

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TRIBAL AFFAIRS**

April 17, 2025

8:04 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Maxine Dibert, Chair  
Representative Ashley Carrick  
Representative Andi Story

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Robyn Niayuq Burke  
Representative Jubilee Underwood  
Representative Elexie Moore  
Representative Rebecca Schwanke

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

PRESENTATION: TRIBAL JUSTICE & TRIBAL COURT

- HEARD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

No previous action to record

**WITNESS REGISTER**

RICK HASKINS-GARCIA, Director of Law Policy  
Alaska Native Women's Resource Center  
Fairbanks, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Co-presented a PowerPoint, titled "The Evolving Legal Landscape of Alaska Tribal Justice."

ALEX CLEGHORN, Chief Operating Officer  
Alaska Native Justice Center  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Co-presented a PowerPoint, titled, "The Evolving Legal Landscape of Alaska Tribal Justice."

**ACTION NARRATIVE**

[8:04:49 AM](#)

**CHAIR MAXINE DIBERT** called the House Special Committee on Tribal Affairs meeting to order at 8:04 a.m. Representatives Carrick, Story, and Dibert were present at the call to order.

**PRESENTATION: Tribal Justice & Tribal Court**

[8:05:27 AM](#)

CHAIR DIBERT announced that the only order of business would be a presentation on tribal justice and tribal courts.

[8:06:21 AM](#)

RICK HASKINS-GARCIA, Director of Law Policy, Alaska Native Women's Resource Center (AKNWRC), co-presented the PowerPoint, titled "The Evolving Legal Landscape of Alaska Tribal Justice." He introduced himself to the committee, as seen on slide 2. He stated that AKNWRC is a tribal nonprofit organization based in Fairbanks. He stated that since 2018 he has worked along side tribes in Alaska to help build the tribal justice systems.

[8:08:18 AM](#)

ALEX CLEGHORN, Chief Operating Officer, Alaska Native Justice Center (ANJC), co-presented the PowerPoint, titled "The Evolving Legal Landscape of Alaska Tribal Justice." He introduced himself to the committee, as seen on slide 3. He shared that he was born and raised in Alaska, and he is a tribal citizen of the Tangirnaq Native Village. He stated that he has been an attorney for over twenty years, working most of that time for tribes and tribal organizations. He stated that he is a member of his tribal council and a member of his regional corporation board. He stated that the work he does at ANJC is devoted to representing and supporting tribes and tribal justice initiatives. He noted that ANJC represents child welfare cases and victims of violent crime cases in the state court.

[8:09:45 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA gave an overview of the presentation, as seen on slide 4, which read as follows: [original punctuation provided]:

- ALASKA'S DOCUMENTED DANGER FOR ALASKA NATIVE WOMEN
- HISTORY OF TRIBAL JUSTICE IN ALASKA

- TRIBAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS AND CHANGES IN HOW THE STATE OF ALASKA HAS RECOGNIZED TRIBAL AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION
- THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT 2022 REAUTHORIZATION

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved from slide 6 to slide 8 and discussed AKNWRC. He stated that AKNWRC organized in 2015, and it is dedicated to strengthening the response of local tribal governments by organizing community efforts. He stated that AKNWRC advocates for the safety of women and children, especially from domestic and sexual abuse and violence. He pointed out that all the board members are Alaska Native women and longtime advocates. He directed attention to AKNWRC's mission, which is to have tribal women, communities, and families be free from violence and to have healing from trauma by utilizing the wisdom of tribal ancestors to create effective community and tribal responses to the violence.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA discussed the funding for AKNWRC, which is through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Family Violence and Prevention Services. He continued that AKNWRC is also the designated Alaska Native Tribal Resource Center, and it is responsible for focusing on the intervention and prevention of family violence, domestic violence, and dating violence. He stated that this is done through culturally sensitive statewide information, training, and technical assistance designed to reduce tribal disparities within Alaska Native communities. He stated that AKNWRC relies heavily on its tribal, state, and national partners, as seen listed on slide 8.

