DocuSign Envelope ID: BDA703F1-48FE-4AFC-A953-1B79550D7692

STATE OF CALIFORNIA Gavin Newsom, *Governor*

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Sara Dutschke
Miwok

COMMISSIONER
Isaac Bojorquez
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER
Buffy McQuillen
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki, Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER
Wayne Nelson
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER
Stanley Rodriguez
Kumeyaay

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Raymond C. Hitchcock
Miwok/Nisenan

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

November 21, 2022

President Dr. Michael V. Drake
University of California
Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: May 16, 2022 UC Berkeley Campus Repatriation Committee letter regarding remains discovered at UC Berkeley Anthropology Department

Dear President Drake:

On behalf of the Native American Heritage Commission (Commission), I am writing to follow-up on the May 16, 2022 letter from the UC Berkeley Campus Repatriation Committee (Committee) concerning a collection of previously undisclosed holdings of skeletal remains revealed by Prof. Tim White and utilized for teaching in the Department of Integrative Biology (letter enclosed).

As you recall, we read the Committee's May 16th letter into the record at the Commission's July 15, 2022 public meeting (Meeting) with profound grief. During this Meeting, Commissioners raised concerns about UC Berkeley's lack of compliance with both federal and State repatriation laws, specifically CalNAGPRA, including the lack of required consultations, a lack of transparency in providing documentation, unexplained delays, as well as the need to investigate and to hold individuals accountable for legal and ethical violations in the creation and treatment of this collection.

The Commission spent the entire morning session of its July Meeting discussing your May 16th letter, the Tim White holdings, and UC Berkeley's actions and inactions concerning this situation.[1] Both Associate Vice Chancellor Linda Rugg and Committee Chairperson Sabrina Agarwal were present at this meeting. They both provided testimony to the Commission and answered questions. The Commission provided direct guidance to both Vice Chancellor Rugg and Professor Agarwal concerning the immediate steps to take concerning the Tim White holdings. Such guidance included immediately engaging in tribal consultation with the potentially culturally affiliated tribes, including but not limited to Ohlone tribes, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, and United Auburn Indian Community, and to immediately turn over records and documentation concerning the collections to requesting tribes.

---

https://nahc.ca.gov/2022/07/public-meeting-notice-and-agenda-july-15-2022/

At this time, the Commission is requesting an update on the status of repatriation efforts, including, but not limited to, tribal consultation and records release to requesting tribes. The Commission is also requesting a status update concerning the investigations of the legal and ethical violations in this matter. Lastly, this letter shall serve as a summary of the direct guidance provided to UC Berkeley by the Commission on this matter at its July Meeting.

I. UC BERKELEY MUST COMPLY WITH CALNAGPRA

A. Requirement for Consultation

In the May 16, 2022 letter, the Committee requests guidance from the Commission concerning its compliance with CalNAGPRA. According to the May 16, 2022 letter, the Committee first learned about this collection in August of 2020 from Prof. Tim White, an individual who has expressly opposed repatriation during his career.[2]

As discussed at our Meeting, once the Committee (or its predecessor committee) learned about this collection in August of 2020, UC Berkeley needed to immediately engage with tribes to consult about cultural affiliation, including proper handling of ancestors and associated items. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subds. (b)(1)(A)-(E).)

According to the May 16, 2022 letter, after the Committee learned about the collection in August of 2020 from Prof. White, it "immediately notified" Santa Ynez regarding remains that had been identified as belonging to that tribe which were subject to a previous 2018-repatriation; however, according to testimony provided by Santa Ynez representative, Attorney Sam Cohen, UC Berkeley did not notify the tribe until February 26, 2021, almost six months after the Committee purportedly learned about the collection. According to the letter, it then took the Committee eleven months to then remove the remaining collection from Prof. White's control. While this delay could have caused additional irreparable harm to the collection, no efforts were undertaken to initiate tribal consultation during this period. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subd. (b)(1).) CalNAGPRA requires UC Berkeley to consult, prior to any inventory work being conducted, with affiliated tribes on protocols to be used in the inventory process, including on minimizing handling. (*Id.*, subds. (b)(1)(B), (i).) This never occurred.

