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April 2, 2014

Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
Assistant Secretary of the Interior  
1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W., MS: 34-SIB  
Washington, DC 20240

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my support for the Meherrin Indian Tribe’s effort in obtaining Federal Recognition as an Indian Tribe.

The Meherrin Indian Tribe has numerous historical archives such as maps, birth and death certificates, census and war records, documenting their long history as a tribe. They are one of eight North Carolina state recognized tribes and has members who currently reside in Hertford County and throughout North Carolina and Virginia. They are seeking Federal Recognition to legally return to the Government – to Government status our Nation has historically enjoyed. North Carolina and Virginia will benefit economically should this Federal Recognition be granted.

I would appreciate any consideration you may be able to give to this matter. Please let me know if I can provide additional information about this outstanding tribe. Thank you for your work, as your efforts benefit citizens of North Carolina, the USA and the world.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael H. Wray  
NC House District 27

MHW/shb
WASHINGTON, DC 20240
1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W., MS: 34-SIB
Assistant Secretary of the Interior
Office of Federal Acknowledgement

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL H. WRAY
Legislatu...
To whom it may concern,

As comment on the proposed finding to decline to acknowledge petitioner #119B, here are three exhibits bearing on that, arranged in order from, in my view, the most important to the least:


Relative to this article, I can only say, that from it we can only tell that some portion of the Meherrin Indians — part of them, most of them, 100% of them, we can't know — landed up among the Tuscarora in New York, we know not when. Rudes' educated guess is that it took place in 1802. From

*But in 1782 Thomas Jefferson said it had already taken place!*
my own study of the matter (see White 1977*), I would say that our record (of
the negotiations between the New York
Tuscarora delegation and the state go-

government of North Carolina in 1801-
1802) is exquisitely detailed. But
as to names of those still left in
North Carolina who migrated north in
1802, we have the names, at least
to my knowledge, of only two—
Chief Samuel Smith, and a woman
named Ne-res-ke (she was men-
tioned by her grandson in Ontario).
For all I know, every last Meherr-
rin Indian in their village on Po-
tecusi creek or anywhere in the
South, may have gone straightaway
to the Tuscaroras in New York in
1763, or 1770: I don’t know.

(Notice that Smithsonian ethnologist
Dr. J.N.B. Hewitt, who knew in 1910
about Akawę́ć’a´i-ka*?, was a Tuscarora
and spoke Tuscarora. Akawę́ć’a´i-ka? is the Meherrin town Cowoncho-hawkon. )
exhibit B. letter, Marianne Mithun to Wes Taulkhiray, July 31, 1992, 4 single-spaced typed pages. This letter demonstrates to me that the Meherrin Indians actually did speak an Iroquoian language, and that the assertion that they did so is not guesswork. That is important because it shows why the Meherrin Indians went to the Tuscaroras up north when they, the Meherrins, left North Carolina: they went to live with a people who spoke a language closely related to Meherrin.

exhibit C. letter, Blair Rudes to Wes Taulkhiray, March 13, 2004. The point of this exhibit is to show that two linguists — Dr. Marianne Mithun-Williams of the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California, and, the late Blair Rudes — both argue, based on excellent evidence, that the Meherrin, like the Tuscarora, spoke an Iroquoian language. Thus, it is plausible that the Meherrin would go to live with the Tuscarora, leaving North Carolina in order to do so.

Of course, Dr. Mithun-Williams and Dr. Rudes
are both linguists of a very high order.

Lastly: I am not trying to prove that no Meherrins refused to participate when their tribe moved north with the Tuscaroras; and am not trying to prove that they (if they ever existed) have no descendants. On the other hand, we, as yet, find no record of same.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

WESLEY D. TAUKCHIRAY

Copy, with exhibits A, B and C and a one-page addendum, to Wayne Brown, or rather to: Meherrin Indian Tribe, co/ Wayne Brown, P.O. Box 274, Ahoskie, N.C., 27910
Two published sources relative to the historic Meherrin Indians that I do not see in the bibliography of the proposed finding to decline to acknowledge petitioner #119B; not here included as exhibits due to the fact that there's no point to demonstrate.