[8:13:49 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 9 and slide 10 and pointed out the problem of domestic violence and homicide of Alaska Native women. He stated that the Violence Policy Center has produced a report for each state, and this report tracked female victims who were killed by male offenders. For Alaska, he stated that the center found a prolonged epidemic of deadly violence against all women. He pointed out that the graph on the slide showed that Alaska had the highest homicide rate in the U.S. in 2020 for female victims killed by male offenders. He added that this was for single-victim or single-offender incidents, and this was the seventh year in a row that Alaska held this position. He emphasized that for the last decade Alaska has ranked first or second in the nation for women killed by men.

[8:15:57 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 11 and stated that Alaska Native women are killed at 10 times the rate than white women. He pointed out the unique challenges in Alaska concerning these high rates of violence, and this includes the state's geographic and infrastructural challenges that would delay an emergency response. He noted that many remote communities lack local law enforcement presence, which also results in a delayed response. Other issues that could cause a delayed law enforcement response include weather issues and communication gaps. He discussed the complexity of the jurisdictions in the state.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA pointed out that there are also socioeconomic factors concerning these high rates of violence. He pointed out the historical trauma from colonization and forced assimilation and the limited economic opportunities in rural Alaska that keep women and children trapped. He noted that there are also housing shortages. He reiterated that in 2020 Alaska Native women were killed at a rate of three- and one-half times higher than all women killed in Alaska, which is 10 times the rate for the murder of white women. He pointed out that these statistics represent real lives and families. He stated that AKNWRC calls for action, awareness, and legislative prioritization. He emphasized that preventative measures are more cost effective than reactive measures.

[8:22:39 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 12 and reported that the National Institute of Justice conducted a study on violence against American Indian and Alaska Native Women, and it found that 84.3 percent of these women have experienced violence in their lifetime. He noted that the data for the study came from 2010. He further discussed a specific breakdown from the study, as seen on the slide. He pointed the conclusion of the study was overall, more than 1.5 million American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. He added that there are multiple reasons for this violence, including colonization and federal law.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 13 and explained that another reason for these statistics is Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe, 435 U.S. 191 (1978). He stated that the court found that Indian tribes did not have criminal adjudicatory jurisdiction for non-Indian offenders in Native territory. He gave the details of the case. He stated that this was a departure from

200 years of tribal Indian law. He explained that from 1978 to 2013 there was a high rate of violent crimes by non-Native offenders with no accountability, which resulted in more crime on tribal lands. He stated that in Alaska, the state has not been able to provide consistent public safety services off the road system, negatively affecting these communities.

[8:29:41 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA, in response to a question from Representative Story, explained that in the court decision it was found that tribes lacked jurisdiction over non-Natives. He stated that tribes could exert authority over their own citizens, or citizens from another tribe, but cases involving non-Natives would go to the federal government. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that 1994 was the first year of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), and this allowed tribal courts to prosecute some non-tribal citizens for certain crimes. He explained that there is an "irrational fear" that non-tribal citizens would not receive fair treatment or due process in a tribal court. He pointed out that now tribal courts are extremely precautionous and work to mirror the protections found in federal and state courts.

[8:34:05 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA pointed out that the history of the tribal court systems in Alaska is unique. He moved to slide 15 and directed attention to a quote from Rose Borkowski, a late Yup'ik Elder. He read the quote, which explained how traditional justice had been implemented by tribes in the past for domestic violence, and the community centered approach they took to restore balance. He emphasized that offenders were not punished but taught how to interact with people properly. He noted that Elders had played a central role as culture experts, often serving as mediators. He stated that the entire community participated when addressing violent offenders, which created a sense of shared responsibility. These responses had been aimed at healing relationships, rather than isolating offenders.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 16 and explained that prior to Russian and American contact, Alaska Natives had been governed by family and clan relationships, not through centralized authorities. He reiterated that wrongdoing was seen as affecting the entire family or clan, and this created a shared responsibility. He stated that traditional justice systems varied across the different cultural tribes in Alaska, as each

had its own systems and traditions that reflected local and community values; however, commonalities were present. He emphasized that traditional tribal justice systems lifted up women, as they had unique roles across all Alaska Native cultures. He stated that female Elders often were seen as key decision makers, and violence against women had been considered an offense against the entire community. He noted that many of the tribes were matrilineal, with rights and cultural significance passed through the mother. In conclusion, he stated that traditional tribal justice systems focused on accepting responsibility, correcting wrongdoing, and restoring balance in the community.

