2025 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Departmental

Reorganization Plan Tribal Consultations Report Out

October 14th and 16th, 2025

In-Person and Virtual Meetings

Washington, D.C. and Denver, Colorado

USDA Consulting Officials:

- Stephen A. Vaden, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture
- John Walk, Acting Director, USDA Office of Tribal Relations

Note:

This report consolidates discussion and comments from two consultations and written comments submitted to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in the 30 days after the consultation. In addition to comments from the USDA consulting officials, there is also a letter from the Deputy Secretary with some further responses.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

Dear Tribal Leaders,

I would like to thank all of the consulting officials that participated in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) two reorganization consultations on October 14th and October 16th, as well as those that submitted remarks in the subsequent 30-day comment period. The Department had unprecedented participation and response rates from Indian Country and that is a testament to the passion with which you represent your constituents.

I want to address a few common themes from the consultations and offer some solutions or progress updates. A goal of this reorganization plan is the reduction of bureaucracy. A commonly discussed concern was the Forest Service's middle management layers. Removing these layers will ensure better communication between the local level and leadership. That is not to say the responsibilities of the Regional Foresters will disappear. Careful planning will ensure operations continue smoothly and that our trust and treaty obligations to Indian Country are upheld.

Multiple Tribal leaders expressed concern about the disruption of local-level relationships, specifically at the county Service Centers that house the Farm Service Agency, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and Rural Development. I want to assure you that USDA does not intend to close any offices or reduce any staff at these Service Centers as a result of the reorganization plan. As I said during the consultations, these offices are the lifeblood of USDA; and their staff is right where we want them.

Several Tribes raised the previous Administration's failure to properly administer the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR). This reorganization plan's goal is to strengthen local relationships so that unacceptable occurrences like the FDPIR fiasco will not happen again. In the specific case of FDPIR, USDA recently awarded new contracts to two companies: Americold and McLane. USDA will be closely monitoring the rollout of these new agreements. Participating Tribes should keep in close contact with USDA. The Food and Nutrition Service wants to hear what is working, and if appropriate, what can be done better. What happened under the previous Administration was unacceptable, and USDA will do everything in its power to make sure it never happens again.

Multiple Tribal leaders proposed the idea of "Tribal hubs" located close to areas of high Tribal population concentration. I was intrigued by this proposal. We will have a strong Tribal presence

in the Juneau office and will now contemplate a similar presence in other office locations, including Albuquerque. Albuquerque was a city frequently named as an option by Tribal leaders, and USDA already intends on consolidating staff in that area.

Finally, regarding the distribution of Tribal-relations expertise between the Office of Tribal Relations and the Mission Areas, there will be a balance. The Mission Areas will still have Tribal relations experts familiar with USDA's trust and treaty responsibilities. At the same time, we view this reorganization as an elevation in status of the OTR. It will be a one-stop-shop and function in an ambassador-like role for the Department in its relationship with Indian Country.

I would again like to thank you for your participation in these consultations. For any Tribal relations needs related to USDA in the future, please do not hesitate to reach out to the Office of Tribal Relations at Tribal.Relations@usda.gov or 202-205-2249.

Sincerely,

Stephen Alexander Vaden
Deputy Secretary

Consultation Summary

I. USDA Opening Remarks

- The Deputy Secretary looked forward to receiving feedback as USDA prepared to finalize its reorganization plan. He affirmed the Department's commitment to working with Tribal governments and Alaska Native Corporations (ANCs) to provide essential services and uphold its trust and treaty responsibilities.
- As part of President Trump's commitment to reforming the Federal workforce to better serve Americans, Secretary Rollins issued SM 1078-015 on July 24, 2025, directing departmental action to consolidate, unify, and optimize USDA's functions and delegating to the Deputy Secretary all necessary authority to implement and make changes to the plan.
- The Deputy Secretary said the plan right sizes USDA's footprint, eliminates unnecessary management layers, consolidates duplicative functions, and, most importantly, allows USDA to more effectively fulfill its mission to the American people.
- The Deputy Secretary also acknowledged there were questions about the impact of reorganization on Tribal communities and assured that USDA formed the reorganization plan with Indian Country in mind. He was confident that, once it is fully implemented, USDA would be more efficient and effective in providing these services to Tribal members and had no intention to disrupt any established relationships.

