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July 12, 2014

Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement
1951 Constitution Avenue
Mailstop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pumunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state's fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.
There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration's repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

Danny C. Cockerham, President
Milo C. Cockerham, Inc.
P. O. Box 659
Galax, VA 24333

CC: Mr. Kevin M. Brown
331 Pocket Road
King William, VA 23086
Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement
1951 Constitution Avenue
Mailstop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240
July 15, 2014

Mr. Kevin Washburn  
Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs  
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
1951 Constitution Avenue  
Mailstop 34B-SIB  
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of my industry, Virginia retailers and more importantly, the citizens within the Commonwealth of Virginia that depend and trust our Federal Government to do the right thing.

For over ten years now the Commonwealth's Native American tribes have sought Federal Recognition for government sovereignty thru Congress. Congress has not acted due to the lack of a compromise from vocal opposition.

The principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion.

Is it your contention that you have never heard of this issue? Responsible government would inquire with representatives of New York, Kansas or Washington States.

There is a compromise that has been on the table since day one. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation, should they elect to venture into commercial enterprises, that they must collect and remit to the Commonwealth, all taxes due on revenues generated from non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some might have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Doesn't this support and simplify execution of our suggested compromise?? Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state.

I urge you to act responsibly and preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by assuring recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

James C. Emmart, VPCGA Board member
Mr. Kevin Washburn  
Office of Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs  
Attn: Office of Federal Acknowledgment  
1951 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Mail Stop 34B-SIB  
Washington DC  20240  
July 15, 2014

July 15, 2014

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of Thrift Oil Company, a Fuel distributor in the Middle Peninsula and as a member of the Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association. On June 25, the VPCGA voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for Federal Acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pamunkey meets seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimate approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the U.S. Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal nations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state’s fuel sales, state and local government would lose at least 75 million dollars annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than 350 million dollars in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than 35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The Chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the U.S Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.
Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration’s repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to our organization.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

Chappy Wake
President
July 14, 2014

Mr. Kevin Washburn  
Office of the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs  
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
1951 Constitution Avenue  
Mailstop 34B-SIB  
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pamunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would

Virginia Neighbors Serving Neighbors
occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state's fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include requirements (stipulations) that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahoominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.


Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration's repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

Michael J. O'Connor
President, VPCGA

CC: Mr. Kevin M. Brown
Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association  
7275 Glen Forest Drive, Suite 204 • Richmond, VA 23226
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Mr. Kevin Washburn  
Office of the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs  
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
1951 Constitution Avenue  
Mailstop 34B-SIB  
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn,

On behalf of the Board and Membership of the Virginia Wholesalers and Distributors Association I am writing to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pumunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register.

Many may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pumunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereign recognition is ultimately approved, it will have a harmful negative economic effect on the Virginia economy.

Our opposition is soundly based on the same kind of economic harm experienced in other States with sovereign tribes, attributable to tax evasion. It is further confirmed by Virginia studies on illegal cigarette trafficking, tax evasion and counterfeit product traveling up and down the east coast and in fact I-95 is now being referred to as the new “Tobacco Road”.

Annually, our licensed wholesale distributors play a critical role with enforcing Virginia’s State and Local tax on tobacco and our monthly reports are significant evidence with the Attorney General’s office in their MSA/Virginia Directory enforcements. Virginia collects more than $350 ml annually from tobacco taxes and local governments another $70 ml and without proper enforcement requirements, Virginia stands to lose revenue and create further negative impact with the State’s overall enforcements. The Virginia State Crime Commission has reported frequently that their findings confirm the number one reason for illegal trafficking is tax evasion.
As has been our consistent position with Congressional legislation, we insist that this process include requirements that the Pumunkey nation must collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members and further that the Governor of Virginia must enter into a “Compact Agreement” which would further include compliance with Virginia law. This would certainly address any future concerns with tribal land expansion into populated commercial areas.

It is very important that you preserve the integrity of Virginia Law for it’s more than 8 million citizens by assuring compliance and include these provisions as part of any form of recognition.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff D. Smith, III
Executive Vice-President
Virginia Wholesalers & Distributors Association
July 14, 2014

Mr. Kevin Washburn  
Office of the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs  
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
1951 Constitution Avenue  
Mailstop 34B-SIB  
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 55,000 Virginians, including 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pamunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state's fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe is
testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration's repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

John H. Woodfin, Jr.
CEO

CC: Mr. Kevin M. Brown
Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement
1951 Constitution Avenue
Mailstop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240
Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pamunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state’s fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in...
other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration's repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

Barry C. Grizzard
Sales Manager, Little Oil Company
Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary – Indian Affairs
Attn: Office of Federal Acknowledgment
1951 Constitution Avenue
Mail Stop 348-51B
Washington, DC 20240
DATE: July 22, 2014
FROM: Stand Up for California and MGM National Harbor (Perkins Coie LLP)
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Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs (202) 513-7650
Attn: R. Lee Fleming, Director
Office of Federal Acknowledgment
1951 Constitution Avenue, NW
Mail Stop 34B-SIB
Washington, D.C. 20240
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R. Lee Fleming
Print Name and Title

Signature

Date 7/22/2014
July 22, 2014

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs
Attn: R. Lee Fleming, Director
Office of Federal Acknowledgment
1951 Constitution Avenue NW
Mail Stop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240

Pamunkey Indian Tribe
c/o Mr. Kevin M. Brown
331 Pocket Road
King William, VA 23086

Re: Comments on the Proposed Finding for Federal Acknowledgment of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe

Dear Messrs. Fleming and Brown:


Determining that an American Indian group exists as an Indian Tribe has important legal and practical significance. Federal acknowledgment is a determination that a group has a substantially continuous tribal existence and has functioned as autonomous entity throughout history until the present. Tribes enjoy sovereign immunity and may exercise jurisdiction over their territory. They may also administer funds under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, establish gaming facilities under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, and obtain other federal benefits.
The importance of an acknowledgment decision thus warrants strict adherence to the applicable regulations. As set forth in the enclosed comments, the Department failed to conduct the requisite analysis and incorrectly concluded that the Petitioner’s evidence satisfied existing regulatory criteria. Evidence may be available to correct these problems, but the Department must adhere to the regulations it has imposed.

A separate question is whether the United States can acknowledge the Petitioner in light of its governing documents. The Petitioner’s history under Jim Crow laws is a terrible one. Yet the Petitioner’s governing documents appear to perpetuate some of those laws, including prohibiting marriage and membership on the basis of race. The governing documents also limit the right of Pamunkey women to marry outside the group, and to vote and hold office. Although the Petitioner appears willing to change the gender-based political restrictions, the Department cannot acknowledge a group whose laws deny its members equal protection.

In light of the Department’s reconsideration of the acknowledgment standards, see 79 Fed. Reg. 30766 (May 29, 2014), Stand Up! and MGM also recommend that the Department place all final determinations on hold. What standards should apply is now an open question. Delay on all pending petitions is warranted as the Department evaluates the need for change.

With respect to Petitioner, Stand Up! and MGM are aware of the group’s unique history and respect its perseverance. Ensuring that the Department adheres to its regulations, however, is essential to protecting the integrity of the acknowledgment process, particularly when the Department has questioned the process itself.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Schmit, Director
Stand Up for California! National Project on Acknowledgment

Lorenzo D. Creighton
President & COO
MGM National Harbor

Enc.
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FINDING FOR FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE PAMUNKEY INDIAN TRIBE
A Notice by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Jan. 23, 2014)

by

STAND UP FOR CALIFORNIA! NATIONAL PROJECT ON FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

and

MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL

Submitted on
July 22, 2014
INTRODUCTION

On January 23, 2014, the Department of the Interior ("Department") published notice in the Federal Register announcing that the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs proposes to determine that a petitioner group that identifies itself as the Pamunkey Indian Tribe ("Petitioner") is an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law. 79 Fed. Reg. 3860 (Jan. 23, 2014). The Petitioner claims descent from the historic Pamunkey Tribe, one of approximately 30 Algonquian-speaking tribes that made up the Powhatan paramountcy. The historic Pamunkey treated with King Charles II of England in 1677, swearing fealty to the English Crown pursuant to the Treaty of 1677 (also referred to as the "Treaty Between Virginia And The Indians 1677" or "Treaty of Middle Plantation"). As successor to the English Crown, the Commonwealth of Virginia assumed the Crown's rights and obligations, including with respect to the Treaty of 1677.

