money, but if your community can't spend all that money, whether it be 7, 20 million, 15 million, 5 million. We hope that the right things done because I'm concerned about it. There's some of these models just don't 'one size doesn't fit all here'.

Leonard Forsman (01:01:39):
Okay, well we're going to need to wrap this up. Any other last questions?

Tom Wooten: (01:01:45):
Leonard. Are you guys going to set up a call with the senators and possibly representatives as well?. I, I'm just following up here. I guess I'll just say I'll support that.

Leonard Forsman: (01:02:20):
Yeah, I want to do more research on it. I don't think it hurts to go ahead and talk to them and tell them our concerns because I've been in these meetings before and Senator Murray will shake her head and go 'I wish I can help you'. That's what I'm worried about. If you guys can check with your DC people, get a feel for what they see the window is for COVID4 to get language in and then I think that's where we focus. So I think what we'll do is go ahead and try to get that set up. But we just want to know what we are going to ask for before we go in.

Tom Wooten (01:03:06):
Again Leonard. I appreciate it. And I think we do need a voice back there. If Tara Sweeney and Interior isn't that voice, we need to find one and fairly quickly. All right, thanks.

Leonard Forsman (01:03:20):
What I've been hearing, it is Pelosi's office where our voice is and if it hadn't been for Pelosi office and then some work Schumer did on his side, nothing would have happened. Our delegation has a relationship with them. Let me make some calls we'll get that meeting set up. Is Board on board for that? (YES)

Terri Parr:
We had Amber on with some brief comments about resources for a CDFI and Ron was going to speak to COVID4
Amber Schultz-Oliver (01:04:25):
Nationally as I reported last time, CDFIs didn't receive stimulus funds in the last package. We're continuing to advocate to seek federal funds that support small businesses, especially those that fall through the cracks that might not be able to get that SBA funding. That oversight seems to be getting attention, the media just recently posted an article that stated that stimulus funds must be directed to CDFIs to serve small businesses. I will put a copy of that article on our websites. I also saw today, I get a lot of my news from Facebook, that SBA is setting up an alternative institution to process the payroll protection program. As you know, that's the program that's being rolled out through the banks and credit unions. But there's a lot of businesses that may not have a relationship with a bank that's able to distribute those funds. So I think they're finding alternative institutions to make sure that there's equal access to those funds. And I haven't heard anything beyond that, but I'm gonna keep on top of that. So here in the Pacific Northwest we just began meeting to discuss how we're all responding to the crisis. All the native CDFIs and other tribal lenders, many are extending forbearance to current borrowers anywhere from three months to the end of the year. Here at ATNI/EDC we're working with borrowers on a case by case basis but have latitude to extend forbearance up to the end of the year due to the seasonality of a lot of our borrowers. Others are also creating an emergency loan product. The Northwest Native Development Fund is offering a product for up to 75% of three months of projected revenue at 4% interest and with no payments being due until for the first six months. Shoshone Bannock CDFI is extending consumer loans up to $1,500. So we're all working on doing something. Finally we are seeking grant funds to lend out to businesses that are not in a position to take out a loan, so it'd be a forgivable loan. The rules on those funds will depend on the funding source. Just as an example, the Oregon Community Foundation just granted us a grant to support Oregon small businesses. I just met with my board yesterday and we're electing to use those funds to be distributed as forgivable loans. If the businesses use the funds as intended, then they don't need to repay it. However, if they don't or if they don't provide documentation of use of funds we'll ask for it to be repaid after 12 months. So that is kind of the quick and dirty of what I have to report and I'm open to any questions.

Henry Cagey: (01:07:39):
Can we get ready for this phase 4 and getting our economic agenda ready for the next round because you know the economy's going to be a big play in this next round. Do we have a position or a recommendation and how to rebuild our economies and get something popped up for, we heard CDFI, maybe opportunities zones, empowerment zones, things that are going to help us rebuild.

Amber Schultz-Oliver: (01:08:09):
Yes, we're going to take guidance from the national organizations. I've been involved with the NAFOA daily call and the Native CDFI network and then NCAI. So as they work on getting a unified voice, we'll work on rolling that out in the ATNI region.