II. Principle 1: Ensure the Size of USDA's Workforce Aligns with Financial Resources and Priorities

USDA Overview

- Across the previous administration, USDA hired thousands of new employees. Many of those new employees were hired on a permanent basis with *temporary* funds, creating an 8% growth in employees and a 14.5% increase in salaries.
- The National Capital Region (NCR) real estate portfolio demands constant upkeep that requires USDA to divert resources. As a result, USDA has a deepening backlog of maintenance in the NCR, including at the Whitten Building, Yates Building, National Agricultural Library, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, and the George Washington Carver Center. By minimizing the NCR footprint, the Department will not only save money but also reduce attrition over time by having more staff join the department for the long-term from places like Tribal Colleges and Universities. These employees will be located in areas with lower costs of living than the NCR.

Tribal Leader Comments

- As a general comment, multiple Tribes requested that USDA extend the consultation period to as late as December and have more than two consultation sessions. Consulting officials pointed out that the multiple conferences occurring during the two consultation dates as well as the reduction in Tribal government capacity during the shutdown may reduce participation. Additionally, some consulting officials said USDA should have consulted before the release of the reorganization plan. One leader called it a failure of USDA to adhere to its own consultation policy.
- In terms of Principle 1, multiple Tribes appreciated the goals of efficiency and accountability, but also emphasized that the reorganization should not affect the ability of USDA to uphold its trust and treaty responsibilities. The loss of staff could lead to a loss of expertise as well as previously fostered relationships. In the case of Alaska, multiple Tribes brought up the unique logistical and administrative difficulties and the need to retain staff with specialized knowledge and relationships in that state.
    - The Deputy Secretary agreed and affirmed that nothing involved in the reorganization plan should weaken the trust and treaty relationship.
    - He further said that having more people does not mean you are getting better or more efficient service, citing the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) supply chain disruption as an example. He said this possibly happened because the Department is centralized in D.C. but had people working from home who did not adequately communicate with one another or tribal nations, leading to a communication breakdown within the Department.
- Multiple Tribes also requested that USDA exempt employees in Tribal relations positions from the reorganization or Reductions in Force (RIFs) while others said any reorganization should be halted until impacts on service could be determined because of the specialized knowledge some positions require.
- Multiple Tribes advocated for the use of authorities like 638 contracting and compacting, the Tribal Forest Protection Act (TFPA), Good Neighbor Authority (GNA), and USDA's Departmental Regulation 1340-002 as ways to fill in gaps, ensure continuity of services, and create cost-savings to taxpayers that also empower Tribes. Some Tribes said this should extend to programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and FDPIR. For example, a Tribe detailed its state's issues with operating SNAP, and how compacting with Tribes would ensure accountability, timely delivery, and culturally grounded service for the people who need it most.
    - The Deputy Secretary believed authorities like 638 contracting and compacting represent an intriguing possibility and that Tribes know their needs better than the U.S. government. He welcomed Tribes to provide details about areas in which they would wish to engage. He also talked about how government bureaucracy

can get in the way, citing examples like certain National Environmental Policy Act regulations that delay the Department's ability to deliver needed services.