[8:41:35 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 17 and slide 18 and explained the impacts of the Russian colonization of Alaska, which began in 1784 and lasted until the U.S. purchased Alaska in 1867. Russian colonization had disrupted the Alaska Native justice systems that had existed for thousands of years, and this started the existence of outside rule, which continued into the purchase of Alaska by the U.S. He stated that Russia had not give Alaska Natives sovereignty; rather, it imposed its own legal practices.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA discussed how American Indian treaties were made, expressing the understanding that almost all of these treaties were violated and broken. He noted that when the U.S. purchased Alaska, it made no treaties with Alaska Natives. He stated that the purchase treaty referred to Alaska Native people as "uncivilized Native tribes." He emphasized that the purchase of Alaska had been without the consent of the tribes. He noted that most people at the time considered Alaska a "useless land," while Alaska Natives maintained that they had title to the territory as the original inhabitants. He noted that the treaty did not include the consent of the Alaska Native peoples.

[8:46:59 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 19 and discussed the influence of the U.S. government on tribal justice systems in Alaska. He stated that the U.S. immediately began to impose its policies on the territory and the people. He stated that the first federal court was established in Sitka in 1884, and this was when civil government was being administered on the District of Alaska. He pointed out that this period represents a loss of land for tribes. He pointed out that, at this time, the U.S. had not

recognized Alaska Natives' title to traditional lands; rather, the land was treated as public domain. He pointed out that this had created an ambiguity with the legal status of the land, which existed for over a century, until the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) in 1971. He noted that once the U.S. had taken control of Alaska, a separate education system for Alaska Native children was created, and this had led to the creation of the missionary and boarding schools. He noted that the first Bureau of Indian Affairs school was established in 1925, and this furthered the segregation of Alaska Native peoples. He pointed out that when the U.S. took control of Alaska, the transformation of Native landowner concepts changed from the traditional, collective stewardship models to individualized property rights. He stated that this shift undermined the tribal government systems, where land decisions had been made collectively.

[8:52:58 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved to slide 20 and discussed post-statehood in Alaska. He explained that in 1959 the newly formed state government expanded its power. He stated that this was done by providing resources to communities to have city councils, different from the village councils, and state magistrates were put forward to assume judicial roles. This system of government was set up in preference to the tribal justice systems.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA directed attention to the quote on slide 21 by Lisa Ka'illjuus Lang, which read as follows (original punctuation provided):

Colonization severed Haida people's ties with ourselves, each other, our nation, the land and sea reflected in the disrespect for and rates of domestic and sexual violence against our women and children. Our potlatches are our ways of upholding our societal laws, and these were outlawed in Alaska in the early 1900s and in Canada during the late 1800s.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA asserted that the effects of colonization on Indigenous justice systems were detrimental, as exemplified in the quote. He explained that the criminalization of Native potlatches had eliminated these formal spaces where traditional justice had operated, making the traditional protection of women and children unenforceable.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA moved from slide 22 to slide 24, and he pointed out the eras of federal Indian law. He explained that the subject is extremely dense, and he focused on the current era of 1994 to the present, which is termed the "self-governance era." He stated that an important part of this was the implementation of the Tribal Self Governance Program, which was established in 1988. He pointed out that this stemmed from the self-governance compacts for health care. He discussed the health care demonstration project, which allowed tribes to consolidate multiple contracts and grants into a single funding agreement. This allowed tribes to assume control over the management of their programs, as opposed to federal agencies. He stated that an amendment in 1994 created a permanent tribal self-governance program, as opposed to a demonstration program. He stated that the program has become very successful, as all the federal Indian programs are carried out by the tribes themselves, and not the federal agencies. He discussed the various results of this, including VAWA. He stated that the self-governance era has had many positive impacts on tribes, including autonomy. He stated that there has been an enhancement to a sophistication in tribal governance. He noted that there are still jurisdictional challenges, especially in terms of non-Native offenders. He also noted the funding inadequacies, despite tribes having more control over resource allocations.