Leonard Forsman: (01:08:36):
I guess I was going to say, Amber, that I think EDC can help and maybe coming up with some policy guidance. What happens is this curve starts to go down, because I think this is something that the health and the economics start to lay over the top of each other. Maybe you have heard something about it; and how they're going to let certain workers out. But one thing they said during that university of Washington medicine call yesterday, which was interesting, was that we may start letting people open up businesses, but they said we got to look at our elders. Does that mean that elder workers
maybe don't go back or you tried to keep your customers, all that type of thing going on. It's kind of an interesting concept to think about. And I think maybe your think tank could maybe help with some policy guidance for that.

Amber Scultz-Oliver: (01:09:34):
Yeah, I hadn't heard that, but that makes sense to make sure that those elders are then taken care of after the economies open up if they're still unable to work. I think that is a really important consideration that wasn't really on my radar, so I'll definitely keep an ear out on that.

Leonard Forsmans (01:09:51):
Yeah. And the other thing they talked about was the people that have recovered potentially being allowed more freedom?? What was that Tom?

Tom Wooten (01:10:08):
Yes. They were talking about survivors being able to provide anti bodies. So that was one of the things about bringing folks back early. I tried to nail him down on that, Leonard, but they were pretty slippery and didn't want to commit to anything. But I think there is light at the end of the tunnel, at least up here where we're all at and we just got to get through it.

Leonard Forsman:
Yeah. And I think those are the kinds of things they are going to be feeding the governors, is this public health information and we have to stay on top of that from a business perspective.

Terri Parr: (01:11:15):
Ron Allen is going to talk about prepping for COVID4.

Henry Cagey: (01:13:00):
One of the things that I want to see us take a good look at is what we're seeing at Lummi is, the expansion of telemedicine, telehealth, telecounseling and online education. One of the things that we want to start working towards is this whole era is going to change everything for our kids, for our elders. The telemedicine is another way that we’re discovering that it's a lot safer, a lot easier to bring up our elders on the iPad and provide services, but I don't know if other tribes are thinking that way. This is a big shift and we want to expand on this whole need to do telemedicine. And we're doing probably about a 100 online visit today, so our guys have really changed the way we provide services to our people and it's working. The big thing we're going to need is infrastructure so that access to fiber, access to the wireless is a big problem. We had to spend $500,000 just to bring cell towers into the Rez, but we'll have a better service after that. But there's a lot of infrastructure that needs to happen for telemedicine to happen.

Terri Parr:
ATNI would like to do a census campaign with tribe, with videos from tribal leaders. If you could do a brief, like 10 second - plus or minus video.
Tom Wooten:
I was thinking about that as well, at least for my citizens. And I think it does make sense if we have a unified voice. So I will send you what I produce is you get mine.

Terri Parr: (01:15:45):
Joel Moffett from our ATNI staff will be coordinating that project. We’d appreciate everybody participating and Coeur d’Alene has expressed their interest and maybe putting out some competition. So let’s have a good time with this.

Sharon Goudy (01:16:12):
Can you post it on the website and any kind of deadline dates with your specific criteria for doing that?

Terri Parr:
Okay so Ron says his IT guys have changed his system and he has video but not voice.

Ron Allen (01:19:57):
Okay. For some reason I don’t have video anymore. But the main thing I was going to emphasize was because Pelosi is emphasizing the infrastructure; it is going to be really important for us to communicate with all the tribes to start putting together their wish list of infrastructure needs. I know there’s going to be other issues. And I heard you guys talk through some of the other issues where they were going to try to fix some of the issues in stimulus 3 in stimulus 4; that is some oversights. But set that aside. On the infrastructure side, it's everything that you can imagine under infrastructure. Now if you look at the NCAI infrastructure document that they produced a couple of years ago, it's a good guide to help you start identifying what those issues are. So they're the obvious that everybody should know everything from roads and bridges to covert issues to broadband capacity, housing for employees. If that's a problem in your area; you have employees that you're recruiting, but you have no housing for them. That's an infrastructure issue. So you want to make sure that all those issues that are under the umbrella of infrastructure. Now, one of the things that was a mistake back with stimulus in early Obama years was they made it shovel-ready. And we want to make sure we have language in there that allows us to use these monies for design and engineering so that at least you can spend money preparing for whatever that infrastructure need is. So that that is an important objective that we would have because there was a lost opportunity for many of the tribes in the past. To me is one of the big issues. I think you guys have already talked about clarity issues that need to be addressed with regard to the PPE issues and the healthcare issues that Laura already identified. I don't need to say anything more than that other than we need to urge the tribe’s planners to start putting together that list and attach numbers to it, even if there are estimated numbers. So that we can try to get a better sense of what that number is, and needed in an Indian country.