- Tribes also brought up areas that should not be cut or have reductions in Tribal access and eligibility, including the Special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), SNAP, and Rural Development programs.
- Multiple Tribal leaders said cuts should not occur at USDA Service Centers, saying that that vacancies should be filled before relocations. Without sufficient FSA staffing, routine processes like check endorsements or livestock sales can stall, which can lead to financial collapse for producers and loss of tribal economic stability. Multiple Tribes brought up Regional Tribal Conservation Advisory Councils and whether the plan would impact these successful partnerships.
    - The Deputy Secretary stated that the reorganization plan will not affect County Service Centers and that those staff are where USDA wants them. He encouraged Tribes to inform USDA of any county staffing shortages.
- Multiple Tribes expressed concern that any further staffing shortages coupled with remoteness could lead to disruptions in service. Multiple Tribes also expressed concern about how staff reductions in the Forest Service (FS) could affect wildfire response, with one Tribe citing the damage from the prolonged absence of culturally informed and ecologically sound practices. One Tribe highlighted its ongoing recovery efforts from wildfires that occurred five years ago. A tribe acknowledged the plan's recognition of the critical importance of appropriate national forest land management and commended the proposal's attention to wildfire risk.
    - The Deputy Secretary agreed regarding the important status of national forests, noting they have not been properly managed for many years in large part because of federal rules and regulations that make it difficult to manage the forest. The important role of fire and prescribed burns would continue to be a focus of FS management.
- Tribes had other requests regarding the staffing plan such as a public, line-by-line list of all USDA positions and functions proposed for relocation, consolidation, or elimination, with identification of those positions that directly serve Tribal Nations or Tribal programs; a Tribal Impact Assessment detailing anticipated effects by program, region, and staffing level; and publishing a recruitment plan and timeline for filling all Tribal-serving positions, with quarterly updates to Tribes.
- Multiple Tribes called for greater cross-agency coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Department of Interior (DOI), specifically with its Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Some of the issues for coordination included feral horses; the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP); Make America Healthy Again; herd management and range recovery programs; and removing duplicate approvals of loans, leases, and conservation programs. One Tribe said, without timely access to USDA

and BIA services, producers risk financial collapse, which not only weakens Tribal food sovereignty but also destabilizes the local economy.
    - The Deputy Secretary understood the frustration that can come from multiple government offices seeming to have concurrent jurisdiction over the same area. He further said he was connecting with his counterpart at DOI to reduce bureaucracy wherever possible.
    - As an example of coordination, he talked about work with DOI regarding grazing issues.
- Multiple Tribes expressed concern about cost, both from a perspective of whether there would be cost savings in the long run as well as concern about the justification of cost savings when it comes to functions involved in treaty obligations. Tribes felt those obligations should not be subject to cost savings measures.

III. Principle 2: Bring USDA Closer to Its Customers by Relocating Resources Outside of the National Capital Region

Introduction

- The Deputy Secretary observed that Washington, D.C., has a high cost of living (current locality pay rate of 33.94%) that has exceeded the growth of government salaries. Employees that want to work at USDA, but who also want to afford a home and start a family, must commute 60-90 minutes or more. This reality has led to a declining pool of people willing to commute to central D.C., especially compared to cities like the five hub locations where commutes are shorter and costs of living are lower. The standard of living at the hub locations will lead to happier employees who are more likely to stay with USDA longer.
- The Deputy Secretary has toured the Kansas City and Raliegh hub locations and met with employees who have voluntarily relocated from the NCR. The employees, including some born and raised in Washington, D.C., voluntarily decided to relocate because they did not have the quality of life they were looking for in the NCR. Some who moved when the Economic Research Service (ERS) and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) relocated in 2019 noted that, though they missed some of the colleagues who decided not to relocate, the new colleagues who joined them brought new perspectives to old problems and allowed their respective agencies to move past old barriers that may have been caused by people who were set in their ways.
- Another important driver is bringing USDA resources closer to Indian Country. As demonstrated by maps shown during the consultation, the 4,600 employees in the NCR are nowhere close to where the majority of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and the Tribal Colleges and Universities are located. Indian Country should not have to travel across the country to be heard by a USDA official in Washington, D.C., who may have no

familiarity with their region. Closer proximity will promote the formation of stronger ties, foster collaboration to ensure more effective and efficient service delivery, and make USDA far more accessible to Indian Country than it currently is.

- The hub locations were selected because they have a much lower cost of living, enabling employees to stay with the agency for longer. USDA sees this proposal as securing the future of USDA for decades to come while taking into account the realities of the cost of living. Although there can be debate about to which cities staff should be moved, it should not be Washington, D.C. By moving people to hub locations closer to Tribal communities, USDA thinks it will make incidents like the FDPIR supply chain disruption harder to fester without response.
- USDA indicated it wants as many of its employees as possible to move to the new hubs and will have offices for them. At the same time, USDA is proposing turning back over for dispensation buildings in the NCR that have more than $2 billion in backlogged maintenance.

