Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29 - Albuquerque, N.M. and Spokane, Wash.
December 1 - Phoenix, Az.
December 2 - Anchorage, Ak.
December 7 - Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29 - Albuquerque, N.M. and
Spokane, Wash.
December 1 - Phoenix, Az.
December 2 - Anchorage, Ak.
December 7 - Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29	- Albuquerque, N.M. and Spokane, Wash.
December 1	- Phoenix, Az.
December 2	- Anchorage, Ak.
December 7	- Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29	- Albuquerque, N.M. and Spokane, Wash.
December 1	- Phoenix, Az.
December 2	- Anchorage, Ak.
December 7	- Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 22 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29 - Albuquerque, N.M. and Spokane, Wash.
December 1 - Phoenix, Az.
December 2 - Anchorage, Ak.
December 7 - Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29 - Albuquerque, N.M. and
Spokane, Wash.
December 1 - Phoenix, Az.
December 2 - Anchorage, Ak.
December 7 - Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29 - Albuquerque, N.M. and Spokane, Wash.
December 1 - Phoenix, Az.
December 2 - Anchorage, Ak.
December 7 - Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)

Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016

(212) 689-8720

RECEIVED NOV 2 2 1983

M E M O R A N D U M -- November 18, 1983

To: Tribal Chairmen

From: Greg Argel

Re: New BIA Proposal on Overhead Costs of Contracts Under Public Law 93-638

The BIA is currently presenting to tribes a proposal to change its method of paying tribal 93-638 overhead costs. The Association on American Indian Affairs believes the proposal would undermine tribal rights to self-determination.

The most critical recommendations of the Bureau's report are: (1) to discontinue the use of the Contract Support Fund budget activity for funding 638 contract program management costs on a continuing basis; (2) to discontinue the use of indirect costs as a basis for distributing Contract Support funds for new and second year contracts; and (3) to incorporate all 638 contract costs (direct and indirect) into BIA 638 contracts after the second contract year.

The Bureau's plan, if implemented, would drastically reduce the overhead funds provided to many tribal organizations. Many 638 contractors will be required to fund 638 overhead from BIA program funds in violation of section 106(h) of P.L. 93-638 or to cease 638 contracting altogether. Tribal initiatives in contracting would be discouraged. The most serious impact would fall on tribal organizations contracting relatively small and isolated programs for which overhead costs are naturally high.

The change proposed is based upon analysis of doubtful documentation included in the report. The report lists current 638 contractor indirect cost rates without any indication as to what these rates represent in actual dollars or what relation the rates bear to program dollars contracted. The rates quoted in the report need more careful examination since some may be based on total program costs while others are computed on personnel costs alone. The Bureau and the Inspector General should review more carefully

the few rates which seem unusually low or unusually high to determine whether they are justified or may require adjustment, instead of abandoning a system which appears to produce for most 638 contractors a reasonable reimbursement level for overhead costs.

The report also states that the Bureau is abandoning indirect cost rates, "encouraged by expressed congressional committee concerns." We are not aware of any concern on the part of the congressional committees that the tribal indirect cost rates be abolished as the basis for entitlement for contract support funds or that encourages the approach proposed by the Bureau.

The F.Y. 1983 conference report on Interior appropriations simply states that "Beginning with the fiscal year 1985 budget submission, contract support funds shall be allocated to program accounts with only funds required for new contracts included in the contract support line item." This is almost the same language as that of the Senate report, while the House report expresses greater concern at the failure of the Bureau to request adequate contract support funds and expresses concern "...that negotiated rates are staying high or increasing in relation to the size of the programs which are being contracted."

Future meetings to present the plan are scheduled by the BIA as follows:

November 29 - Albuquerque, N.M. and Spokane, Wash.
December 1 - Phoenix, Az.
December 2 - Anchorage, Ak.
December 7 - Washington, D.C.

Information on the time and place for each of the meetings can be obtained from the Area Offices. (Meetings were also held in Minneapolis, Aberdeen, and Oklahoma City on November 15 and 17.)