Neither volume names any Meherrin individuals whom we don't already know.
Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, publishing items of interest to students of Algonquian and Iroquoian languages and literatures, appears in four issues per calendar year volume. Volume 6 is $3.00 (Canadian or US, payable to Algonquian Linguistics only.) Your contributions of class, meeting, and project announcements; publication notices; research notes; bibliographical notes; errata; reviews; and papers are welcome. Papers should be typed in our column format with Courier 12 type if possible.

Editor: John D. Nichols, Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont. N6A 5C2 Canada.

TWELFTH ALGONQUIAN CONFERENCE REPORT

The following papers were given at the Twelfth Algonquian Conference at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on October 17-18 1980.

Aubin, George, "Remarks on Golden Lake Algonquin"

Barbour, Philip L., "The Feasibility of Establishing Key-spellings for Indian Place-names Mentioned in the Earliest English Accounts of the Virginia and New England Settlements"

Bragdon, Kathleen J., "Linguistic Acculturation in Massachusetts in the 17th and 18th Centuries"

Burnaby, Barbara J., "The Shift to English in Northern Ontario"

Daniels, Peta, "Micmac Ideograms"

Denny, J. Peter, "Algonquian Word Structure from the Viewpoint of Logical Semantics"

Drapeau, Lynn, "Les voyelles brèves *a et *i en position initiale de mot an montagnais: un rapport sur quelques changements à Betsiamses"
The most recent discussion of the Meherrin appears in Boyce's "Iroquoian tribes of the Virginia-North Carolina coastal plain" (Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 15, 1978, pp. 282-9). Therein, Boyce notes that the identification of the Meherrin as Iroquoian is uncertain, and "based on indirect evidence, primarily their political association with the Nottoway and Tuscarora (p. 282)." The history up to the present of the Tuscarora is generally well documented and described, as is that of the Nottoway up until their assimilation and the death of the last individual claiming Nottoway descent in 1963. The ultimate fate of the Meherrin remains, like much of their past, a mystery.Boyce notes that, "in 1761 they were said to have been still living in Northampton County, North Carolina, near the Roanoke River. They may have been absorbed shortly thereafter by the Tuscarora (Saunders, Clark, and Weeks, (eds.), The colonial and state records of North Carolina, Raleigh, 1886-1914, Vol. 6, p. 616)." The evidence to be discussed below suggests that this was in fact the case.

In 1910, Hewitt (BAE-B 30, Vol. 2, p. 840) stated that the Tuscarora in North Carolina were originally not a single tribe or nation but a confederation of at least three tribes the Kahtehuʔa·kaʔ, "people of the submerged pine", the Skarú·ręʔ, "hemp-gatherers" or Tuscarora proper, and the Akawę́čaʔa·kaʔ (meaning uncertain) (the forms given here are phonemicizations of those given in Hewitt). Boyce has shown in his earlier works (see Boyce 1978 for references) that Hewitt, acting on distorted oral tradition and false assumptions based on modern political structure, was mistaken and that there was in fact no Tuscarora confederacy in North Carolina. Boyce's identification of the Kahtehnuʔa·kaʔ with the oft cited and important Tuscarora town of Caughtteghnah (catchna, Contah-nah) is undoubtedly correct, although the given meaning, "people of the submerged pine", is suspect since the root {-htehn-} which would correspond regularly to the root seen in, e.g., Oneida ohnéhtaʔ 'pine', is not attested in either early or modern Tuscarora (early heigta (Lawson 1709), modern háhteh 'pine'), or in the related Nottoway (ohotee 'pine'). Regarding the Akawę́čaʔa·kaʔ, Boyce notes that the "tribe was a recognized non-Tuscarora element living on the New York Tuscarora reservation, apparently without equal political rights... they may have been political allies from North Carolina, as Wallace (BAE-B 180, 1952, p. 52) has suggested, or they may have been an element adopted by the Tuscarora who were settled during the eighteenth century in New York." It would appear that both views may be correct.
The Meherrin have been mentioned as having only one town in Virginia, Cowinchahawkon. A comparison of the town name with the name Akawęč'á·ka·? shows them to be essentially identical (the names is phonemicized here as Akawęč'á·ka·? rather than Akawętsá·ka·? as in Boyce 1978 since Hewitt's spelling, Akawęńtc'aká? clearly indicates the presence of a /ʔ/ following the /ɔ/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co</th>
<th>win</th>
<th>chah</th>
<th>awkon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ʔch</td>
<td>á·ka·?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graphic representation of the cluster /ɔʔ/ by -chah- is not unusual as an epenthetic vowel is often heard in such clusters. David Cusick (Sketches of the Ancient History of the Six Nations, 1828) records Kauwetska for Akawęč'á·ka·?, suggesting that the initial A- of Hewitt's form may be gratuitous (see also Hewitt, BAE-B 30, Vol. 1, p. 33).