Tribal Leader Comments

- Multiple Tribal leaders disagreed with moving staff from the NCR to the hubs. They believed that Washington, D.C., is more convenient because Tribes already travel there frequently. Tribes also worried about the staff attrition likely to occur based on past governmental reorganizations. One Tribe cited a Government Accountability Office report about the ERS and NIFA relocations, discussing the findings regarding workforce and productivity declines. One Tribe was concerned that it could lead to another FDPIR supply chain disruption. Because new contracts are about to begin, the Tribe requested a pause on any FNS reorganization until at least six months after successful program delivery on the part of new vendors. One Tribe said mass relocations will destroy irreplaceable knowledge about Treaty rights, forest conditions, and working relationships built over decades, and new staff unfamiliar with the land will make mistakes. A Tribe requested a list of the Tribal liaisons in each hub while another wanted a regional service map.
    - The Deputy Secretary pointed out that all knowledge does not emanate from Washington, D.C., and that USDA must locate in communities where employees can stay long term and are closer to the people they serve.
    - Although USDA would be moving a good number of people out to the five regional hubs, it intends to keep 2,000 people in the NCR, including departmental leadership, agency leaders, undersecretaries, and key career employees who are involved in policymaking with political appointees. Every agency will have representation in D.C. so that, when members of Tribes come to talk to Congress, there will be people at a senior level to meet with Tribes.
    - At the same time, the Deputy Secretary said USDA will be moving some senior-level leadership to the hubs. USDA wants these hubs to be where decisions

affecting people closest to them are made. This will include having officials present who can consult and enter into agreements on behalf of the Department. USDA wants these hubs to be a permanent part of its future and not something wiped away in a few years.
    - With FS in particular, the Deputy Secretary says he expects the western hub in Salt Lake City to have a very strong FS presence. Much of the FS leadership currently located in the Yates Building will relocate. Final decisions have not been made about who goes to which hub, which is part of the reason USDA is having these consultations.
- Multiple Tribes expressed concern about the lack of an Alaska hub. One Tribe also said excluding Alaska from the hub network directly contradicts USDA's stated intent of bringing USDA closer to its customers and worried that centralizing these functions outside of Alaska would delay critical support and reduce USDA's ability to respond effectively to regional needs such as landslides, flooding, and subsistence resource declines.
    - The Deputy Secretary confirmed the Alaska office will be staffed with employees who have decision making and consulting authority as well as the ability to enter into agreements with Tribes. USDA's Alaska office will retain the agency's expertise regarding Alaska's unique policy needs.
- Multiple Tribes proposed having "Tribal hubs" in cities such as Bismarck, Rapid City, Billings, Tulsa, Albuquerque, and Anchorage while establishing a program that would allow Tribal citizens to work remotely for USDA from their reservations. A Tribal coalition noted it is very important for their tribal citizens that work for the federal government to be able to work remotely on the reservations for cultural reasons. A Tribal leader said that establishing an Alaska-based hub, preferably in Juneau, is essential to ensure that decision makers remain close to the lands, programs, and communities most affected by federal policies. One tribe requested a population-based approach be considered with Tribal hubs.
    - The Deputy Secretary pointed out that the Secretary specifically named a Juneau office in the reorganization plan. While the regional office structure in the Forest Service will disappear, the Juneau office will remain because Alaska is different in scope and challenges. USDA intends to strengthen its partnership with Alaskan Tribes, ANCs, and the State.
- Multiple Tribes expressed fears about FS moving further away with the creation of hubs. In addition, multiple Tribes noted the need to take into account the ecological and cultural complexities of Tribal lands. For example, the forests near Fort Collins and Salt Lake City are different than the forests in other areas whose oversight may be consolidated into those hubs.

- One tribe said centralizing authority in the Lower 48 also runs counter USDA's DR 1350-002 on Tribal consultation and Executive Order 13175, which requires agencies to strengthen, not weaken, nation-to-nation engagement.

IV. Principle 3: Eliminating Management Layers and Bureaucracy

Introduction

- USDA has too many managers and not enough workers as well as too many people in offices and not enough interacting with Tribal partners. USDA wants management much closer to Tribal communities so that all are better informed and USDA can make better decisions.