According to the Committee, identifying the tribes for consultation was made difficult because of the haphazard manner in which Prof. White and others maintained the collection without regard for provenance. While difficult, it was not impossible. This entails researching the history of the collection, some of which had already been collected by another professor, Prof. Tony Platt, but certainly required interviewing professors within the department about its origins and historical additions, in conjunction with reviewing any related records, including published histories, field notes, and archeological documentation. Based upon a "totality of the circumstances," UC Berkeley was (and is) required to consult with those tribes whose state aboriginal territory includes the areas determined by a reasonable belief to have been the areas where ancestors and associated items were removed. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subd. (b)(1)(E).) The Commission may assist with the identification of tribes for this purpose, but UC Berkeley bears the obligation to identify and consult with these tribes. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subd. (b)(1)((E)(2).)

After the collection was transferred to a safer location in July of 2021, still no demonstrated efforts were made to consult with affiliated tribes. Rather, according to the May 16, 2022 letter, from

[2] In fact, Prof. While has previously brought suit to prevent repatriation of ancestors. (*White v. University of California* (9th Cir. 2014) 765 F.3d 1010, 1023.)

September through December 2021, the Committee performed an "analysis" of the remains that included handling and determinative sorting, without consulting with any tribes. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subdivisions (b)(1)(B)(i).) No explanation is provided for not consulting with California tribes as required under CalNAGPRA before attempting to undertake this endeavor. In this instance, tribes were entitled to be consulted on handling, including to be consulted on whether such an analysis should have even occurred.

Under CalNAGPRA, by January of 2022, UC Berkeley was required to create a preliminary inventory of this collection. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subd. (b)(1).) Yet, according to the May 16, 2022 letter, UC Berkeley has not even undertaken the most fundamental initial steps towards creating such an inventory, including researching its origins and history, providing documentation to tribes, and engaging in consultation on inventory protocols. By the time the Committee issued the May 16, 2022 letter, almost two years had passed with no CalNAGPRA compliance.

For purposes of compliance with Health & Saf. Code, § 8013 and establishing the potentially culturally affiliated tribes, Professor Agarwal stated at the July Meeting that the UC Berkeley Repatriation Committee would review records associated with the collections, including the letter from Prof. Tim White, UC Berkeley's historical collections practices, the information UC Berkeley has on sites excavated by the University as well as other institutions or archaeological groups that may have transferred collections to UC Berkeley, the University's history and practices concerning its collection and attainment of Native American human remains, and tribal knowledge of the collections and the University's practices concerning Native American human remains. Of course, due diligence should be directed to locating any written records and historical records concerning the origins of the Tim White holdings, even though the May 16th letter insinuated there were none.

B. Compliance with CalNAGPRA Concerning the UC Berkeley Campus Committee's Responsibilities

The Committee raised concerns about its ability to require UC Berkeley's compliance with CalNAGPRA. This concern is substantiated by the UC Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation Policy (Policy) which only permits the Committee to review Policy violations and to "*make recommendations* to the Chancellor for corrective actions as necessary (emphasis added)."[3] The Policy violates state law in this regard which requires that all claims "of any violation of the policies and procedures adopted pursuant to Section 8025 shall be submitted to the campus Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Implementation Committee for *determination*." (emphasis added, Health & Saf. Code, § 8025, subd. (b)(4).) According to the Legislature, the purpose behind this requirement is to ensure "the University's compliance with legal requirements . . . ." (Assem. Bill No. 2836 (2017-2018 Reg. Sess.) § 1 (Leg. Findings), subd. (b)(5).)

The UC must amend its Policy to comply with state law by enabling the Committee to perform its statutory duties to assess and remedy UC Berkeley's violations of CalNAGPRA as reflected in the Policy. To be sure, the Committee should not be powerless to act in the face of such tribal injustices.

C. Providing Information to Tribes During Consultation

A critical component to consultation is sharing information about a collection with tribes. CalNAGPRA embraces this concept by requiring institutions to provide information about a collection's geographical location, cultural affiliation, aboriginal territory, and most crucially here, "the

[3] UC Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation Policy (Jan. 1, 2022) at p. 17 at https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2500489/NAGPRA

circumstances surrounding their acquisition." (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subd. (b)(1)(A).) In addition, upon the request of a tribe, institutions "must provide additional available documentation to supplement the information" already required to be provided under CalNAGPRA. (Health & Saf. Code, § 8013, subd. (g)(1).) This specifically includes "a summary of agency or museum records, including inventories or catalogs, relevant studies, or other pertinent data for the limited purpose of determining the geographical origin, cultural affiliation, and basic facts surrounding the acquisition and accession of human remains and cultural items subject to this section." (*Id.*, subd. (g)(2).)