[9:03:47 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA, in response to a question from Representative Carrick regarding whether the Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe decision influenced change, directed attention to Public Law 280 (PL 280). He expressed the opinion that after the Oliphant decision, the federal authorities' lack of support to the communities had been irresponsible. He explained that the victims [of crimes by non-Natives] were left without accountability and justice.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK opined that the Oliphant decision was "more than irresponsible," and this is a good example of how the self-determination era had positive gains and the right direction.

[9:08:40 AM](#)

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA, in response to a question from Chair Dibert concerning the changing rates of violence against women, expressed uncertainty why the rates dropped in 2008 through

2010, and he offered to follow up to the committee. He deferred to Mr. Cleghorn.

9:09:38 AM

MR. CLEGHORN expressed uncertainty, and he suggested that it could be tied to the surge in the presence of Village Public Safety Officers, as this had been a priority during that time.

9:10:15 AM

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA, in response to a question from Representative Story, emphasized the importance of the restorative justice practice by the tribes. As the tribal justice system is reinvigorated, he pointed out that the Alaska tribes are learning from the tribes in the Lower 48. He stated that while these tribes mimic the Western government systems, Alaska tribes are reaffirming traditional justice practices and the restorative practice. He expressed doubt in the practice of "locking somebody away" from the community. He opined that recognizing the importance of culture, family, and community, as rehabilitation, would allow these people the opportunity to heal.

MR. CLEGHORN gave the example that in Juneau, the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska have been operating a juvenile program to divert young people from the state system into a healing-to-wellness court.

CHAIR DIBERT commented on her experience with potlatches in the Interior with her tribe, and she expressed the importance of this.

9:17:20 AM

MR. CLEGHORN stated that his goal in co-presenting the PowerPoint is to highlight the progress of tribal jurisdiction in Alaska. He moved from slide 30 to slide 32 and addressed the definition of "inherent tribal sovereignty." He stated that "inherent" means that autonomy would not be derived from another government. He explained that federal law has acknowledged that tribal powers are not stemming from acts of the U.S. Congress; rather, they are inherent sovereign powers that have never been extinguished. He stated that sovereignty predates the formation of the U.S., as tribes have been on the land for time immemorial, and federal law has not diminished this. He addressed the definition of "tribal," pointing out that there

are 229 tribes with federal recognition. This means that the federal government has acknowledged a specific group of Native people as a tribe and a distinct political entity. These tribes have a government-to-government relationship with the federal government, and they are sovereign nations with the right of self-governance.

MR. CLEGHORN defined "sovereignty" as the right to make laws and be self-governed. He emphasized the importance of using the term "citizen." He stated that "sovereignty" gives the right to make laws and administer justice. In conclusion, he stated that sovereignty means the right to govern, protect, and enhance the health, safety, and welfare of citizens. Connecting sovereignty to self-determination, he stated that this means the Alaska Native peoples would do their own work. He asserted that sovereignty and self-determination are closely related.

MR. CLEGHORN moved to slide 33 and asserted that tribal jurisdiction is necessary to address the safety crisis and child welfare. He pointed out that Alaska Native children are still being removed from their homes. He argued that tribes should be able to exercise their own jurisdiction because violence committed with no accountability harms people and communities. He maintained that this accountability does not need to look like Western accountability, but it does need to exist because it is a core part of justice. He expressed the understanding that each tribe would structure accountability differently.