That the Meherrin and the Akawęč'á·ka·? are one and the same correlates well with what little is known about these people. As noted above, the Meherrin were political allies of the Tuscarora. Further, though they resided in Virginia near the Nottoway in earliest historical times, by 1681 they had already moved south into North Carolina along the Chowan River; and by the mid-eighteenth century they were living relatively near the remnants of the Tuscarora still in North Carolina. The last mention is made of the Meherrin in North Carolina in 1761, and the first mention is made of the Akawęč'á·ka·? in the early 1800's. It is also worth noting that in the interim, specifically in 1801-2, a delegation of Tuscarora from New York went to North Carolina to petition the government for compensation for lands taken during and after the Tuscarora Wars of 1711-13. Following the successful negotiations, the delegation returned to New York taking with them most of the Tuscarora still living in North Carolina. It is likely at this time the Meherrin joined with the Tuscarora and left for New York.

The association of the Meherrin with the Akawęč'á·ka·? strengthens the case for considering the Meherrin to have been an Iroquois people in two ways. First, as the town name Cowinchahawkon shows, the name Akawęč'á·ka·? is not a Tuscarora word in origin, but a Meherrin term; yet, the morphology of the word is to all appearances Iroquoian (Co- represents *ka-'it', -hawkon- represents *-ʔa·ka·? -ha·k- 'characterized by, people of', and -winch(a)- is probably a noun root, although the meaning of the noun is unclear. Second, although the Akawęč'á·ka·? were recognized as a non-Tuscarora element on the Tuscarora Reservation in New York, there is no evidence to suggest that they spoke a language strongly different from Tuscarora or that they had traditions or social organizations which were significantly different. To the contrary, the apparently
rapid assimilation of the Akawč'á'ka·? into the main body of the Tuscarora — a process seemingly completed by the late 1800's when Hewitt made his observations — suggests that the Akawč'á'ka·? or Meherrin were quite similar in language and culture to the Tuscarora.

COMMENT ON PROULX'S
"YUROK FIELDWORK REPORT"

Howard Berman

A few of the statements in Proulx's "Yurok Fieldwork Report" (Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics 6:2) require correction. My fieldwork on Yurok was done in a series of field trips in 1970, 1971, and 1972. I elicited texts and grammatical material as well as vocabulary. I used Kroeber's field notes in my work as I used all other sources of Yurok available to me, but this was only a small part of what I did. My central task was to salvage as much Yurok data as I could. The lexical material I elicited will appear in IJAL as "A Supplement to Robins' Yurok-English Lexicon".

I was surprised to learn that Mrs. Shaughnessy failed to recognize the words she had used eight years before. I can only conclude that she had forgotten them in the interval. When I began working with her in 1970 she had forgotten much of her language, but as I worked with her, her memory improved and in 1972 she remembered Yurok much better than she had in 1970. Apparently by 1980 she had again forgotten much of her language.

All of the words which appear in the forthcoming supplement were elicited on at least two occasions, often at least a year apart. As Proulx mentions, I made every effort to be as accurate as possible.

My only paper on Yurok which is generally available is "Subordinate Clauses in Yurok -- a Preliminary Report" which appeared in The Chicago Which Hunt, edited by Paul M. Peranteau et al., Chicago Linguistic Society, 1972. Much of what I said there was repeated by Proulx in The Subordinative Order of Proto-Algonquian, IJAL 46:289-300, but without any reference to my earlier article.