The January 23, 2014, Proposed Finding ("PF") concludes that the Petitioner descends from the historic Pamunkey and qualifies as an Indian tribe based on Petitioner's ability to satisfy seven mandatory criteria for acknowledgment set forth in 25 C.F.R. Part 83, Procedures for Establishing that an American Indian Group Exists as an Indian Tribe. The evidence the Petitioner produced and the Department’s analysis of that evidence do not support acknowledgment at this time. Evidentiary and analytical shortfalls in the PF for the Petitioner include the Department’s failure to examine the historical period before 1789 and evidentiary deficiencies in establishing the requisite community and descent. These evidentiary and analytical deficiencies may be remediable, but they must be addressed to satisfy the current acknowledgment criteria.

A more fundamental question is the ability of the Department to acknowledge the Petitioner in light of its governing documents. Those, which are required by the acknowledgment regulations, prohibit members from marrying African-Americans. The governing documents also prohibit women members from marrying non-Pamunkey men, from voting, and from holding office. The PF states that the Petitioner agreed to remove gender-based restrictions on voting and holding office in 2012, but those restrictions have not yet been removed and there is no indication that the Petitioner has agreed to remove race-based restrictions on marriage. The history of the Petitioner indicates that race-based restrictions were necessary for self-preservation in Jim Crow Virginia. Such restrictions, however, have been unconstitutional since 1967. And in 1968, Federal law has required Indian tribes to guarantee their members equal protection. The United States cannot acknowledge or expend funds on an entity that retains laws declared unconstitutional decades earlier and continues to deny its members equal protection. Petitioner’s

1 Following the violence against Virginia Indians that accompanied Bacon’s Rebellion (1676–1677), several tribes, formerly part of the paramount chiefdom under Tsenacomoco, reunited under the authority of the Pamunkey chief Cockacoeske and promised fidelity to the Crown in exchange for its protection. The Tribes that signed the Treaty of 1677, per the spellings within the treaty, are the Appomattux, the Manakins, the Maherains, the Nansaticoes, the Nanzem’d, the Nanzemunds, the Nottowayes, the Pamunkey, the Pomunkey, the Portabacchoes, the Sappones, and the Wayonoake. Treaty between Virginia and the Indians, King Charles II -Queen of the Pomunkey et al., May 29, 1677, reprinted in 14 VA. MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY (1906-1907) 289-96.
governing documents must be revised and past violations—if any—remedied before acknowledgment is appropriate.

An additional complication is that, in May, the Department published notice of a proposed rule to revise the Part 83 procedures. 79 Fed. Reg. 30766 (May 29, 2014). The Department explains its purpose in proposing regulatory changes, in part, as follows: “the current process has been criticized as ‘broken’ or in need of reform,” and the proposed regulations would, among other things, “establish[] objective standards, where appropriate, to ensure transparency and predictability.” Id. at 30766. The Department has proposed to allow petitioners, including Petitioner here, who have submitted complete petitions, but not yet received a final agency decision, to choose whether to proceed under the existing or new regulations. Id. at 30774 (proposed § 83.7).

The Department has called into question the legitimacy of its regulations, including whether the standards it is applying are objective, transparent and predictable. Since 1978, the regulations have slowly, but increasingly, deviated from how the Supreme Court and John Collier Sr. and Felix Cohen, the principle architects of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, defined a tribe for purposes of Federal law. The Department has stated that “[t]he changes proposed in the proposed rule remain true to these fundamental standards and depart only in very modest ways from our existing Part 83 criteria.” Id. at 30768. Yet it is evident to the commenters that the proposed changes actually represent a radical departure from long-established, judicially defined standards. The Department should not proceed with this Petition until it has resolved what standards are sufficiently “objective” for establishing that an American Indian group exists as an Indian Tribe that will “ensure transparency and predictability.” In light of the deficiencies in the PF and the constitutional infirmities of Petitioner’s governing documents, proceeding under the new regulations is unlikely to cause substantial delay.

**Interested Parties**

1. Stand Up for California!

Stand Up for California! (“Stand Up!”) is a non-profit organization that focuses on gambling issues affecting California, including tribal gaming, card clubs, horse racing, satellite wagering, charitable gaming and the state lottery. Stand Up! has been involved in the ongoing debate of issues raised by gaming and its impacts for over a decade. Since 1996, Stand Up! has assisted individuals, community groups, elected officials, members of law enforcement, local public entities and the State of California with respect to gaming. Additionally, Stand Up! acts as a resource of information to local, state and federal policy makers.

Tribal acknowledgment directly affects the gaming environmental in California. The Department’s proposed changes to the acknowledgment regulations set forth at 25 C.F.R. Part 83 would substantially reduce the standards for acknowledging tribes and could result in a dramatic increase in the number of recognized Indian governments in California. Other states could see dramatic changes as a result of the proposed regulations, including potentially Massachusetts, Connecticut, Michigan, Ohio, Virginia and others. The net effect of the proposed rules would be to replace longstanding, clearly defined criteria that have been in effect since 1978 with much
more lenient and subjective standards that grant enormous discretion to the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

Because the proposed acknowledgment regulations have the potential to impact California dramatically by increasing the number of tribes, the amount of land transferred to the United States for newly recognized tribes and the number of gaming facilities, Stand Up! established a National Project on Federal Acknowledgment to review and comment on the proposed regulations and to evaluate how the current regulations are being applied. The general purposes of the National Project are to: 1) evaluate the legal underpinnings for the acknowledgment process; 2) evaluate how the process has been and is being applied to pending and potential petitioners; 3) educate state and federal policy makers and elected leaders regarding the long-term implications of acknowledgment in their state; and 4) monitor the Department’s development and application of federal regulations affecting state and tribal interests. Stand Up! has a legal and factual interest in this PF and others that the Department announces.

2. MGM Resorts International

MGM Resorts International ("MGM") is a publicly traded hospitality company whose primary business is the ownership and operation of casino resorts. MGM is one of the world's leading and most respected hotel and gaming companies. Since its inception, MGM has demonstrated a powerful commitment to the philosophy of social responsibility – a reflection of the fundamental integrity that informs MGM’s business conduct and its relationships with its employees, guests, communities and the planet. Parallel to MGM’s goal to excel financially, in an ethical and responsible manner, is its ambition to make a unique contribution in its singular way to solving the societal challenges that confront everyone. MGM supports responsible gaming and has implemented the American Gaming Association's Code of Conduct for Responsible Gaming at its properties. It has also been the recipient of numerous awards and recognitions for its industry-leading Diversity Initiative and its community philanthropy programs.

MGM operates destination casino resorts in a variety of jurisdiction. In each of these jurisdictions and in every gaming jurisdiction in the United States, operators must adhere to legal and regulatory standards that far surpass most other industries. With properties and investments located in Nevada, Mississippi, Michigan, New Jersey and Illinois (and Macau, China and Dubai), MGM also has a strong interest in protecting its investments, the investments of its partners, and the communities that have welcomed MGM into their fold. MGM has also partnered with federally recognized Tribes, has shared extensive industry expertise in development and operations with such partners, and continues to look for opportunities to invest in Indian country. MGM understands some of the unique challenges Indian country faces in seeking investment and experienced partners, challenges that the proposed acknowledgment regulations will greatly exacerbate by reducing applicable standards dramatically and destabilizing already volatile gaming markets.

As is widely recognized, the federal acknowledgment process is a significant factor in the development of gaming nationwide. Newly recognized tribes offer a unique opportunity to locate casinos in favorable gaming markets, and often petitioner groups located in attractive locations are the beneficiaries of significant outside investment. The acknowledgment process must
therefore be carefully monitored to ensure that the standards are applied rigorously and that financial interests do not improperly impact acknowledgment, including by influencing the rulemaking process itself. By reducing opportunities to participate in acknowledgment proceedings, the Department also reduces accountability and therefore institutional buffers that protect Departmental staff responsible for these critically important decisions. It is strongly in MGM’s interest to participate in the Department’s acknowledgment proceedings, with respect to both specific petitions and proposed changes to generally applicable acknowledgment regulations.

**COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FINDING**

1. **The Department Cannot Acknowledge Petitioner While It Fails to Provide Equal Protection to Members.**

   Petitioner’s governing documents violate equal protection, as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment, U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1, and later the Indian Civil Rights Act, 25 U.S.C. §§ 1301-1304. Since 1954, it has been clear that the United States can no more discriminate on the basis of race than can the States. See *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954) (stating that “[i]n view of [the] decision that the Constitution prohibits the states from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government”). Discrimination on the basis of sex is similarly impermissible. See *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677 (1973) (holding that classifications based on sex are inherently suspect). The federal government is also prohibited from expending funds on programs that discriminate on the basis of race. See Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 2 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq.