MR. CLEGHORN moved to slide 34 and addressed the timeline of tribal jurisdiction in Alaska from 1958 to the present. He noted that in 1958, PL 280 was extended to "Indian country" within Alaska, which put federal law in jurisdiction in these lands. Next on the timeline, he pointed out that in 1971 ANCSA was created. He highlighted the 1978 Oliphant decision and expressed the opinion that the court's "weak reasoning" in the case had not recognized that the tribes exist with inherent sovereignty. He stated that this rationale "didn't go much deeper" than recognizing that the U.S. exists, and tribes are "domestic," so tribes would not have jurisdiction. He expressed the understanding that, in the decision, the court had recognized it was creating a problem, and it recognized that the U.S. Congress would be the branch of government to address these concerns. He stated that the reparation of this did not occur until 2013.

MR. CLEGHORN, discussing the timeline, pointed out that in the 1999 case, John v. Baker, 982 P.2D 738, 761 (ALASKA 1999),

Alaska courts had recognized the inherent sovereignty and jurisdiction of tribes based on "membership or citizenship." In 2013, VAWA had restored Lower 48 tribal jurisdiction over non-Native people who committed domestic violence, and in 2022 VAWA's reauthorization occurred, and this is when Alaska tribes were included. He stated that this provides the ability for Alaska tribes to have criminal jurisdiction over non-Native people who commit certain violent crimes within the village.

[9:28:56 AM](#)

MR. CLEGHORN, in response to a question from Representative Story, explained that in 2013 VAWA had created a pathway for Lower 48 tribes to exercise criminal jurisdiction on non-Native people who committed domestic violence, but Alaska was not included. He stated that when VAWA was reauthorized in 2022, a chapter about Alaska was included. He stated that this reauthorization had expanded the list of eligible crimes. In response to a series of follow-up questions, he expressed uncertainty on the number of non-Native people who have been charged in tribal courts in the Lower 48. He offered to follow up after the meeting. He stated that he would be able to provide the number of tribes in the lower 48 that are exercising criminal jurisdiction.

[9:33:56 AM](#)

MR. CLEGHORN moved to slide 35 and pointed out the functions of PL 280. He stated that it allows states to exercise jurisdiction in Indian country; however, Alaska does not have Indian country, so the jurisdictional impacts of this in the state are minimized. He stated that PL 280 does affect federal public safety and justice funding; however, he pointed out that this funding has been diminished. He stated that PL 280 did not terminate tribes, extinguish tribal sovereignty, or take away tribal jurisdiction. On slide 36, he explained ANCSA's effect on tribes in the state. He stated that it had settled Aboriginal title claims and revoked reservations, which had impacted the territorial jurisdiction of Alaska tribes. He stated that ANCSA did not terminate tribes, and it did not extinguish tribal sovereignty.

MR. CLEGHORN stated that because tribes in Alaska do not have Indian country or reservations, this has created a question about tribal jurisdiction. He stated that the Alaska Supreme Court in *John v. Baker* had addressed this question, and the court had found that Alaska tribes do have jurisdiction, as seen

on slide 37. Moving to the next slide, he stated that in between 1999 to 2022 there had been many court cases around tribal jurisdiction, but with the 2022 VAWA reauthorization tribal jurisdiction was affirmed. He stated that VAWA does two things: it affirms Alaska tribes' jurisdiction, and it creates a pilot project for Alaska tribes to exercise criminal jurisdiction over non-Native people that commit certain crimes within the village. He pointed out that it does not create Indian country; rather, it recognizes a village as a Native territory.

MR. CLEGHORN moved to slide 39 and stated that in VAWA 2022, the U.S. Congress is recognizing and affirming the inherent authority of Alaska tribes occupying the village to exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction for all Native people in the village.

[9:39:54 AM](#)

MR. CLEGHORN moved to slide 40, which listed the types of cases that tribal justice systems are currently covering, including adoptions, child protection, domestic violence, disorderly conduct, drug and alcohol regulation, divorces, and more. He stated that each tribe would determine the extent of its jurisdiction, and this is often driven by community need and by available resources.

MR. CLEGHORN, on slide 41, stated that Native villages in Alaska are under concurrent jurisdiction between tribal, state, and federal courts; however, tribes have exclusive jurisdiction over internal tribal affairs. He stated that this concurrent jurisdiction is found under PL 280. He expressed the opinion that progress needs to be made concerning communication and collaboration in the concurrent jurisdiction between the state and the tribes. He noted that tribes have exclusive jurisdiction over their internal government affairs. He maintained that VAWA 2022 was clear that concurrent jurisdiction would not be disrupted, as seen on slide 42.