At the Meeting, San Ynez testified that it was unable to obtain information concerning the circumstances surrounding the collection's acquisition, including UC Berkeley, Hearst Museum, and Department of Anthropology records related to the collection's creation and history. The horror uncovered by the Committee is coupled with the fact that according to the Committee still other Native American remains were "borrowed" from the Hearst Museum for an indefinite period for anthropological study. The size and extent of this unrecorded "loan" is not disclosed by the Committee and Santa Ynez testified that records related to the loan, as well as communications with Prof. White concerning the collection were never provided to the Tribe. To the extent that the Hearst Museum had no records documenting any such loan (a claim made by the Committee to the Commission, but later contradicted by evidence provided to the Commission at its July 15, 2022 meeting), UC Berkeley deprived the tribe of this crucial information. Not only was UC Berkeley not forthcoming with the tribe, the potential of an unrecorded loan reinforces the State Auditor's findings that campuses lack "adequate controls and oversight related to access to their museum collections of Native American remains and artifacts." (State Auditor, Native American Graves and Protection and Repatriation Act, The University of California Is Not Adequately Overseeing Its Return of Native American Remains and Artifacts (June 2020) at p. 28.)[4] UC Berkeley's failure to be forthcoming with its information and to produce required documentation culminated in unsuccessful attempts by Santa Ynez to obtain these records through Public Records Act requests. Nothing is more fundamental to the consultation process than sharing the circumstances surrounding this collection's history and acquisition essential for determining cultural affiliation. The failure to produce required records related to this collection compounds the injustice surrounding its creation. UC Berkeley must comply with CalNAGPRA by immediately providing requesting tribes with all the information it has surrounding this collection.

II. MAINTAINING ACCOUNTABILITY

In the context of UC Berkeley's long history of Native American exploitation, it perhaps should have come as little surprise that the Committee discovered almost two years-ago, with the assistance of Prof. Tim White, "a large collection" of Native American remains that have allegedly been used for more than 50 years, up until very recently, for anthropological instruction and study by Prof. White and other professors. All told, approximately 95 Native American ancestors were recovered in piles. And because of their open hostility to repatriation and Native American culture, Native American ancestors were dumped in boxes and containers with remains from other sources without regard to provenance, nor care taken for their handling. At our Meeting, Commissioners and tribes expressed their anguish in response to this long-standing and profound act of violence to our peoples and culture.

Unfortunately, the May 16, 2022 letter raises as many questions as it attempts to address. First and foremost, federal and state laws requiring the identification of this collection for repatriation have been in existence for over thirty years (since 1990 and 2001 respectively), yet this collection not only evaded repatriation since that time, it was actively used for instruction. While the Committee may

[4] The report may be found at: https://www.auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2019-047.pdf

have only discovered this collection in 2020, clearly many faculty were well-aware of its continued existence, as well as the legal necessity for its repatriation, as borne out by Prof. White's failed lawsuit opposing repatriation of UC Berkeley's collections. This constitutes not only a violation of federal and state repatriation law, but raises serious ethical concerns.

According to the UC's Standards of Ethical Conduct, professors are required to "abide by federal, state, and local laws that affect our campus roles."[5] Research is required to be conducted with "integrity and intellectual honesty, and show the greatest care for human or animal subjects."[6] According to the UC Regents:

> Members of the University community are expected to conduct themselves ethically, honestly and with integrity in all dealings. This means principles of fairness, good faith and respect consistent with laws, regulations and University policies govern our conduct with others both inside and outside the community. Each situation needs to be examined in accordance with the Standards of Ethical Conduct. No unlawful practice or a practice at odds with these standards can be justified on the basis of customary practice, expediency, or achieving a 'higher' purpose.[7]

Second, Professors in Anthropology were given access to Native American collections, including collections within the Hearst Museum with no accountability for their care and handling. In this instance, remains from the Hearst Museum were simply dumped in with piles of other remains which included ancestors from Santa Ynez which were required to have been included in a 2018 repatriation to that tribe. Not only does the UC ethical code require that research be conducted with "integrity and intellectual honesty" and "show the greatest care for human or animal subjects," it requires professors ensure that "internal controls are established, properly documented, and maintained for activities within our jurisdictions."[8] Based upon the facts provided in the May 16, 2022 letter these ethical standards were clearly breached.

Third, individuals within the Hearst Museum provided professors within UC Berkeley's Anthropology Department with access to its collections, including the ability to remove items, without oversight and adequate documentation, which included remains that were required to have been repatriated in 2018. According to the Hearst Museum's code of ethics, the Hearst expects that employees overseeing its collections "must maintain the highest standards of honesty, integrity, professionalism, and respect at all times. Any action or conduct that would threaten the Hearst Museum's mission or its public trust is unacceptable."[9] The ethical code goes on to state, "All Hearst Museum collections will be treated according to professional museum standards, ensuring their proper physical care and documentation, and that access to them is appropriately controlled."[10] Based upon the facts provided in the May 16, 2022 letter, this did not occur and its standards were breached.