Tribal Leader Comments

- Multiple Tribes expressed concerns regarding the elimination of the Forest Service regional offices. Their concerns included the diminishment or elimination of gains from good working relationships, the loss of institutional knowledge specific to Tribal issues and treaty obligations, losing coordination with leadership, and the effect on the management of local treaty resources. A Tribe asserted that the proposed reorganization represents a breach of the USDA's trust responsibilities. Another Tribe worried that the loss of regional forestry staff would also limit its access to fuel management, timber stand improvements, and post fire rehabilitation support. A Tribal coalition recommended a reduced staff Eastern service center with a dedicated tribal relations, research station, and law enforcement staff in the upper Great Lakes Region. One Tribe called for reinstating or protecting Alaska-based research and fire management capacity rather than consolidating all Forest Service science functions in Fort Collins. A different Tribe requested an analysis of how the elimination of its regional office will allow for the maintenance of its treaty rights.
    - The Deputy Secretary observed that the most important people in USDA's relationship with Tribes are the people on the ground closest to tribal members. Those positions will remain where they are. The regional offices and related management layers are being eliminated so that more resources can be devoted to the forest-level employees. Too many management layers are separating people on the ground from leadership. Important issues become stuck at the regional level with no visibility in Washington, D.C. It is a problem that has grown over time as the number of employees in regional offices has grown.
    - This reorganization plan will not necessitate the closure of forest-level offices.

    - The Deputy Secretary said a side benefit of that is a more direct line of communication. It will also free up funds previously dedicated to management for more productive uses.
    - He said the Office of Tribal Relations (OTR) would follow up about an issue related to the Spotted Eagle Fire.
- Multiple Tribes also disagreed with the elimination of the Regional Forester position. These Tribes worried about the creation of an accountability vacuum and procedural uncertainty. One tribe worried that phasing the position out would require one of the largest rulemakings in FS history. A Tribal coalition called Regional Foresters a vital partner in forest management rather than a redundant bureaucratic layer. One coalition proposed a phase-out period of at least two years.
    - The Deputy Secretary said the intent is to cut back on unnecessary bureaucracy and not to allow important decision-making authority for Tribal issues to disappear. He took note of the Tribal agreements consulting officials cited and the important role that Regional Foresters play in some of those agreements so that the Forest Service can ensure that those roles are not forgotten. Instead, the roles should be delegated to officials that are closer to the Tribes rather than in a regional office located elsewhere.
- Several consulting officials talked about how important timber harvesting is for rural communities and tribal nations as both an income and job creator. One Tribe pointed out though that wildland firefighting and market development opportunities cannot be separated from forest management. That Tribe observed that forest management addresses the root causes, and focusing solely on removing timber does not create sustainable markets.
    - The Deputy Secretary agreed on the importance of timber sales to rural economies and cited how USDA had already exceeded its 2025 harvest goal. It is a top priority in this administration to end the decline in rural communities caused by shrinking timber harvests. New authorities granted by Congress to allow for faster harvesting of timber should help with this. USDA is excited to work with its Tribal partners to once again make proper forest management a departmental priority.
- Multiple Tribes discussed barriers with NEPA, with one Tribe saying the phasing out of FS regions, combined with NEPA issues, has led to a project between the Tribe and the FS being put on hold, placing his people at great risk.
    - The Deputy Secretary talked about recent reforms and new categorical exclusions that will make NEPA review less burdensome. He agreed that misplaced interpretations of environmental laws should not stand in the way of USDA's trust and treaty responsibilities. The Deputy Secretary requested additional information so that the backlogged project could be addressed.

- A Tribe said reducing the number of Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) regions to five would make regions too large. The Tribe worried that FNS staff might not move, leaving positions unfilled and frustrating the Tribe's efforts to work in partnership with USDA to operate nutrition programs that support elders, children, and the community.

V. Principle 4: Consolidating Support Functions

Introduction

- The Deputy Secretary said the Office of Tribal Relations should be a one-stop-shop for Tribes, as its name suggests. He further suggested making OTR the center of the Department's government-to-government relationship, similar to an ambassadorial role.