   In 1968, Congress passed the Indian Civil Rights Act (“ICRA”). 25 U.S.C. §§ 1301-1304. The declared purpose of ICRA is “to insure that the American Indian is afforded the broad constitutional rights secured to other Americans,” and to “protect individual Indians from arbitrary and unjust actions of tribal governments.” S.Rep. No. 841, 90th 73 Cong., 1st Sess., 6 (1967). ICRA prohibits any “Indian tribe in exercising powers of self-government … [from denying] to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of its laws or deprive any person of liberty or property without due process of law.” 25 U.S.C. § 1302(a)(8). A tribe may structure its government any way it wishes, as long as it does not violate ICRA. See *Howlett v. Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Flathead Reservation, Montana*, 529 F.2d 233 (9th Cir. 1976). Congress prescribed fundamental limits on a tribe’s exercise of its governmental authority, including prohibiting a tribe from engaging in discriminatory practices prohibited under the U.S. Constitution.

   The Petitioner’s practices and ordinances violate these fundamental principles and laws. The acknowledgment regulations require petitioner groups to submit “a copy of the group’s present governing document including its membership criteria. In the absence of a written document, the petitioner must provide a statement describing in full its membership criteria and current governing procedures.” 25 C.F.R. § 83.7(b). The PF states that “the first law of the Pamunkey” is that a member of the Pamunkey “may marry only white or Indian.” PF at 47-48 (prior practice or custom first codified in 1886), 65 (same), 55 (current governing documents retain prohibition). The penalty for violation of this prohibition is forfeiture of all membership.
rights, including the right to reside on the reservation. PF at 83-85. The penalties for all other violations were until recently limited to fines of $5 to $500. PF at 85. Men who married a non-white, non-Pamunkey woman have been required to provide evidence of the woman’s ethnicity, and there are council minutes detailing accusations that a member’s wife may have been “colored” or “negro.” PF at 73. The PF explains that this prohibition was specifically intended to exclude African-Americans from residence on the state reservation and membership in the group. PF at 47-48.

As the PF describes, the Petitioner passed this ordinance in an attempt to preserve the Indian character of the community in the face of slavery, segregation, and discrimination. PF at 32, 34, 43, 72-73. These ordinances, however, remain in effect today, decades after any such excuse could possibly be justified. Petitioner’s ordinances currently deny members marrying African-Americans equal protection of the law. No member may retain his or her full membership rights or remain on the reservation if that member marries an African-American. Anti-miscegenation laws were declared unconstitutional almost 50 years ago. See Loving v. Virginia, 388 U.S. 1 (1967).

The Petitioner’s treatment of its women members is similarly unconstitutional. Petitioner’s governing documents also deny its women members the right to marry whomever they choose. Although Pamunkey men may marry white women (but not African-American women) and reside on the reservation, Pamunkey women may not marry any non-Indian. PF at 48, 55, 73, 79. Further, women members are not even allowed to vote, hold office, or attend council meetings without an invitation. PF at 79, 83; Technical Assistance Letter 1 at 4. Although the PF notes that the Pamunkey council recently voted to amend its governing documents to remove these restrictions against women (but not against African-Americans), the PF also states that the governing documents of the Pamunkey have not yet actually been amended and the changes have not been implemented. PF at 79, 79 n. 411, 83 n. 419. The PF fails to discuss why these changes have not been implemented. In an even greater deficiency, the PF fails to examine why the prohibition on African-Americans was left in place at the same time.

It is undisputable that racially-based marriage prohibitions violate equal protection and due process. See Loving, 388 U.S. 1. Prohibitions on women voting and holding office are similarly unconstitutional. See White Eagle v. One Feather, 478 F.2d 1311 (8th Cir. 1973). Even if tribes have the sovereign right to define the terms of their membership, see Nero v. Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma, 892 F.2d 1457 (10th Cir. 1989), the United States cannot acknowledge a petitioner if its governing documents violate constitutional protections. If the Petitioner is acknowledged with its current governing documents in place, it will immediately be in violation of federal law. Furthermore, it will be the actions of the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs to acknowledge the Petitioner that will result in the violation of federal law. The Assistant Secretary lacks the authority to do this. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2). The Petitioner cannot be acknowledged under federal law unless it amends its governing documents to repudiate and remove the unconstitutional provisions.

In addition, the acknowledgment regulations should be amended in the current rulemaking to require that tribal governing documents do not violate the ICRA, that any past

\footnote{The Pamunkey, however, themselves held slaves. PF at 7 n. 13 and 31 n. 141.}
violations since ICRA was passed have been remediated to the extent possible (including, in this case, by requiring a list of previously illegally sanctioned members and impacted non-members, if any\(^3\)), and a finding that acknowledgment of an Indian tribe will not result in violation of the ICRA, the Constitution, or any other federal law.

This modification to the acknowledgment regulations is required to ensure that petitioner groups appreciate their legal responsibilities under the Constitution and ICRA, and remediate current and past violations, before acknowledgment. The rulemaking should be completed and made applicable to all pending petitioners, including the Petitioner, before any acknowledgment decision is made.

2. **Contrary to existing regulations and precedent, the Proposed Finding fails to evaluate whether the Petitioner has existed as a tribe for the full historical period.**

The acknowledgment regulations require a petitioner to demonstrate that “[a] predominant portion of the petitioning group comprises a distinct community and has existed as a community from historical times until the present.” 25 C.F.R. § 83.7(b). In addition, a petitioner must demonstrate that it “has maintained political influence or authority over its members as an autonomous entity from historical times until the present.” These two criteria are fundamental to what it means to be a “tribe.” The regulations further define the relevant terms. “Historically, historical or history means dating from first sustained contact with non-Indians,” and “sustained contact” is defined as “the period of earliest sustained non-Indian settlement and/or governmental presence in the local area in which the historical tribe or tribes from which the petitioner descends was located historically.” Id. § 83.1. Therefore, “first sustained contact with non-Indians” unambiguously means contact with Europeans, and the Office of Federal Acknowledgment has consistently applied the definition in this manner. *See e.g.*, *United Houma Nation v. Babbitt*, Not Reported in F. Supp., 1997 WL 403425 (D.D.C. 1997) (OFA noting in proposed finding that the “federal acknowledgment criteria 83.7(b) and (c) require the petitioner to provide evidence that they fulfill criteria 83.7(b) and (c) from the time of first sustained contact with Europeans to the present”); *see also United States v. Washington*, 641 F.2d 1648 (9th Cir. 1981)(recognition as tribe requires Indian group to be lineal descendants of historic tribe and to have maintained tribal relations).

In 2008, however, the Assistant Secretary–Indian Affairs reinterpreted the regulations as requiring petitioners to document community and governmental continuity from 1789 only, the year that the Constitution of the United States became effective, ostensibly establishing the sovereign with which an Indian tribe could carry on a government-to-government relationship. Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Office of Federal Acknowledgment; Guidance and Direction Regarding Internal Procedures*, 73 Fed. Reg. 30146 (May 23, 2008). Indeed, prior to the Assistant Secretary’s new interpretation, acknowledgment determinations uniformly evaluated

---

\(^3\) ICRA prohibits an Indian tribe from violating the civil rights of “any person,” 25 U.S.C. § 1302(a)(8), and therefore also applies to any non-members whose rights have been violated by these discriminatory practices, including non-Pamunkey spouses of members.
the continuity of tribal existence from dates of first sustained contact that occurred prior to 1789.\footnote{See, for example, the determinations for the Wampanoag of Gay Head, Ramapough, Miami of Indiana, and Narragansett petitioner groups. Since the Assistant Secretary’s re-interpretation, only the Shinnecock petitioner group has been acknowledged without an evaluation of continuity from first sustained contact before 1789. Given the Shinnecock’s prior adjudication as an Indian tribe by a federal court, it is unclear that a determination by the Assistant Secretary on this point was necessary. See \textit{New York v. Shinnecock Indian Nation}, 400 F. Supp. 2d 486 (E.D.N.Y. 2005).}

This guidance contradicts the plain language of the acknowledgment regulations and is impermissible. The Assistant Secretary reinterpreted the regulations “[i]n order to reduce the evidentiary responsibilities of the petitioner.” \textit{Id.} at 30147. The Assistant Secretary explains that it chose the 1789 date because the Constitution was ratified on March 4, 1789, when Congress assumed the power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes. \textit{Id.} Accordingly, prior history need not be reviewed. \textit{Id.}

The interpretation is incorrect for several reasons. To begin with, it is factually incorrect that the United States began with the Constitution. Before the Constitution, the United States existed under the Articles of Confederation, which also provided Congress with the power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes. \textit{See Art. of Confed. Art. IX, sec. 4, cl. 3.} Even before the Articles of Confederation, the Second Continental Congress dealt with the Indian tribes as the de facto provisional government of the United States. \textit{See Worcester v. Georgia,} 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515, 558 (1832). Further, it is well established that, upon independence, the United States succeeded to the claims and rights of the Crown of England with respect to Indian tribes. \textit{Id.} at 517. Moreover, judicial precedent establishes that tribal sovereignty derives not from the Constitution, but instead is retained from an inherent, aboriginal sovereignty that existed before colonization. \textit{See U. S. v. Wheeler,} 435 U.S. 313 (1978); see also \textit{U.S. v. Lara,} 541 U.S. 193 (2004) (Thomas, J. concurring) for extensive discussion of tribal sovereignty.