Moreover, in 2018 AB 2836 (D-Gloria) was enacted primarily because of the repatriation failings on the part of the UC system, and UC Berkely in particular. Among other things, the legislation

---

[5] UC Standards of Ethical Conduct (May 2005), at https://ethics.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/standards_of_ethical_conduct.pdf
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] UC Statement of Ethical Values and Standards of Ethical Conduct (May 2005) at https://ethics.berkeley.edu/code-conduct#:~:text=Members%20of%20the%20University%20community%20are%20expected%20to%20conduct%20themselves,inside%20and%20outside%20the%20community.
[8] UC Standards of Ethical Conduct (May 2005), at https://ethics.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/standards_of_ethical_conduct.pdf
[9] Institutional Code of Ethics, Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology, at pp. 2-3 at https://hearstmuseum.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/policy/Ethics_Hearst_FINAL.pdf
[10] *Id.* at p. 3.

specifically called for the UC to come into compliance with federal and state repatriation laws and to adopt clear and transparent policies and procedures concerning repatriation matters.

The May 16, 2022 letter raises the existence of both serious legal and ethical violations by UC professors and staff regarding the creation, continued use, and maintenance of this collection. We trust that a thorough investigation is underway to document these violations and to hold responsible individuals accountable. Anything less, effectively sanctions this behavior perpetuating a history of Native American exploitation by the UC. As such the Commission requests an update concerning its investigations, including providing the Commission with investigative reports, and actions taken in response to these investigations to hold appropriate individuals accountable for their legal and ethical breaches.

We would like the opportunity to schedule a meeting with you and other high-ranking UC officials to obtain these requested updates and to discuss this matter further. We appreciate your attention to this highly sensitive and important matter.

Sincerely,

Laura Miranda
Chair, Native American Heritage Commission

cc: Assemblyman James Ramos
Grayson Hough, California State Auditor
Provost Michael Brown
UC Berkeley Repatriation Committee
UC Systemwide Repatriation Committee
Chairman Kenneth Kahn, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
Chairman Gene Whitehouse, United Auburn Indian Community

OK20151051
Word Blank Document.docx

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

November 21, 2022

President Dr. Michael V. Drake
University of California
Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

RE: Executive Secretary Questions in Response to UC Berkeley Letter, May 16, 2022.

President Drake,

During our July 15, 2022, Native American Heritage Commission Public Meeting, I was authorized by the Commissioners to submit questions to you and your staff about the handling of Ancestral Remains surrendered by Professor Tim White. Please see a list of questions we have pertaining to the May 16, 2022, Letter from Sabrina Agarwal, UC Berkeley Campus Committee Chairperson. You can respond to each corresponding question separately and email back to me if that is easier.

Professor Tim White (para #1, 05/16/22)

1. Why did it take Professor Tim White until August of 2020 to disclose what he had in his possession?
    a. With existing NAGPRA Laws since the 90's and CalNAGPRA Laws from 2001 to present, it seems the University of Berkeley would've been proactive to identify and potential collections of ancestors and artifacts held by Professor White, or any other Professor, and held within Integrative Biology Department, the Anthropology Department, and all other Departments on the UC Berkeley Campus.
2. What was his reasoning for not disclosing his possession of remains sooner?
3. Was there any action taken to hold Professor White accountable for having these remains for so many years and not reporting to the University?
4. What was the exact date he surrendered the Collection held in his possession?
5. What other Professors were aware of the Collections held in Time White's possession?
6. Did any of them come forward to let the University know?

Interim Policy, (para #1, 05/16/22)

7. When was the "then Interim University of California System-Wide Policy" enacted and shared to high-risk departments to locate and disclose all previously unreported holdings of NAGPRA/CalNAGPRA eligible Human Remains?

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

8. NAGPRA & CalNAGPRA has been around for many years so was there any Policy in place to report and Collections prior to the System-wide Policy?
9. Why wasn't it followed until August of 2020?
10. Was Professor White disciplined for noncompliance to either or both Policies?
11. Does Professor White still have access to any ancestral remains?