Two other minor points: Mrs. Shaughnessy lives in Requa -- Yurok rek'Way -- and her father was a white man who did not speak Yurok. Perhaps the man she referred to as her father was an older relative of her mother.
31 July 1992

Mr. Wes Taukchiray
Indian Law Unit
Lumbee River Legal Services
Drawer 939
Pembroke, North Carolina
28372

Dear Mr. Taukchiray:

Here is what I can tell you about possible Iroquoian affinities of the Meherrin terms you have asked about, on the basis of their linguistic form. As you know well, Iroquoian is a language family consisting of a number of languages descended from a common ancestral language, now referred to as Proto-Iroquoian. Well-known members of this family are the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Susquehannock, Cayuga, Seneca, Huron-Wyandot, Tuscarora, Nottoway, and Cherokee. These languages are sufficiently well attested to make their classification clear. Evaluation of terms from other otherwise undocumented languages depends on comparisons with the sounds and, where possible, grammatical structures of the known languages.

The name Meherrin itself is not Iroquoian, but that fact says nothing about the possible Iroquoian status of the group. It is common for group names, particularly in English, to be taken from the names that other groups used for them or from placenames near where they lived. The -k suffix on the name may be an Algonquian locative suffix, 'at' or 'place of'. It would not be at all surprising that the group would be known to Europeans by an Algonquian based name, since the English knew of them and their area through Algonquian groups first.

It is unfortunate, of course, that all we have of the language are names. Names are often unanalyzable in any case. One can imagine a scholar of the future attempting to determine with certainty the language of the 20th century inhabitants of the United States purely on the basis of a few relic placenames: Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston ... Nevertheless, the few placenames we have of the Meherrin suggest that the most likely affiliation of their language is Iroquoian.
The evidence is grammatical. In the Iroquoian languages, there are only 3 kinds of words: nouns, verbs, and particles. Placenames are usually either nouns or verbs grammatically, or fragments of them. The fragments are usually unanalyzable. In Northern Iroquoian languages, the branch of the family represented by all of the languages above except Cherokee, so including Tuscarora and Nottoway, all nouns and verbs contain a pronominal prefix. The beginnings of two of the town names, Co- and U- both correspond to neuter pronominal prefixes that occur in all of the Iroquoian languages. The first would actually be ka- (with unaspirated k) or perhaps kə-, the second u-, corresponding to the same u- in Tuscarora or o- in Nottoway.

Placenames often, though not necessarily, contain a locative suffix of some kind: ‘at’, ‘the place of’ ... The ending of the first town name, spelled -awkon, is a common Iroquoian locative ending meaning ‘in’ or ‘inside of’, or ‘under’. Basic nouns contain what is called a noun suffix. In Nottoway, as in all of the Northern languages except Tuscarorara, the most common noun suffix is -aʔ. In Tuscarora, the general noun suffix is -e(h), pronounced as in Northern American English ‘cat’. The ending of U-not-e could be this noun suffix.

The material between the pronominal prefixes and the noun or locative suffixes is the stem, carrying the main meaning of the word. The spellings of the first name given in the various sources, -wonchah-, -wochah-, -winchah- are all compatible with possible Iroquoian stem shapes. Several identifications spring to mind, but I will not specify them, because a number of hypotheses are possible, and it is not good to introduce guesses into the record. The same is true of the second name; -not- could correspond to several stems. The indeterminacy comes from the crudeness of the transcriptions.

It was on the basis of the above evidence that I identified the Meherrin as a probably Iroquoian speaking group in my article on Iroquoian in The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment, 1979, edited by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, University of Texas Press, Austin and London, Pp 133-212 (especially 139-140).

The third town name, Taurara or Tawara, could be Iroquoian, or not. It is not possible to tell with certainty on the basis of internal grammatical structure, but it would be compatible with an Iroquoian language.

The river name Quo rah rauh keh or Quaurarawke could well be Iroquoian. The sounds are perfectly compatible with an Iroquoian language. In addition, it contains a suffix that could correspond to the basic Northern Iroquoian locative suffix, here -keh ‘at’, which renders the hypothesis even more probable.