The acknowledgment regulations have always emphasized the principle that sovereignty is pre-constitutional and therefore tribal status requires an evaluation from first sustained contact with Europeans. The original acknowledgment regulations, promulgated in 1978, defined “historical” to mean “dating back to the earliest documented contact between the aboriginal tribe from which the petitioners descended and citizens or officials of the United States, colonial or territorial governments, or if relevant, citizens and officials of foreign governments from which the United States acquired territory.” 43 Fed. Reg. 39361, 39362 (Sept. 5, 1978) (emphasis added). The notice of proposed rulemaking for the 1978 regulations emphasized that under the proposed rules, the Assistant Secretary would acknowledge “only those Indian tribes whose members and their ancestors existed in tribal relations \textit{since aboriginal times} and have retained some aspects of their aboriginal sovereignty.” 43 Fed. Reg. 23743, 23744 (June 1, 1978) (emphasis added).

The 1994 rulemaking established the current definition of “first \textit{sustained} contact with non-Indians,” but that change “was aimed at eliminating possible problems caused by the often sporadic and poorly documented nature of \textit{initial} contacts.” 59 Fed. Reg. 9280, 9284 (Feb. 25, 1994) (emphasis added). The 1994 rulemaking emphasized that “the standards of continuity of
tribal existence remain unchanged" and "[n]one of the changes made ... will result in the acknowledgment of petitioners which would not have been acknowledged under the previously effective acknowledgment regulations." Id. at 9280; see also id. at 9292 (tribal authority derived from "aboriginal sovereignty"). Furthermore, the 1994 rulemaking considered and rejected the Assistant Secretary's stated purpose in re-interpreting the regulations ("to reduce the evidentiary responsibilities of the petitioner"), explaining that the purpose of the acknowledgment process is "to acknowledge that a government-to-government relationship exists between the United States and tribes which have existed since first contact with non-Indians" (not tribes that have existed since first contact with the United States) and that a demonstration of continuous tribal existence from a more recent date (1934 was specifically proposed by commenters) "would provide no basis to assume continuous existence before that time." 59 Fed. Reg. at 9281.

Notably, each of these changes has been implemented pursuant to notice and comment rulemaking, as the Administrative Procedures Act explicitly requires. 5 U.S.C. § 553. In fact, the proposed changes to the acknowledgment regulations would effectuate the change that the Assistant Secretary has illegally attempted through guidance, and it is in the context of that regulatory proceeding that the question of the legality of this change will be more fully addressed. But until the Department has legally revised its regulations, it must comply with the regulations in their current form or defer resolution of any pending application until new regulations are promulgated. Miami Nation of Indians, Inc. v. Dep't of the Interior, 255 F.3d 342, 348 (7th Cir. 2001).

Application to the Petitioner

The PF is deficient, due to the Assistant Secretary's application of its illegal guidance. The Petitioner claims to be the successor to the historic Pamunkey Tribe of the Powhatan Paramountcy, famous for the story of Pocahontas and Captain John Smith. The date of first sustained contact with non-Indians would therefore be 1607, the year of the founding of Jamestown. PF at 4. The PF states that "various sources, almost all submitted by the petitioner, show that a Pamunkey Indian tribe or settlement continued throughout the colonial period," but does not discuss or present all of that evidence, nor predicate its decision on that evidence. PF at 5. Instead, the PF only considers the period from 1789 to the present. PF at 4.

As a practical matter, the failure to consider a tribe's full history will almost inevitably distort any acknowledgment decision by ignoring historical context. What happened during the period of first sustained contact is a critically important period of any tribe's history. There were wars and alliances with Europeans, as well as between tribes, as happened from time immemorial. Tribes were decimated from small pox, war, genocide, and enslaved, all terrible events for which reparations may be appropriate. But the acknowledgment process is not intended to be reparatory; it is intended to identify for prospective purposes whether a sovereign entity continues to exist such that the United States should relate with that entity on a government-to-government basis. Thus, the Department must evaluate the full history of the historical tribe.

In this case, the PF considers the "historical tribe" to be the Indian community found on the Pamunkey Island "Indian town" in 1789. Except for a single, cursory paragraph, that finding almost completely ignores 182 years of Pamunkey history. PF at 4-6. It is impossible to
determine from the evidence in the PF that the Indian community at Pamunkey Island actually meets the criteria for tribal acknowledgment in 1789, i.e., that it existed as a self-governing tribe, rather than simply an increasingly assimilated community of Indian families.\(^5\)

The available evidence is, in fact, in tension with the Department’s conclusion that the Pamunkey Island community existed as a sovereign, self-governing political entity in 1789. The evidence presented in the PF of political authority within a generation before and after 1789 consists of a 1786 petition to the state legislature for non-Indian reservation trustees to be appointed, evidence from 1795 that the local community had run a non-Pamunkey Indian and his Pamunkey wife out of town, petitions from 1798, 1799, and 1812 regarding the non-Indian trustees, and a 1799 act of the state legislature regarding the trustees. PF at 58-60. Every one of these pieces of evidence (except perhaps the running out of town) argues not for the existence of a self-governing community, but rather for the opposite: a community governed by non-Indians appointed by the Commonwealth, with every instance of community concurrence in the actions of the trustees being an exercise of rights specifically authorized and delegated by the Commonwealth, rather than an exercise of inherent sovereignty. \(^6\)

For example, in 1769 the trustees and Pamunkeys petitioned to have the trustees empowered to settle disputes among the Pamunkey, and in 1798, the trustees were empowered to enact laws for the Pamunkeys and to “manage + [sic] transact all affairs relative to said Indians.”\(^6\) Significantly, the petitions to the Virginia legislature were signed during this period by all the adult males of the community, with no leaders (other than the trustees) identified.\(^7\) PF at 7. A valid determination of the character of the Pamunkey community in 1789 would require analysis of the community’s evolution over time, including a full evaluation of the trustee system from its inception.\(^8\) The evidence relied upon by the PF does not support the existence of a self-governing tribe in 1789.

---

\(^5\) None of the circa 1789 evidence cited by the PF as establishing that a Pamunkey tribe existed at that time clearly identifies a tribe, as opposed to simply a remnant community of primarily Indian individuals and families, identified as an “Indian town” or settlement in the approximate location of the current state reservation. PF at 4-8. The third-party observations and opinions cited, although applicable to criterion 83.7(a), do not, of course, apply the full acknowledgment criteria. In particular, there is compelling evidence that the petitions and tax lists, which are relied on heavily by the PF as identifying members of a Pamunkey tribe, included non-Indians who lived, or perhaps leased land, on the reservation and therefore do not identify exclusively Pamunkey individuals. PF at 6-7, nn. 11, 13. The assumption that non-Indians living on the reservation were “likely” married to Pamunkey women, and therefore left offspring of Pamunkey descent, is not supported and is contrary to this evidence.

\(^6\) Helen C. Rountree, Pocahontas’s People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia Through Four Centuries, Univ. of Oklahoma Press (1990) at 168. The trustees were empowered to approve or disapprove any laws proposed by the Pamunkey. \(\text{Id}\). at 204.

\(^7\) See also, Helen C. Rountree and E. Randolph Turner III, Before and After Jamestown, University Press of Florida (2002) at 190. In addition, there is evidence that the petitions cited were not signed exclusively by Pamunkey Indians. PF at 6-7 and nn. 11 and 13. For example, the Petitioner declines to include William Sweat as a Pamunkey Indian; he is identified as a white man and a signatory to the 1836 petition. \(\text{Id}\).