Go into one of Kevin's points about the 8 billion in the 3 we made our best estimate. And probably 20 billion was probably closer to correct than the 8 billion, but regardless of that point we just did the best guess back then. And if we have inventory and we have numbers that we can pass a red face test, then it makes it easier for us to make that argument for a specific set aside for the tribes. So that was my main points, Leonard, that I wanted to underscore with regard to 4. It is going to take a while. They're already in a spitting match over is it needed or if it is needed, which they seem to be leaning towards, but what is actually in it?
Henry Cagey: (01:23:53):
Have you heard anything on hospitals and clinics? Is that going to be part of that?

Ron Allen: (01:23:59):
Yes. That is part of it. And one of the things that I think people are trying to decide is identifying hospitals that were underdeveloped and/or the need for clearinghouses for supplies. So that was one of the big issues that is very controversial right now, is the availability of the strategic stockpile. But we don't have any in the Northwest and so tribes should be thinking about that as well. So hospitals, clinic capacities, dialysis centers, et cetera.

Henry Cagey (01:24:52):
What about public health?

Ron Allen (01:24:56):
I don't have an answer for that. Laura would probably have and NIHB would probably have a better answer to that than I have.

Leonard Forsman: (01:25:15):
Good job, Ron. Thanks Ron. Did you have anything to add as far as any suggestions you have for Thursday's call?

Ron Allen: 13 (01:25:40):
Well, boy we are all over the map with regard to the 8 billion and the formula. I saw the Lummi letter that went out this morning, I think, and he had a bunch of different criteria in there that have been debated and discussed, including they are advocating the same as Red Lake, the cap. So the question of the day is depending on what criteria they have, do they have the database? And, and I've been going back and forth with Mark Cruz who's in the middle of this with Tara on coming up with a database on that they're going to use to develop the formula. So the question is what database are they going to use? Population database, what base are they going to use? What's their current numbers? And we haven't even seen it. If they have a number in there for your population, Leonard, and let's say that your number's 1000, but did they have 500? You would want to be able to say, no, we need to correct that because I'm going to miss out on some money. We don't know what that database is for population. I'm pretty certain they have a good database for land. That's an item that's been in a number of people's recommendation. Do you have land? But more importantly is if you have a base and you use other factors like population and land base or employees the question of the day is what percentage of the formula do they account for? So if you say that the percentage for the base is, let's say it's 5%, I don't know what the number is, but then population is 25% and then land base is 10%, and then employees is 40%, whatever the numbers is. We eventually had to make a recommendation what those numbers make sense. The argument that has been getting traction is the one about the employees. This morning's conversation with NAFOA was that they wanted to make sure that tribal governmental employees and business employees are aggregated because they're all falling under the tribe's umbrella. Some were thinking that there should be a separate, this morning's call was an advocacy for combining them because they're all part of the tribal operations cause that's your revenue base. So I think that makes sense. The question is whether or not they can gather that data. I have made a request yesterday to Treasury; can they gather that data and aggregate the ones associated with the tribe because those forms come in different names. The form for your government is going to come in under
your government, the form for employees, your business arm will come under a different name. And so using yours, Leonard, it may be Suquamish and then Port Madison. Well, can they combine the two so that they make sure they know that they're the same entity? And I've asked those questions and they haven't gotten back to me. I think that we should ask those questions: can they gather that data for it to be a criteria in a timely manner and can they aggregate those associated with the same tribe. So that's one number under one tribe. So that's pretty much where we are. Yeah, the large tribes who have large numbers; Navajo could be a good example or a tribe that has a very large operation. Shakopee could be a good example, Pechanga down there in California, because they have large numbers with employees. The guys in Mohegan up in Connecticut, have a very diversified portfolio. And so are they going to aggregate those numbers and at the end of the day does there need to be a cap? And then one of the other things that confuses this matter is: all of our businesses that have less than 500 are following under one category and all of those businesses that are over 500 fall into a different category. Are they going to try to separate them out? That's an interesting question that I don't have an answer to, but it may get raised on Thursday.

