

# HUBBELL ATTACHMENT 44

All redactions are 5 U.S.C. §§ 552 (b)(5), (b)(6), and (b)(7)(C) unless marked otherwise



**Office of Inspector General**  
Program Integrity Division  
U.S. Department of the Interior

**Investigative Activity Report**

<b>Case Title</b> <b>HUBBELL TRADING POST</b>	<b>Case Number</b> [REDACTED] Ex. 2
<b>Case Location</b> Ganado, Arizona	<b>Related File(s)</b> [REDACTED] Ex. 2
<b>Report Subject</b> Interview of [REDACTED]	<b>Report Date</b> February 6, 2007

On February 6, 2007, [REDACTED] was interviewed by DOI-OIG Special Agents [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] has known [REDACTED] for over [REDACTED] years and has traveled to Hubbell Trading Post (HTP) approximately once a month for those [REDACTED] years.

[REDACTED] was interviewed by NPS Special Agent [REDACTED] in August 2004; a few months after the search warrant was executed at [REDACTED] HTP in Ganado, AZ. [REDACTED] added [REDACTED] was also interviewed by NPS SA [REDACTED] on February 12, 2006 in Chinle, AZ.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] was the one who told [REDACTED] to put tags on [REDACTED] rugs so that the weaver, date and prices could be documented. [REDACTED] recalled helping [REDACTED] over a few days several years ago with cleaning up [REDACTED] garage and storage area at HTP and tagging a lot of [REDACTED] rugs with old HTP tags so that there would be some accounting of when the rug was made, by whom, etc. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] told SA [REDACTED] this information back in August 2004 and "SA [REDACTED] was only writing down things [REDACTED] wanted to hear". [REDACTED] felt this was important and would help explain why there were so many rugs at [REDACTED] residence with HTP tags on them.

<b>Reporting Official/Title</b> [REDACTED] Special Agent	<b>Signature</b> [REDACTED]
---	--------------------------------

Distribution: Original - Case File Copy - SAC/SIU Office Copy - [REDACTED]

Case Number:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Case Number: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated NPS and [REDACTED] shut down HTP during the search warrant and audit in June 2004. That was unprecedented for HTP and the entire investigation of [REDACTED] has damaged the relationship between the NPS and the Navaho community.

[REDACTED] reviewed two interview reports prepared by NPS. One was with NPS SA [REDACTED] in August 2004 and the other was with NPS SA [REDACTED] in February 2006. SA [REDACTED] had not been aware [REDACTED] had previously interviewed since SA [REDACTED] had not placed that interview in the case file or let SA [REDACTED] know that the interview had taken place when SA [REDACTED] asked for all interview reports. On the interview with SA [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] had left out a lot of information that [REDACTED] had provided to [REDACTED]. The most important things left out was how [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had used old HTP tags to mark [REDACTED]'s personal rugs; that [REDACTED] had quite an extensive collection of Navaho rugs and jewelry at [REDACTED] residence that were [REDACTED] property; the number of consignments at HTP; and Malone's trading practices which do not and are not supposed to conform to standard procedures for merchandising or sales.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Case Number: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

# HUBBELL ATTACHMENT 45

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Telephone:

Date of Interview: February 2, 2006

I met with [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Hubbell Trading Post, on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ganado, AZ. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I had previously spoken with [REDACTED] by telephone to schedule this interview, explaining the nature of this investigation. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



I asked [REDACTED] to explain the financial relationship that existed between [REDACTED] and the National Park Service, and Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site in particular. [REDACTED] explained that approximately 6% sales/profits from [REDACTED] at HTP went into an "Interpretive Support Account" maintained by [REDACTED] and controlled by [REDACTED]. The National Park Service (usually [REDACTED] the superintendent) would submit requests to spend money out of the account for specific items or projects, but the money remained [REDACTED] to obligate and [REDACTED] retained ultimate discretion over expenditures. [REDACTED] clarified that the NPS is not able to claim those funds as their money.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

During this interview [REDACTED] mentioned that [REDACTED] had already been interviewed as a part of this investigation. I noted that I had not been aware of a previous interview conducted by personnel assigned to this case, and had not been provided a copy of any reports documenting a prior interview.

[REDACTED]

HUBBELL ATTACHMENT 46

All redactions are 5 U.S.C. §§ 552 (b)(5), (b)(6), and (b)(7)(C) unless marked otherwise

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]

DOB: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Date of Interview: February 12, 2006

I met with [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] had called me to request and schedule this interview, having learned from [REDACTED] that I'd assumed responsibility for the "Hubbell (i.e. [REDACTED] Investigation)". I introduced myself to [REDACTED] displaying my NPS law enforcement credentials and shield as I entered [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] has known [REDACTED] for over [REDACTED] years, and considers [REDACTED] a good friend. [REDACTED] explained that [REDACTED] is a full-time dealer in Navajo textiles and Indian art, and has traveled throughout the Navajo nation for years as a part of [REDACTED] own business, buying rugs from weavers on the reservation. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As a part of that process, they used obsolete Hubbell Trading Post tags (of a design no longer being used at HTP, since they were not pre-numbered), and applied them to [REDACTED] rugs with their own markings or identifiers. The tags they used had been discontinued for use at the trading several years earlier, and would otherwise have been thrown away. [REDACTED] elected to simply use these tags to label [REDACTED] own rugs, as a matter of convenience. [REDACTED] recalled that they did not tag all of [REDACTED] rugs; and that since the project at the time was just to clean up the garage, only rugs in the garage got tagged (though not all of those rugs were tagged; only those worthy of display or those whose weaver [REDACTED] might have recalled). [REDACTED] noted that at this time [REDACTED] saw that [REDACTED] had literally hundreds of rugs just in the garage; with closets in the house also full of rugs and jewelry. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] noted that [REDACTED] had attempted to share virtually all of this same information when [REDACTED] been interviewed in this case before, by Special Agent [REDACTED]. I indicated to [REDACTED] that I was not aware [REDACTED] had previously been interviewed, and that I had not been provided with a copy of any reports documenting such an interview. I assured him that I would make further inquiry in that regard. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]