\(^8\) The conclusion that the Pamunkey satisfy criterion 83.7(c) (political authority) is contradicted by the evidence for other periods, as well. See PF at 36-37 (1850s-60s; internal differences resolved by the predominantly non-Indian Colosse Baptist Church); 43 (1877 Pamunkey petition emphasizing loss of self-sufficiency); 69 (1898-1902; lack of stability of elected positions).
In addition, the historical relationship between the Pamunkey and other tribes, especially the Mattaponi, bears directly on whether a distinctly Pamunkey community existed on Indian Island, yet this is almost entirely ignored in the PF. The 1677 Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed by the “Queen of the Pamunkey” on behalf of the Mattaponi tribe as well as the Pamunkey, and there is evidence that other tribes also sought refuge in the Pamunkey/Mattaponi Indian Town during the colonial period.9

The failure to consider this historical context, and the resulting conflation of this mixed community of Pamunkey, Mattaponi and other Indians10 (and non-Indians as well11), as “exclusively” Pamunkey, undermines the PF’s conclusions regarding descent from historical members of the Pamunkey tribe, which as described later in these comments, depends on the assumption that residents of the state reservation were exclusively Pamunkey Indians. Moreover, the analysis does not meet the basic regulatory requirements. Unless Petitioner proceeds under new regulations, if and when such regulations are promulgated, it must comply with current requirements, rather than guidance that illegally reinterprets current evidentiary requirements.

3. The determination that the Petitioner maintained political authority through the 20th century cannot establish the existence of a distinct community during this period when there is evidence that less than 30 percent of the group resided on the state reservation.

A petitioner must also produce evidence demonstrating that “predominant portion of the petitioning group comprises a distinct community and has existed as a community from historical times until the present.” 25 C.F.R. § 83.7(b). A “predominant portion” means that “at least half of the membership [must] maintain[] significant social contact with each other.” 59 Fed. Reg. 9280, 9287 (Feb. 25, 1994). The provision requires a “demonstration of the social solidarity of the tribe.” Id. at 9287.

The acknowledgment regulations allow evidence of political authority to substitute for a demonstration of community for certain periods of time. 25 C.F.R. § 83.7(b)(2)(v). This provision is referred to as a “cross-over” provision. Under certain circumstances, it may be reasonable to rely on evidence of political authority when there is insufficient evidence of community to demonstrate continuity. However, when there is evidence that affirmatively establishes that a substantial portion of the petitioner ceased to participate in the group, the Department cannot ignore contrary evidence.

The Assistant Secretary’s conclusion in the PF that the Petitioner meets criterion 83.7(b) (community) during the 20th century is based on “cross-over” evidence under 25 C.F.R. §

---

9 The Mattaponi and Chickahominy took refuge with the Pamunkey from wars with colonists and other Indian tribes at various times during the colonial period. See Rountree, Pocahontas’s People, at 114-115.
10 Intermarriage is documented with other Indians from as far away as the Catawbas of South Carolina. Rountree, Pocahontas’s People, at 194.
11 There is abundant evidence, even within the PF, of significant intermarriage with whites and blacks (despite the later-codified prohibitions), of the leasing of land to non-Indians, and even of squatters living on the reservation without authorization. PF at 6-7, 23 n. 110, 24-25, 31-33, 38, 38 n. 148, 43, 48, 51 n. 246, 60. The extent to which these historical patterns resulted in a non-Indian population living on the state reservation in 1789 cannot be assessed without an evaluation of the pre-1789 period.
83.7(b)(2)(v). The evidence that the PF cites to consists of council meeting minutes dealing with the allocation of land and residence rights on the reservation, and exerting other kinds of political authority over reservation residents.\(^{12}\) PF at 53.

Here, the evidence establishes that less than the requisite “predominant portion” (meaning at least half) of the petitioning group comprised a distinct community during the mid-20th century. The PF repeatedly emphasizes that the Petitioner lived in an “exclusive settlement” or a “concentrated residence.” See, e.g., PF at 22-26, 28, 44, 50, 58, 70. The PF states that the existence of the state reservation as a geographic locus of group residence and social interaction is key to the evaluation of tribal existence: “One must understand Pamunkey social interaction in the context of the exclusive settlement at Indian Town, as well as within the context of the rural, isolated character of King William County.” PF at 22 (emphasis added). The PF explains that “[t]he small size of the reservation also means that people see each other routinely.” PF at 55. The PF concluded, “the fact that the Pamunkey lived in a nearly exclusive settlement assumes informal social interaction among members of the group.” PF at 24.

Reliance on the existence on a reservation is not unreasonable, although it should not itself be determinative, in cases, for example, where a reservation was not actually used for residency. The regulations were revised to assist petitioners that did not have the benefit of a reservation to help preserve tribal community. 59 Fed. Reg. at 9287 (noting that the revision “takes into account the historical difficulties and limitations which may have made it impossible for unrecognized groups to maintain a separate geographical community”). Where a tribe has a separate geographical community, however, as the Petitioner does, abandonment of that community is highly relevant.

Yet the PF ignored the importance of the reservation in its evaluation of community for the 20th century, despite relying on it extensively for the prior periods. The PF states that “[t]he reservation continued to lose residents throughout most of the 20th century, as more and more people left rural King William County.” PF at 54. By 1954, only 19 out of 70 adult male members remained on the reservation. Id.\(^{13}\) That is less than 30% of the petitioner group, and far lower than the “predominant portion” the regulations require. The evidence shows that the absent members did not stay in the local area, but had left King William County, moving to cities such

---

\(^{12}\) Significantly, the record does not include evidence of any political authority over members living off the reservation. The PF, at 74-75, describes an instance in which the council tried to take action to prevent an off-reservation member from associating with “colored” people, but admits that there is no evidence that it did so, or that it was actually heeded by the off-reservation member. The minutes also record attempts by the council to secure financial contributions from off-reservation members, but do not record any success in this endeavor. PF at 77-78. The council minutes therefore contain no evidence that political authority on the reservation actually equates to social interaction with off-reservation members.

\(^{13}\) No copy of the 1954 membership lists referenced has been submitted by Petitioner, despite being previously requested by OFA to either submit a copy or explain its unavailability. PF at 82, 89; Technical Assistance Letter 2 at 2. Petitioner claims that this document is “currently maintained in the County clerk’s office, King William, Virginia.” PF at 89. However, when the interested parties requested this document, the county clerk’s office could not locate this document, was unaware of any such document, and expressed doubt than any of Petitioner’s documents would be so maintained in that office. This document must be produced to verify the accuracy of Petitioner’s representations, particularly the portion of the group’s membership that resided on the reservation in 1954.
as Richmond or Philadelphia. *Id.* This pattern of dispersion continues to the present day. The 2012 membership list identified only 60 out of 203 members, again less than 30%, residing on the reservation. PF at 55.

The Department cannot assume that interactions took place, without evidence. See Muwekma FD 2002, 59 (“Although members live within an area where interaction is possible, such interaction was not documented, and may not be assumed.”) Even if the Department is permitted to assume, without evidence, that first-degree relatives remained in contact with each other, there are only 38 first-degree relatives living off-reservation. PF at 55. Thus, the PF is, at best, assuming that approximately 48% (i.e., 60 living on reservation + 38 first-degree relatives/203 members) of Petitioner members interacted with the “core community.” PF at 55. This is less than the requisite “predominant portion.” The evidence therefore establishes that the Petitioner would not satisfy criterion 83.7(b).

For that reason, the PF attempts to rely on “cross-over” evidence of political continuity, required by 25 C.F.R. § 83.7(c). As explained above, the cross-over provision may be a reasonable proxy for demonstrated community in the absence of evidence to the contrary, but here, the evidence establishes that the Petitioner does not, in fact, satisfy criterion 83.7(b) because there was a steady and deliberate abandonment of the reservation by Petitioner’s members. The reasons for the abandonment vary—e.g., desire to find jobs, Petitioner’s discriminatory marriage policies. See PF at 54-55. Regardless of the reasons, the evidence shows that only a small portion of the members remained in social contact, and even then, more than a third of that group is only assumed to have maintained social relations. The regulations state that a petitioner “may be denied acknowledgment if the evidence available demonstrates that it does not meet one or more criteria.” 25 C.F.R. § 83.6(d). The Petitioner cannot be acknowledged on this basis.

The current rulemaking includes a proposal to lower to 30% the portion of the petitioning group that must comprise a distinct community. This proposal is insufficient on its face: it is nonsensical to conclude that a group forms a community when the evidence establishes that most of the group (in fact, up to 70%) does not form a community. The current regulatory requirement must therefore be maintained, and the cross-over provisions revised to apply only in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Thus modified, the current rulemaking should be completed and made applicable to all pending petitioners, including the Petitioner. The Petitioner cannot be acknowledged when the evidence establishes that it did not, in fact, comprise a community from at least the mid-20th century to the present.