MR. CLEGHORN, on slide 43 through slide 46, explained that some of the details of tribal jurisdiction are difficult to understand. He directed attention to the issue of enforcement within the tribe and outside of the tribe. Concerning enforcement outside of the tribe, he said that this is done either in full faith and credit or in comity. He stated that some federal statutes, such as VAWA and the Indian Child Welfare Act, require state courts to give full faith and credit to

tribal court orders. He added that this would also concern a protective order issued by any state, tribe, or territory that is violated in another jurisdiction, as this jurisdiction must enforce the order as if it were its own. He pointed out that this area needs more state collaboration, as there continues to be confusion about tribal court protective orders and the responsibility to help with enforcement.

[9:44:52 AM](#)

MR. CLEGHORN moved from slide 47 to slide 50, and he addressed the VAWA 2022 Pilot Project. He stated that the statute asserts that the Alaska Tribes, who are meeting standards in protecting a defendant's rights, could exercise special tribal criminal jurisdiction over certain crimes committed in their villages by non-Indian perpetrators. He noted that in this situation "defendant's rights" would have the same meaning as it does in the Western legal system, which includes free, licensed attorneys for poor defendants, law-trained tribal judges, publicly available tribal criminal laws, recorded criminal proceedings, jury trials with a representative jury pool, and the right for any non-Indian to file a federal habeas petition. He reiterated that VAWA 2013 was about domestic violence, but too many crimes fell out of this federal definition. He stated that VAWA 2020 resulted from the advocacy to expand this list, and now there are nine listed crimes, as seen on slide 49. To implement VAWA 2022, he stated that the Inter-Tribal Technical Assistance Working Groups (ITWG) were created. He stated that this group had been formed by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in 2013 and has met every year. He noted that this group is open to all tribes.

MR. CLEGHORN moved to slide 51 and stated that because Alaska is unique, it formed its own ITWG, or "AK ITWG." He stated that it is similar to the national ITWG, but specifically for Alaska, as Alaska tribes are working together on public safety and justice, in a peer-to-peer collaboration. He added that there is Alaska-specific technical assistance. He stated that AK ITWG began meeting in 2024, and it has had two meetings. He explained that DOJ had chosen the Alaska Native Justice Center to lead the AK ITWG, along with other partners, as seen listed on slide 52. He pointed out that Alaska has two tracks for participating in AK ITWG. He stated that Track One is open to all interested tribes, regardless of whether they plan to apply for the Pilot Program. He stated that this track includes peer-to-peer information sharing, and members would receive targeted technical assistance. He added that tribes who wish to join the

AK ITWG should submit a letter to DOJ. He stated that Track Two tribes are those who have expressed interest in special tribal criminal jurisdiction over non-Native people. He pointed to the list of interested tribes on slide 54.

[9:51:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK expressed appreciation to the presenter and expressed the hope that the committee could investigate the topic further in the future.

CHAIR DIBERT expressed appreciation that the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) is an AK ITWG partner. She mentioned the Sophie Sergi case and expressed the importance of protecting Alaska Native women on campuses.

MR. CLEGHORN added that the UAF's program on tribal management and government has been working to get information out on these issues. In response to a question concerning other possible partners, he stated that other non-profit regional corporations involved in similar tribal justice support have been interested. He expressed gratitude for the opportunity to share information on the topic, and he noted the complexity. He pointed out that compressing the information concerning tribal justice and tribal courts is a challenge.

MR. HASKINS-GARCIA expressed his appreciation for being able to speak before the committee. He noted that the Chickaloon Village would be presenting to the committee soon. He pointed out that it is one of the participating villages in Track Two of AK ITWG. He expressed anticipation on hearing about its work.

CHAIR DIBERT thanked the presenters, and she made closing comments.

[9:57:46 AM](#)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Special Committee on Tribal Affairs meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.