The term Wyanokkeek Utaway is the best evidence of an Iroquoian affiliation. As you note, this refers to a place near the Ahoskie swamp. The second word, utaway, would be the expected form of a noun for ‘swamp’ in a language related to Tuscarora. It would contain the neuter pronominal prefix u- mentioned above, the noun root -taw-, descended from the Proto-Northern-Iroquoian ancestral form *-naw- ‘swamp’, with regular, predicted
sound change of *t to *n, then the noun suffix -e, here spelled as in English ‘say’, with the same pronunciation. A possible analysis of the first word is the name Wyanok with suffix recorded as -kek, possibly corresponding to the suffix -keha? that turns a noun, frequently a noun referring to a group of persons, into a modifier, something like English -ish in Span-ish or -n in America-n. (Early writers sometimes wrote k for final glottal stop ?.) The suffix would be appropriately used in a term meaning ‘Wyanok swamp’, where Wyanok modifies swamp.

The man’s name, which you give as Tut-sech, bas;queat, would not be Iroquoian as transcribed here. Iroquoian languages do not contain labials like the b here.

Unfortunately, I can tell you nothing about the Neusiok or about hutusquock on the basis of these names.

If you have further questions about explanations here, please feel free to contact me again.

Sincerely,

Marianne Mithun
Professor of Linguistics
Note:

Thank you for all the materials you sent.

Thank you, too, for the thoroughness of the documentation on Meherrin. As you of course know, it is crucial that all transcription from any source, even me, be retained in its original form, with specification of its provenience. If we are to extract every possible clue from the data, we need to know exactly what was written, who wrote it, and under what circumstances. Anglicizations can obliterate important evidence and invalidate sources that would otherwise be useful. The term transcribed Utaway above, for example, might represent either uhtawe or utawe. English speakers normally do not hear or record syllable-final $h$, although in some instances more skillful but untrained transcribers have used $gh$ or $ch$ for the sound. The root -$htaw-$ in the first would mean 'current' or 'rapids', while the root in the second, -$taw-$ would mean 'swamp'. (If we knew that a good linguist had written utawe (or uta·wae), then we would know that there never was an $h$. If the transcription had been anglicized, we would assume that a linguist had not written it, and much more indeterminacy would be introduced.)

These two roots are actually close in meaning. In most other instances, meanings would be completely unrelated. If you ever feel that anglicization is important to you, it is critical that it be in parentheses beside the original transcription, with explanation. This itself is dangerous, however, because the next author citing your work might use only the anglicization, and again, useful evidence is obliterated. It is far better that new anglicization not creep into the record at all.
Dear Wes,

The article I wrote on the Meherrin is fairly difficult to track down so I am enclosing a copy of it for you. I am afraid Marianne gave you some wrong information in the letter she sent you back in 1992. As you know, the Meherrin were also referred to by the sobriquet of the ‘muddy-water’ people. The name itself most likely comes form a cognate root to Tuscarora -ehr- ‘dirt, soil’ seen in the noun awêreh ‘dirt, soil’ (Rudes 1999:153). If a Tuscarora, for example, wanted to say the ‘muddy-water’ people, the word would be *wehruhá·ka-? ‘it-dirt-be.in.water-characterized.by’. The word Meherrin probably comes from a Meherrin word that began wehr-; English listeners often hear a w before a nasal vowel as an m. There is also good evidence form the records of the Nottoway language that English listeners often heard an extra, short vowel between h and r in the southern Iroquoian languages. Marianne is probably correct that the final -k of the older spellings of the name represents an Algonquian ending. Many Algonquian place names in the Virginia-Carolinas area end in the locative suffix -ank. It is also worth noting, however, that the early English explorers of the Virginia-North Carolina countryside all had Algonquian-speaking guides from the Powhatan Confederacy or, later, the Chowan and Machapunga peoples. These guides often Algonquianized place names that they gave to explorers by adding the ending -ank to a name that was otherwise not Algonquian. All that is to say that the early spellings of the name Meherrin probably reflect an Algonquianized rendition of the Meherrin name for themselves, which contained the root -ehr- ‘dirt, soil’. Marianne is correct that Iroquoian place names typically begin with a neuter singular pronominal prefix which in the southern Iroquoian languages appear as ka- and w-; however, she forgot to mention the third neuter singular pronominal prefix, w-, which is the one seen nasalized in Meherrin.

As for the etymology of Cowinchahaka, etc., you can look at the enclosed article. Marianne is correct that it is impossible to know for certain what the root of this name: -ench-, and the root of Unote originally meant because they are too many possible connections with known roots in Tuscarora. But she is right about the word for ‘swap’ in Tuscarora being ąhtaweh.