4. **The Petitioner cannot document the requisite descent from the historical Pamunkey.**

The PF concludes that the Petitioner satisfies criterion 83.7(e) (descent from a historical tribe) because 80% (162 out of 203) of the Petitioner’s members have documented descent from a member of the historical Pamunkey tribe. Eighty percent is the lowest percentage of documented descent that has been accepted in prior acknowledgment decisions, see Samish FD 1995, 14; it is also the minimum amount proposed to be specified in the current rulemaking. See 79 Fed. Reg. at 30769. Importantly, because the Petitioner group is small, the disqualification of just one member would drop the percentage of documented descent below this level (161 out of 203 equals 79%). In addition, descent has been documented from only six historical Pamunkey
Indians, each of which has at least one unique descendant. Therefore, the disqualification of just one of these six ancestors would cause the Petitioner to fail this criterion. In fact, at least one of these six ancestors, Matilda Brisby, cannot be documented to be a historical Pamunkey Indian.\footnote{In addition, there is reason to believe that Edward “Ned” Bradby (Sr.) and his brother William Bradby were not of Pamunkey descent. Helen Rountree documents a long-standing tradition that one James Bradby, a non-Indian, married into the Chickahominy tribe, converted the people to Christianity, and “became the ancestor of the Bradby families among both the Chickahominy and Pamunkey tribes.” See Helen C. Rountree, Change Came Slowly: The Case of the Powhatan Indians of Virginia, 3 J. Ethnic Studies 1, 13 (1975), citing Theodore Stern, Chickahominy: The Changing Culture of a Virginia Indian Community, 96 Proc. Am. Phil. Soc. 192 (1952). See also, Helen C. Rountree, Pocahontas’s People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia Through Four Centuries, Univ. of Oklahoma Press (1990) at 172. The number of non-Indians is also significant, given that around 1789, the Pamunkey tribe only included about a dozen men. \textit{Id}.} The Petitioner has therefore failed to satisfy the requirements of criterion 83.7(e) and cannot be acknowledged under the current analysis.

Matilda Brisby is identified as the ancestor of 148 of the 162 members of the Petitioner group that can document descent from a historical Pamunkey Indian. The PF states that “[m]ost” (i.e., not all) of these 148 members can also document descent from one of the other five historical Pamunkey Indians. PF at 98. The Petitioner’s ability to satisfy the descent criterion therefore depends on being able to document that Matilda Brisby was a Pamunkey Indian. The evidence that Matilda Brisby was a Pamunkey Indian is based on the ca. 1835 Colosse Baptist Church “Island List” and “testimony for an 1872-1877 SCC [Southern Claims Commission] claim filed on behalf of her estate by her son-in-law, John Langston.” PF at 97. Neither of these documents establishes that Matilda Brisby was a Pamunkey Indian; at most, they establish that a “Matilda Brisby” was a resident of “Indian island” or “Pamunkey Island.” In addition, it is clear that the PF has confused more than one person as “Matilda Brisby.”

The Island List is a list of individuals, including a “Matilda Brisby” who joined the Colosse Baptist Church; its significance is that it identifies the individuals as “descendants of an Indian Tribe on Indian island.” The PF asserts that “[b]ecause the historical Pamunkey Indians were the only tribe residing on an ‘island’ in this area, these individuals are presumed to be Pamunkey Indians.” PF at 8. This presumption, however, is not supportable. First, it is doubtful that the church actually verified the specific tribal descent of the listed individuals (certainly no documentation exists to that effect); at most the document establishes that the listed individuals were Indians and residents of the state reservation.

Second, the PF itself admits, with respect to earlier Church documents listing “Indian” members, that these lists may include “non-Pamunkey women (particularly Mattaponi) married to Pamunkey men.” PF at 29. In addition, there is evidence throughout the PF that whites, blacks, and other (non-Pamunkey) Indians lived and formed families on the state reservation (despite the later-codified prohibitions). PF at 6-7, 23 n. 110, 24-25, 31-33, 38, 38 n. 148, 43, 48, 51 n. 246, 60. Finally, there is abundant evidence to contradict the premise that “the historical Pamunkey Indians were the only tribe residing on [the state reservation].” The close association of the Mattaponi tribe with the Pamunkey tribe is largely ignored throughout the PF. The foremost scholar of Powhatan history, Helen Rountree, concluded that the Mattaponi and Pamunkey tribes, as members of the historic Powhatan Chiefdom, were administratively considered as parts
of the same tribe by the Commonwealth and effectively occupied the same state reservation until 1894, when the Mattaponi formally separated from the Pamunkey-led Powhatan Chiefdom and the Commonwealth appointed separate trustees for the Mattaponi. PF at 60 n. 269. The PF itself admits that Pamunkey and Mattaponi lands “were both known as ‘[I]ndian town,’” PF at 61, the two tribes shared a school, PF at 94, the tribes sent joint delegations to the Governor, PF at 48, both tribes were referred to as “Powhatan,” PF at 52 n. 252, and in addition, Appendix C demonstrates that Pamunkeys often resided on the Mattaponi reservation as well. Given this history, it is arbitrary and capricious to assume that Pamunkey Indians were the only Indians residing on the state reservation. The Island List does not establish that Matilda Brisby was a Pamunkey Indian.

Moreover, the PF misrepresents the content of evidentiary sources it relies on to demonstrate descent. The PF cites to SCC testimony as identifying Matilda Brisby as a Pamunkey Indian (the PF does not, however, quote this testimony, unlike for all other historical ancestors identified as “Pamunkey Indian” in SCC testimony). PF at 97. The testimony does not identify her as Pamunkey. See Attachment 1. Rather, the testimony only identifies Matilda Brisby as living on “Pamunkey Island.” Id. at 11. Residence on the state reservation does not establish that an individual was a Pamunkey Indian, or even an Indian at all. Indeed, the SCC testimony cited does not even identify Matilda Brisby as an Indian. See id.

Finally, it is clear that the PF has confused more than one individual as a single “Matilda Brisby.” The PF states that Matilda Brisby was born about 1790, yet claims that she remarried in 1850 and proceeded—at the age of 60, apparently—to have five more children before dying after 1860. PF at 97. The PF goes on to say that two of her daughters died before she did, but not before leaving grandchildren, which would mean that at least one of those daughters would have had to have borne children before the age of 10. Id. This confusion can perhaps only be explained (or compounded) by the incorporation of a third individual into the identity of “Matilda Brisby”—indeed, the PF concedes that “[t]his couple [the union of Matilda Brisby and her second husband] may be the same as or confused with” a Matilda “Brisley” (aka Bradbury on the 1860 census) whose marriage to a third man produced three other children of different names. Id.

These statements cannot be reconciled and are refuted by the record. The SCC testimony of John Langston establishes that Matilda Brisby died in 1866, and had been a widow “more than 20 years” at her death; additional testimony concurs that she died in 1866, but specifies she had been a widow “about 24 years.” Att. 1 at 11, 13. She therefore had been widowed (i.e., not married) from about 1842 until her death and cannot be the “Matilda Brisby” who married Edward Brisby around 1850 and had five children, nor the Matilda “Brisley” (aka Bradbury on the 1860 census) married to Edward Brisby, “possibly” with three other children. PF at 97.

Given this confusion, it cannot even be said that the Matilda Brisby identified on the Island List (whatever the probative value of that document) is the same Matilda Brisby that was the subject of the SCC testimony cited. Nor can it be said that the same Matilda Brisby is the mother of both Martha Ann (Brisby) Page Sampson and Matilda A. (Brisley) Langston—both of

---

15 An “Edward Brisbon (or Brisby)” is identified by Helen Rountree as a white man living on the reservation about 1799. Powhatan’s People at 173. Other white men are also identified. Id.
whom are essential to Petitioner’s claim of descent, as each is documented to have unique
descendants among Petitioner’s members, who must document descent from Matilda Brisby. PF
at 98. As long as the PF relies on descent from Matilda Brisby for even one member, the
Petitioner cannot establish the minimum degree of descent required to satisfy criterion 83.7(e).
The Department must reconsider the evidence regarding Brisby, who the record does not
establish was even an Indian, and the number of members who rely exclusively on her to
establish descent to determine if the Petitioner actually satisfies the acknowledgment criteria. 16

In short, the PF fails to document that Matilda Brisby was a Pamunkey Indian and also
fails to document that she is the ancestor of Petitioner’s members who are claimed to be her
descendants. Each of these failures is independently fatal.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the PF is deficient and does not support acknowledging the Petitioner as an Indian Tribe under Federal law.