Tribal Leader Comments

- Multiple Tribal leaders argued for Tribal relations and treaty expertise to remain in the agencies and across USDA. They expressed concerns with the possible dilution of expertise at the regional and field office-level.
- Multiple Tribes talked about the importance of Tribal expertise on the ground, including having people that know the land, have worked with Tribes, and can push through organizational obstacles.
- Multiple Tribal leaders discussed OTR's future, advising that it should be strengthened as an office and should remain in Washington, D.C., so that Tribes can have direct access to leadership. Some tribes advocated for the establishment of a Special Advisor to the Secretary on Tribal Affairs, modeled after the position held by Mark Cruz at HHS. One Tribe was enthusiastic about the reorganization plan's support for OTR but worried that, without a commensurate growth in the number of staff at OTR, it will not make up for the loss of tribal expertise from other agencies.
    - The Deputy Secretary said a goal of the reorganization is to see to it that OTR lives up to its name. OTR should be the focal point for tribal relations and know everything that's going on in all of the Department's mission areas that are affecting tribes.
    - For OTR, the government-to-government relationship with tribes is very important and something that deserves the attention of both the Secretary and Deputy Secretary. When Tribes engage in government-to-government conversations with USDA, OTR should be able to engage with Tribes directly. It should not matter which mission area is involved; OTR needs to be the manager and ambassador.
- Multiple Tribes called for the filling of vacant positions such as the OTR Director, national Tribal liaison positions in agencies that do not currently have one like FNS and

the Risk Management Agency, and local areas like the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

- Multiple Tribal leaders pointed out that Tribal relations is not a "support function" but rather a government-to-government relationship binding under the Constitution, treaties, and Supreme Court precedent. A Tribe pointed out that at least 226 treaties contain agriculture-specific provisions, and much of the FS lands fall under various treaties. Arguably, USDA has more treaty responsibilities than any other agency present within the Federal government.
- Multiple consulting officials said that the consolidation should not affect consultation requirements.
    - The Deputy Secretary assured that reorganization plan in no way alters or modifies USDA's legally-required consultation obligation.
- Multiple Tribes requested clarification if the "delivers all statutorily required tribal relations functions" includes functions required by treaty.
- One Tribe advocated for a Tribal Agriculture Partnership Office within USDA, ideally within Rural Development or the NRCS. This office could work closely with OTR, which is well positioned to play a greater role in coordinating federal support for Tribal Nations. Satellite branches in major Tribal population centers would enhance communication and ensure local accessibility.
- One Tribe said USDA should bolster the number of positions in the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) with treaty and statutory expertise, as recommended by USDA's Tribal Advisory Committee. Another Tribe expressed concern about the loss of grants and contract staff. There was also a concern from the Tribe that OGC had more responsibilities, such as Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) compliance, assigned to it with no additional capacity added.
    - The Deputy Secretary said that what is envisioned is taking the FOIA professionals currently located in mission areas and moving them into OGC.
- One Tribe said the Office of Partnerships and Public Engagement (OPPE) and other statutory entities with mandates affecting Tribal relations must remain operational and accessible to Tribes without interruption.
- A Tribal coalition said that USDA should establish — for human resources, procurement, and information technology functions — formal Service Level Agreements (SLAs) that define maximum response times for Tribal requests, include exceptions and flexibility for urgent Tribal procurement or emergency needs, and account for the smaller scale and distinct legal status of Tribal governments. It also asked for Tribal data access and partnership agreements (including Indigenous Food Sovereignty and climate resilience projects) to remain protected. The coalition also strongly recommended that USDA establish an explicit government-to-government escalation process for Tribal concerns that involve emergencies, trust resources, or treaty violations as well as a joint USDA–Tribal Oversight Committee to monitor reorganization implementation.

- A Tribal coalition requested further clarification on items such as the roles, responsibilities, and functions of OTR and USDA agency Tribal Liaison positions. It also requested USDA address any impacts to service delivery resulting from the proposed relocation of personnel to USDA Hub locations. The coalition highlighted Tribal forestry operations as a particular area for focus.

VI. Closing Comments

- The Tribal Comment period is open until November 16, 2025.
- Comments will be reviewed and taken seriously with a report to be issued that will contain Tribal comments, proposals, and concerns.
- USDA noted its government-to-government relationship with the Tribes is essential to the Department's mission.
- USDA also understands the importance of OTR and having subject matter expertise in the mission areas. The Tribes' comments regarding the importance of these positions and OTR will bear heavy weight in USDA's reorganization plan.