Turning back to Catawba, I agree with you that niye’ is the Esaw word for ‘true people, Indians’ and that bahá’a contains the root for ‘know’. The word patchaka’ looks like pučiká? ‘he goes around’ (verb root pač- ‘go around’); Gatschet often wrote -tk- for the habitual verb suffix that appears as -k- in the Catawba recorded by Speck and Siebert. The word a’hware’ looks like Gatschet was trying to write awa’häre: ‘he walks’. I would therefore read the phrase as: niye pučiká? bahá’a awa’häre: “person-true go.around-often-participle know-we-not-participle walk-he-not-indicative” ‘Indian(s) coming
Around we do not know one walks' or more idiomatically, "we do not know any Indians who have passed this way."

You mentioned that you were a student of Bruce Pearson. I have known him for many years and have been helping him recently with some work he is doing on the Wyandot language. I just saw him at a conference last month in Connecticut. He did publish a short article a couple of years ago on Shawnee in an issue of a journal that I edited. I will try to track down a copy and send it to you.

I have not forgotten about your inquiry in your last letter regarding work to be done; I have not written back simply because I have not thought of anything. If I do hear of something, I will let you know.

Well, that's all for now.

Best regards,

[Signature]
April 22, 2014

Office of Federal Acknowledgement
Attention: Assistant Secretary Washburn
1951 Constitution Avenue, NW, MS: 34-SIB
Washington, DC 20240

Re: Meherrin Indian Tribe (119b)

Dear Mr. Washburn:

On behalf of the North Carolina General Assembly this letter is in support of the Meherrin Indian Tribe in obtaining Federal Recognition as an Indian Tribe/Nation and establishing a government-to-government relation with the United States.

The Meherrin Indian Tribe is one of eight state recognized tribes in North Carolina. Historically, the tribe has been located in the Ahoskie/Winton/Archer Town areas since the 1690's living within a nine mile radius. The present day descendants proudly speak of their forefathers as defenders of this great Nation since the colonial times. Many of their ancestors are documented as fighting in the French and Indian War, American Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Civil War, World War I and II, as well as modern day conflicts. From the American Revolutionary War to the present, you will find the names of Archer, Bizzell (Bissell), Brown, Boone, Collins, Flood, Keene (King), Lewis, Manley, Nickens, Smith, Reid Read, Reading), Robbins, Reynolds, Weaver along with others. Their history is well documented in books, periodicals, magazines and colonial records in Virginia and North Carolina.

The Meherrin Community continues to give their services to schools of Hertford, Bertie Gates, Northampton, Chowan, Perquimans and Pasquotank Counties. The Meherrin people have continued to preserve their distinct community and share their unique culture and heritage with all the citizens of the counties previously listed.

In keeping with the Proclamation that North Carolina Governor Pat McCrory issued in November, 2013 during Native American Month and honoring the Meherrin Indian Tribe along with seven other State Tribes: "...we rededicate ourselves to supporting tribal sovereignty, [and] tribal self-determination"
I concur with Governor McCrory and I support the Meherrin Indian Tribe's quest for Federal Acknowledgement in establishing a nation-to-nation relation with the United States.

If I may be of further assistance, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Annie W. Mobley

AWM/js
Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs  
Attention: Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
Mailstop MS-34B-SIB  
1951 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20240

Dear Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs:

We are writing to you regarding a matter pertaining to the federal recognition of the Meherrin Indian Tribe of North Carolina. The Meherrin Indian tribe is recognized in the state of North Carolina at N.C.G.S. 71A-7.1, and by virtue of that statute, holds membership on the North Carolina Commission of Indian Affairs (in accordance with N.C.G.S. 143B-407).

The Meherrin Indian Tribe has been issued a proposed finding pursuant to 25CFR Part 83, by the Department of Interior / Bureau of Indian Affairs. In response to the Department’s published finding, we are pleased to provide this letter of support for the Meherrin Tribe in their quest for federal acknowledgment.

It is our understanding that the Meherrin tribal government will compile and provide responses to any deficiencies referenced in the proposed findings.

Thank you in advance for your work and favorable review of the Meherrin Indian Tribe’s petition for federal acknowledgment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gregory A. Richardson

C: Chief Wayne M. Brown