---

16 The Department treats descent as a key indicator of tribal existence. 25 C.F.R. § 83.7(e). There is some question, however, regarding the legitimacy of descent in establishing tribal status, when hundreds of years have elapsed and descent is claimed from one of potentially several hundred ancestors. See Rice v. Cayetano, 528 U.S. 495, 527 (2000) (Breyer, J. concurring)(stating that “[t]here must, however, be some limit on what is reasonable, at least when a State (which is not itself a tribe) creates the definition”). The current rulemaking includes a proposal to quantify, for the first time, that 80% of the petitioner group must descend from a historical tribe. 79 Fed. Reg. at 30769. This is the lowest percentage that has been determined sufficient in past acknowledgment determinations. This requirement is perhaps reasonable for historical periods up to approximately one century, but is likely not sufficient for historical periods of two centuries or longer. In this case, there is evidence of significant intermarriage with individuals outside the group who were white, African-American, or other Indian. There is therefore no way to determine, based on the PF, that the Petitioner can establish descent from the historical Pamunkey tribe by any reasonable definition.
Attachment 1
I hereby certify that the

above-acknowledged was taken, is a duly qualified

in said for the County of 

lot therein, authorized by law to take acknowledgments, and that I, above his

signature.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto signed my name and sealed my official seal, this

day of ____________________________ 1876.

[Signature]

[Seal]

[Seal]

W. H. R. M.

The name or names of the persons, taking the property, and whether they were officers or soldiers of the United States, and in what company or regi-

men they belonged, and, if officers, their rank, and where they were stationed, and the date of the said uniform or military uniform or military organization the service of the United States; it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the

person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the property was

the name or names of the persons, taking the property, and whether they were officers or soldiers of the United States, and in what company or regi-

men they belonged, and, if officers, their rank, and where they were stationed, and the date of the said uniform or military uniform or military organization the service of the United States; it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the

person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.

If the claim is for the two or four years' or three years' while employed in the military service of the United States, the petition must describe the

name or names of the persons or persons by whom the said property was taken, and where it was taken, and whether any warrant, receipt, or other writing was given them for the person taking the property. If a receipt or other writing was given, the original, or a copy of it, must be annexed to the petition, but if not within

the power of the claimant, it must be certified that the original paper is, or is believed to be, in the custody of the United States, and all the facts of the

said paper, and the place of the taking, and all the material circumstances thereof, must be stated.
To the Honorable Commissioners of Claims,
(Under the Act of Congress of March 3d, 1871,)

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Your Petitioner would state:

1. That the John Laughter, eldest of the citizens of King Williams County, Virginia, who remained a loyal adherent to the cause and Government of the United States during the war, and was so loyal before and at the time of the taking the property for which claim is here made; that

   his Post Office address is.......

   and at the time this claim accrued, the he was a citizen of King Williams County, Virginia, and that he is the

   claim in the name of the administrator of the Estate of Matilda Brawdy-Bristow. He departed this life on the 4th day of March 1866.

   This he was appointed administrator of his Estate in the following October.

2. That the name

   of the party hereinafter mentioned.

3. That on or about the 11th day of March, 1865, in the County of King Williams and State of VA

   of Erath Bristow in command of United States Forces

   did the following property for the use of the

   Viceroy of the United States, for which, the

   voucher was given to said:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Horse, 4 year old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 Bales Corn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large Broom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200 Feet Planks</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100 Coat Covers</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100 Out Ashes</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1000 Bales Hay, 4800 Od</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names and residences of the witnesses who will be relied upon to prove loyalty:

Mr. P. Miles, King & Co., Va.
Samuel C. Page

The names and residences of those to prove the other facts alleged in the petition:

Mr. P. Miles, King & Co., Va.
Samuel C. Page

And Petitioner further says that he did not voluntarily serve in the Confederate army or navy, either as an officer, soldier or seaman, at any time during the late rebellion; that he never voluntarily furnished any stores, supplies or other material aid to said Confederate army or navy, or to the Confederate Government, or to any officer, department, or sufferer from the same, in support thereof, and if he ever voluntarily accepted or exercised the functions of any office whatever under, or yielded voluntary support to the said Confederate Government.

[Signatures]

John L. Lane
Attorney for Claimant, Richmond, Va.

CHANDLER, MORTON
Attorneys for Claimant, Richmond, Va.
State of Virginia
COUNTY OF Henrico

Personally appeared before me, and for the State and County above stated, and by me duly sworn, (such for himself,) deposits, and says, that he is the petitioner named in the foregoing petition, and who signed the same; and the matters therein stated are true of defendant's own knowledge, except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, he believes them to be true.

Given under my hand and seal, this __________ day of __________, A. D. 1871.

John Lupton
Notary Public

Know all Men by these Presents, That

John Lupton above

of the State of Matilda, Brinkley,

in the State of Virginia

and appoint L. H. CHANDLER, ALFRED WILSON, individually and by their

name of Chandler, Hornor, Brothers, of Richmond, Va.,

true and lawful Attorney, in

for other....and in my name, place and stead, truly acknowledging and revoking any and all other

powers of attorney of prior date hereto, of any and every nature given in and tending the premises hereinafter set forth,
to write, to act in my behalf, in the matter of certain claims hereunto attached, and to be filed by my said attorneys

in the office of Commissioner of Claims, appointed under the Act of March 2, 1871; giving and granting unto said

attorneys, or either of them, full power and authority to do and perform all and every act and thing, whatsoever

may be necessary or convenient to be done in and about the premises, so fully to all intents and purposes as

might or

could do, if personally present at the doing thereof, and to receive and sign all vouchers, drafts or other papers, hereby

ratifying and confirming all that my said attorneys, or either of them, may or shall lawfully do, or cause to be done

by virtue hereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this ______________

day of __________, A. D. 1871.

[Signature]

John Lupton
Notary Public

State of Virginia
County of Henrico

Notary Public duly appointed and authorized

In and for said State and County, do hereby certify that on this day personally appeared before me,

John Lupton, above named, the State of Matilda, Brinkley, and

who, after personally known to me to be the identical person described in, and who executed the foregoing instrument, and...

acknowledged the execution thereof to be his voluntary act and deed for the use and purpose therefor expressed.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal, this ______________

day of __________, A. D. 1871.

[Signature]

Notary Public
No. 14,979...

CLAIM OF

John Laughton, Adm. of
Matilda Bridgely, deceased,
of

Kings, Williams County, Virginia

$11,574.

TESTIMONY OF

TAKEN BEFORE

Mr. Harwurtz,
Supt. Commissioner

Chas. V. Morton,
of Richmond, Va.

Sept 5, 1772.
CLAIM

No. 14779

John Leighton Adair

Red. Rail Station

Application to have Testimony Taken

By

SPECIAL COMMISSIONER

M. S. Pleasant

Chandler & Morton

Attorney.

Richmond, Va.
Before the Commissioners of Claims.
(Under Act of Congress of March 3d, 1871.)

In the matter of the Claim of John T. Sumner, Administrator, for the
estate of Joel Hall Stanton in the County of King William
and State of Virginia

Comes now the claimant before M. P. Pharratt, Esq., Special Commissioner for the
State of Virginia and represents that he has heretofore filed with the above named Commissioners a petition for the allowance of a claim for property: & taken & used for the use of the army of the United States, which claim, as stated below, does not exceed the sum of three thousand dollars.

That the said claim, stated by items, and excluding therefrom all such items as refer to the DAMAGE, DESTRUCTION and LOSS, and not the USE of property: to unauthorized or unnecessary DEPRIVATIONS of troops or other persons upon the property, or to BENT or compensation for the occupation of buildings, grounds or other real estate, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value per Unit</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Horse</td>
<td>6 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Cow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 Bushel Corn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>500 lbs. Bacon</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28 Iron</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100 lbs. Hog</td>
<td>200 lbs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100 Salt Shad</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1600 Fence Rails used for fencing, at 100 rails, the cord - 16 cords, cord at $6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$454.40
That, as stated in the petition referred to the property was taken from or furnished by John Langston
Colonel in the State of for the use
of a portion of the army of the United States, known as the
and commanded by , and that the persons who took or received the
property, or who authorized or directed it to be taken or furnished, were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the property was removed in the Camp of said Cavalry
and used for by the Officers and Soldiers composing the same
all this on or about the 1st of March in the year 1866, as appears by the petition
presented to the Commissioners.

That the claimant is unable to produce the witnesses hereafter to be named before the Commissioners at
the City of Washington, for one or more of the following reasons, to wit: (1)
He is in limited circumstances and cannot pay expenses of himself and witnesses to Washington.

