## **Questions for the Record by Democrat Members**

Questions from Rep. Gallego for the Honorable Joe James, Chairman, Yurok Tribe

- 1. Can you go into more detail about the long history of this legislation, as well as the vetting process it has gone through at the local level? Please describe your outreach efforts to local tribes and stakeholders, and your efforts to resolve any concerns, and if any changes were made to address those concerns.
- 2. Can you expand upon the Yurok Tribe's collaboration with the U.S. Forest Service on this legislation?

## Questions from Rep. Huffman for The Honorable Joe James, Chairman, Yurok Tribe

- 1. Chairman James, can you please describe the Yurok Tribe's intentions regarding the confirmation of governing documents? I understand Yurok's Constitution applies to your "Ancestral Lands," which extend beyond the boundaries of your Reservation. How would this provision impact such Ancestral Lands that are outside the boundaries of the Reservation?
- 2. Can you please explain why Sec. 8 and Sec. 9 of H.R. 1312 are important to the Yurok Tribe and its relationship with neighboring Tribes?

## **Questions for the Record by Republican Members**

## Questions from Rep. Bishop for the Honorable Joe James, Chairman, Yurok Tribe

- 1. On page 5 of your written statement, you explain that your tribe's carbon project involves "selling collected carbon." Can you describe what selling collected carbon entails?
- 2. Does the 2006 cooperative management agreement, confirmed and authorized under section 5(e)(4) of the bill, facilitate the removal of dams on the Klamath River?
- 3. Can you submit to the Committee a complete copy of the tribe's governing documents that would be ratified and confirmed under section 7?
- 4. The Hoopa Valley Tribe owns fee land in the narrow area of mostly BLM land between their reservation and the Yurok Reservation. They have suggested that the BLM land between their parcel and their reservation be conveyed to the Hoopa Valley Tribe instead of to the Yurok Tribe (under Section 2(3) of the bill) to avoid isolating their tract. Would you support that?

5. Several Indian tribes have expressed concern about provisions in Section 5 of the bill that would give special status to and ratify certain agreements of the Yurok Tribe over the millions of acres in the Klamath River watershed. Would you support limiting the effect of those provisions to the Yurok Reservation to avoid effects on other tribes and lands?