One more thing, Leonard. I went back and forth with Mark Cruz about being transparent. They're not communicating with us and there's instructions within Interior and BIA 'do not talk to the tribes.' They're very explicit about that. I've tried to reach to some of my friends and allies in there and they said that they didn't want to get caught having talked to the tribes when they are told explicitly not to. So that means that they're not being transparent about what they're recommending to Treasury. At the end of the day Treasury is going to make their best call, but they don't have the kind of experience with tribes as DOI or BIA has. So we don't know what they're even thinking about. And what database are they going to use, population, employees, land base, et cetera. And then how do you break that out?

Leonard Forsman: (01:31:45):

Well, that's helpful, Ron. If you tribes haven't got your comments in, I would think, try to get them in before Thursday, get them in as soon as possible. I think a lot of them that come in at the deadline probably won't have as much review time because they're going to get to be pretty much close to their decision point by that. All right. Anything else for Ron?

Henry Cagey:

Are you hearing anything on FEMA?

Ron Allen: (01:32:38):

No, I've been going back and forth with them on how we can access them. Most tribes are going through the state. I think Leonard asked that question to a lot of folks recently and most tribes of going through the state and we've heard indications that the state is willing to absorb our 25% match. And I've been printing out and trying to filter through what kind of expenses we can charge to the FEMA monies that are going to be recovered. And that's going to require a close coordination between us, the tribes and the state FEMA contact. I think that all the tribes in the various States, Idaho and Oregon particularly need to do the exactly the same thing. And we need to track those guys down. Now, FEMA has been very forthright in who their contacts are in each of the states. So we have that data. They've been very forthright on who the contacts are. And the questions I've been asking is how do we know how much money is available to the States? What are they asking for? How are they coordinating with us with regard to the resources we should be able to recover through FEMA money? So I don't have the answers there. I'm just like you, trying to try to figure out what that opportunity is now.
Leonard and I and a couple of others are having a brief conversation; we're trying to coordinate that this week with Craig Bill and David Schumacher and his staff in the Governor's office. They want to give us 10 million dollars. What they want to do is get 5 billion out to us right now. And so right now they're trying to figure out how to cut $100,000 per tribe checks and the rest of the first 5 million proportioned out by population base. Craig is scrambling to try to find the most current numbers. I had suggested to Rebecca Kaldor to help out, to try to get an accurate enrolled citizenship for the 29 tribes so you can figure that part out. Then the second 5; they want to talk about should it be other factors? You have raised other factors by areas that have been extremely hard hit by COVID19 and so we need to talk through that. They also agree that a tribe should get a share of the 2.9 billion to our state and so they want to talk through one: what is the number? Their current number is 2.5% of the state population; we have so far said to them we want 2.5% of the 2.9 billion. And if they agree to that, then we have to figure out how to access those monies. That's separate from FEMA. So we're trying to work that track as well.

Terri, you might want to put out a call to all of our Northwest tribes to tell them to tell you how many employees, both governmental and business do they have. And, and right now approximately what ratio had been laid off or furloughed. That would be good data to have right now. And if they would send you their current enrolled number, we don't have a good database. BIA has already admitted their database is not current so they're going to go off of an old base. That's a database that needs to be updated. We might as well start working on it ourselves in the Northwest.

Henry Cagey: (01:37:55):
Shawn John has that for you, he did the economic impact study for NIGA and so he has all of the employee data. It is in Jason Giles shop. If they'll release it. You gotta check with Ernie?

Ron Allen: (01:38:16):
Okay I'll send out an email and cc Leonard and Terri to see if they will release that. I don't know why they wouldn't, it'd be useful information

Terri Parr: (01:38:42):
But is that just their gaming employees.

Henry Cagey: (01:38:52):
Yes. The economic impact study that they just finished

Ron Allen:
Yes, but Terri's question is relevant; did they just gather casino hospitality data? But it should be in the report, Terri.

Henry Cagey: (01:39:09):
Can David Bean get that for us, Leonard?