That, by the following named persons, the claimant expects to prove that from the beginning of hostilities against the United States, to the end thereof, his sympathies were constant with the cause of the United States; that he never, of his own free will and accord, did anything, or offered, or sought, or attempted to do anything, by word or deed, to injure said cause or retard its success, and that he was at all times ready and willing, when called upon, or if required, to aid and assist the cause of the Union, or its supporters, so far as his means and power and circumstances of the case permitted:

Mr. P. Miles
Samuel C. Page
Whitney Cook

That, by the following named persons, the claimant expects to prove the taking or furnishing of the property, for the use of the army of the United States:

Mr. P. Miles
Samuel C. Page

(1) State the Military organization by name as fully and particularly as possible.
(2) State as well as can be done, the place to which the property was consigned for the use of the army.
(3) State as fully and minutely as possible, the particular person or persons using the property, and in what particular use it was applied
(4) State the reasons why the witnesses named be brought to Washington.
The claimant now prays that the testimony of the witnesses just designated, be taken and recorded at such place and at such time as the special Commissioner may designate, at the reasonable cost of the said claimant, and that due notice of the time and place of the taking thereof, be given to the claimant, or to his counsel.

Submitted on this 6th day of July, 1877.

John Langston Mayor

Chancellor

P. O. Address of Attorney:

Richmond
Before the Commissioners of Claims.

ACT OF CONGRESS, MARCH 3, 1871.

Case of John Langston, Adn..
No. 13009.

It is hereby certified, that on the 12th day of July, 1871, at Barren Big Island, in the county of Nuea, West Indies, and State of Ohio, personally came before me the following persons, viz: John Langston, Claimant,

J. J. Howard, for Counsel, or Attorney,


Claimant's Witnesses,

for the purpose of a hearing in the above entitled cause.

Each and every deponent, previous to his or her examination, was properly and duly sworn or affirmed by me to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, concerning the matters under examination; and the testimony of each deponent was written out by me, or in my presence, and as given before me, and subsequently read over to said deponent, by whom it was also subscribed in my presence.

Witness my hand and seal this 12th day of July, 1871.

[Signature]

Special Commissioner of the Commissioners of Claims.

Deposition of Mr. Claimant.

In answer to the First General Interrogatory, the Deponent says:

My name is John Longston, my age 46 years, my residence Alwilla, in the State of Ohio, and my occupation a farmer.

I am related to the claimant, and have a beneficial interest in the claim, as husband of one of the daughters of Oliver Roesly, dec'd.

[Note: The claimant should always be first named throughout, in which case the word 'related to' should be omitted when]
Jan the son in law of Matilda Anthony, who died in 1866. She was over 70 at her death. She was a widow over than 30 years. She left her daughters both married & some great grandchildren. The children of two other daughters who died before her. The inventory administrator of her estate by the will of Dr William Anthony. The substance of my verification will be given with this claim. There are not fully settled up the estate. The proceeds, of this claim, if any, will go to the children equally, the grand children taking their mother's share.

Says hearing with any mother in law. Her property was taken to see it done. It was taken in March 1865 by the United Country. The war in the Island of Tennessee. Where Arden is in 5 days. I did not see the horse taken, but saw it next day at the Country camp. It was saddled like a regular army horse. Seems to one of the officers tried to get it back, but he told me the horse was needed as some of the army never had a horse. The war is over now. And I heard the corn taken out of the barn house and carried off to the camp in wagons. Some about 15 barrels were taken. Also, thirty had 50 barrels. They left her about 5.-

I saw the meat taken out of her store house.
Wm. P. Miles having been duly sworn before
and sworn to J. G. year of age, a farmer
and preacher by occupation & resident of
Sunnyside Island. Silas Whitehead died
she died in 1866 leaving three children all
females & all of age. She was about 75
year old when she died. She had been a widow
about 37 years. I saw some of her property
taken by Sheridan's cavalry in March 1865.
Saw some of her corn carried off in bags
but I can't say how much. I also saw in one
bag full of flax. I think there was more taken
that I didn't see. I saw some pieces of meat
carried off by some soldiers & also some of her
jewelry taken but I could not tell how many.
Saw some of her beans taken to feed the
beast. I can't be precise but there were about
250 pounds
taken. The fence was a low one...

John Langston was appointed administrator
of the estate by the County Court of Kingville
Co. He is a son-in-law of Mr. Brown. The
four children as I understand have an equal
interest in the estate.

Wm. P. Miles
Lambert L. Page, having been duly sworn, deposes as follows: I am 71 years of age, a farmer by occupation, a resident of Rensselaer Island. I know Mrs. Brealy; she was my great grandmother. She was three or four years old when her property taken by Abraham Lincoln in March 1861. I saw some of the bacon taken from her house. It was a good lot but I do not know much about it; it was more than 200 pounds. I have been asked to swear about the bacon. I think they took about 200 pounds. We made one insane here - I think I have no interest in this claim. I am the son of Mrs. Brealy, daughter by her first husband. She got all the property from her second husband.

Witness

Lambert L. Page

Dec. 1

H. F. Harrant
REMARKS BY THE SPECIAL COMMISSIONER.
Claim
of
John Langston
Dow. of Mrs. P. B. R. B. of
Dow. U. H. H. H.

SUMMARY REPORT.

Amount Allowed $
Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Indian Affairs
Attn: R. Lee Fleming, Director
Office of Federal Acknowledgment
1951 Constitution Avenue, NW
Mail Stop 34B-SIB
Washington, D.C. 20240
July 12, 2014

Mr. Kevin Washburn  
Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs  
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement  
1951 Constitution Avenue  
Mailstop 34B-SIB  
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pamunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state’s fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration’s repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.
We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David G. Sutton
President
Tiger Fuel Company
Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement
1951 Constitution Avenue
Mailstop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240
July 15, 2104

Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement
1951 Constitution Avenue NW
Mailstop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pumunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state's fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth
all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration's repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
G. T. Connelly
Controller
Workman Oil Company
MR KEVIN WASHBURN
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY- INDIAN AFFAIRS
ATTENTION OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
1951 CONSTITUTION AVE NW
MAILSTOP 34B-SIB
WASHINGTON DC 20240


July 15, 2104

Mr. Kevin Washburn
Office of the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs
Attention Office of Federal Acknowledgement
1951 Constitution Avenue
Mailstop 34B-SIB
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Mr. Washburn:

I am writing on behalf of the membership of Virginia Petroleum Convenience and Grocery Association, a 66 year old Virginia trade association representing approximately 400 businesses engaged in the petroleum marketing and convenience store industries. On June 25, the VPCGA board of directors voted unanimously to oppose the proposed finding for federal acknowledgement of the Pamunkey Indian Tribe as published in the January 23, 2014 Federal Register. While some may see the proposed notice as mere acknowledgement that the Pamunkey meet seven mandatory historic criteria, if sovereignty is ultimately approved, it will change Virginia forever in a very negative way.

We oppose this proposed finding because it places a small special interest ahead of more than 8.1 million other Virginians. It bypasses the US Congress, which has considered and failed to enact recognition legislation.

Our principal opposition to government sovereignty is that it will lead to the same kind of economic disruption seen in other states with sovereign tribes, disruption attributable solely to tax evasion. Has the Interior Department considered the transfer of wealth that would occur when the Pamunkey nation is able to sell gasoline without charging state gas tax of approximately 15 cents per gallon? If tribal stations manage to capture just 10 percent of the state's fuel sales, state and local governments would lose at least $75 million annually. The situation is the same for tobacco products. Each year Virginia collects more than $350 million in tobacco products excise and sales taxes. If only 10 percent shifted to an independent Pamunkey nation, the state would experience a budget shortfall of more than $35 million dollars, taking money from youth smoking prevention, compliance checks on tobacco sellers and the tobacco regions of our state.

There is a solution that will not bankrupt Virginia and its citizens. Recognize the tribes, but include stipulations that require the Pamunkey nation to collect and remit to the Commonwealth
all taxes on purchases made by non-tribal members. The chief of the Chickahominy tribe testified to the US Senate that it was not their intent to engage in tax evasion and we take him at his word. It is now time for you as assistant secretary to consider the concerns of all Virginians and not a select few.

Some would have you believe that our concerns are baseless as there are a limited number of tribal members and their traditional reservation is far from a commerce center. Experience has shown that a limited number of members has not stopped tax free sales in other states. Additionally, we know that the recognition bill in Congress would have allowed them to expand into some of the most populated areas of our state. Add this to the administration's repeal of the so-called commuter standard for Indian casinos and it is clear that the present size of the tribe and location are of no comfort to this association.

We urge you to preserve the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia by rejecting this finding, or at the very least assure recognized tribes do not engage in tax evasion.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Warner L. Hall
President
Workman Oil Company
MR KEVIN WASHBURN
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY- INDIAN AFFAIRS
ATTENTION OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
1951 CONSTITUTION AVE NW
MAILSTOP 34B-SIB
WASHINGTON DC 20240