Leonard Forsman:
I wouldn't assume, but most of us are members of NIGA and we paid for it. I would think that they would release it to us, but I can ask.
Ron, you said on the state side we are working on FEMA money that we are just going to apply through the state for money that we could apply directly through the federal government. But the fact is if we go through the state, we have a lot less paperwork and documentation and infrastructure things that we have to do so it makes more sense if your state. The issue with us is our state's relatively charitable, when not charging us at 25% holding. And then you also said something about another fund. Is that the fund that the state's getting through treasury?

Ron Allen: (01:40:17):
No, the 200 million is from the legislature.

Leonard Forsman: (01:41:01):
Okay. Well, good enough. Anybody else have anything before we conclude the meeting?

Jeanie Louie:
Ron, did I hear you right; that the casino employees then will be reimbursed for their salaries?

Ron Allen (01:41:24):
Well, it's not clear. Cantwell's office has been contacting me about it and they're apparently trying to work with Commerce and SBA on the provision for tribal employees under 500 is one thing. The employees over 500 is in a different category where they get relief. There is provisions in there and I don't know where it is, that says casinos aren't eligible. And I've yet to find that and they're trying to clarify that that's not true. Particularly for tribes. There are different provisions in there for the big industries and that's where the Nevada guys and Jersey guys are earmark so to speak. So I don't have a great answer for you, Jeanie.

Going back to the 8 billion, if they're treating the state a certain way with flexibility then they treat us the same way. We want consistency in terms of applications geared to government. But if they treat the industry the same way simply because our industries are under our governmental umbrella, they should still be treated the same way. The problem is the way the Bill was constructed where they categorize as small businesses under 500 and those over 500 are treated a different way to get a relief. So you're going to have to look closely at it. I don't have those provisions right in front of me, but I do know that they're in a different section of the bill. I'm sure your employees that have to be much larger than 500,

Jeanie Louie:
Right? Yes, over a thousand. And we're paying them their salaries for being off during this time and we're not using unemployment. So that has to figure in there somewhere.

Ron Allen: (01:44:01):
Well, I think that those employees, I could be wrong about this, but they can be in the Payer Protection provision where you can get a loan and I think the loan can go up to 10 million. And if it's for carrying employees forward the loans turns into a grant and its a forgiven loan. So the devil's in the details of that provision. So you gotta look at it very closely.

Leonard Forsman: (01:44:37):
Is that under SBA, Ron? (Yes) That would extend to enterprises over 500?
Sharon Goudy: (01:45:27):
Okay. On that last issue that was raised, can you get an attorney from NCAI or someone from their economic development department to interpret that question for us? Cause I think we're all interested in the over 500 employee and the, and the payment protection act issue.

Leonard Forsman: (01:45:43):
I think NOFA probably would have a pretty good handle on that.

Ron Allen: (01:45:52):
I'll shoot him that question and, try and get feedback from him and cc both of you guys.

Leonard Forsman: (01:46:20):
All right, good enough. I think we're going to go ahead and adjourn this call. We'll be getting back together again once we have more information on COVID4.

Tom Wooten: (01:46:32):
Are you going to send something out before the Thursday call?

Leonard Forsman: (01:46:35):
I did send Kevin an email and I wanted to him summarize his kind of rambling statement that he admitted was kind of rambling because it's so complicated. I felt sorry for him to get that in writing and I think he said they're drafting a letter or something. We'll get that out to everybody. So you have something to draw from before the Thursday call.

Ron Allen (01:47:47):
I think the answer is yes, Leonard. You should be prepared to put yourself in the queue. If you don't have questions up front by listening to the dialogue. I'm going to jump on because these questions that I'm asking I want them to be a little more transparent with me because once they're done with this one, they're going to immediately huddle up because they got one week to figure this formula out and get the money out to us. They have already said that on the 24th that it's a done deal so they can get the money to us before the 27th. Now, one of the things that did bother me, and I think he might be shooting from the hip, Kowalski, I think his name was from Treasury, he made a comment about we've got to make sure that there is an actual need. I kind of went wait a minute, who's going to determine that and what criteria was that? Cruz and those guys told me they thought that he was shooting from the hip when he made that statement so I'm hopeful that they're not going to try to weave in some sort of judgment factor that this tribe needs this and this tribe needs that and we're going to make these adjustments. So they really don't have the time to do anything like that.

Leonard Forsman: (01:49:16):
Okay. All right we'll get something out to you guys before the call.