First Group Collection (para #1, 05/16/22)

12. What was included in the First Group of accessioned remains taken on loan from the Hearst Museum and returned?
13. When were they determined to be from the Hearst Museum?
14. When were they returned to the Hearst Museum?
15. What was the date Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians were notified their ancestors that were supposed to have been previously repatriated in 2018 were part of this first group of ancestors still in Professor White's possession?
16. When were the ancestors returned to Santa Ynez after discovery?
17. Were they consulted on appropriate handling of that collection?

Second Group, (para #2, 05/16/22)

18. When were you made aware of the Second Group of Ancestors you are contacting us about?
19. As per the policy, you moved the unreported ancestors to an appropriate and secure location. Did you reach out to Santa Ynez, Native members on the UC Berkeley Campus Committee, or any other CA Tribe to consult on an appropriate handling and secure location?
20. What date did you move them to a secure location?
21. Did you consult with any tribes or tribal people on additional inventory work to be conducted?
22. Did you consult with any tribes or tribal people on the protocols to be used in the inventory process? To minimize handling of ancestors and other funerary objects before starting your determination of remains to be in fact Native American.
23. If the remains were reported in August of 2020, why did it take until July of 2021 to be moved from the Integrative Biology Department?
24. (Sabrina, UC Campus Committee) Were you aware of this collection prior to July 2021?
25. From September to December 2021, you (Sabrina) conducted the determination of the Second Group of Ancestors?
26. Who else participated in the analysis of the collection?
27. Once you determined 95 were most likely Native American ancestors, was the UC Campus Committee made aware of this analysis?
28. Were any tribes or tribal people consulted on best practices for appropriately handling and securing the ancestors?
29. Were any Tribes consulted about the discovery?

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

UC Policy (para #3, 05/16/22)

30. You reference the Policy "Protecting Previously Unreported Items Potentially Subject to NAGPRA or Cal NAGPRA." Is this a UC Policy or Berkeley Policy?
31. Did you know about protocols and process outlined in AB 275 that was already in effect during the time of analysis?

Tangi Kamu, (Thank you, Miwok)

Raymond C Hitchcock

Raymond C Hitchcock
Executive Secretary, NAHC

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY DAVIS IRVINE LOS ANGELES RIVERSIDE SAN DIEGO SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA SANTA CRUZ

Commissioner Laura Miranda
NAHC Chairperson
California Native Heritage Commission
1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95961

May 16, 2022

Dear Chairperson Miranda and NAHC Commissioners,

I am writing on behalf of the UC Berkeley NAGPRA Advisory Committee to update the NAHC and seek your guidance in regards to possible NAGPRA-eligible holdings found on our campus under the new UC policy.

I want to acknowledge that some of what this letter details is sensitive, dealing with the handling of ancestral remains being held at UC Berkeley, and it may be upsetting to readers.

Background: In August 2020 Professor Tim White (Professor, Integrative Biology UC Berkeley) contacted the Hearst Museum Director Lauren Kroiz, followed by our NAPGRA Liaison Tom Torma, to self-report previously undisclosed holdings of skeletal remains being used for teaching in the Department of Integrative Biology. Professor White's disclosure of these remains was prompted by the then interim University of California system-wide Policy that asks high-risk departments to locate and disclose all previously unreported holdings of any potentially NAGPRA/CalNAGPRA-eligible Human Remains (section E). Within these holdings, there were two groups. The first, was a group of accessioned remains taken on loan from the Hearst Museum, that have now been returned to the Hearst Museum[1]. **The second group, for which we are contacting you, was a large collection of unprovenanced (unknown source) historical skeletal remains**. This was a group of human remains that had been used for teaching by Professor White in the Department of Integrative Biology and previously in Anthropology teaching space since his arrival in 1977. The history of this collection of human remains is unknown, we know only that it was present and used by Prof. White and others in the Department of Anthropology since his arrival in 1977, but that it was likely collected and added for over a century. There are no written records with any of the mostly non-labeled remains.

Current Status/Protection of Unreported Items: As per the policy, this large number of unreported human remains were moved to an appropriate and secure location, and a preliminary determination was made to determine whether the items fall under fall under NAGPRA or CalNAGPRA, as per the UC Policy. The remains were moved from the Department of Integrative Biology in July 2021, and analysis of the remains was led by myself (Sabrina Agarwal) in September-December 2021, in order to determine only for each remain element if it *could* be Native American in origin and the overall minimum number of individual ancestors. No in depth or destructive analysis was made. It was determined that the minimum number of individuals that could potentially be Native American archaeological ancestral is **95**. There were a total of 22 minimum number of individuals determined to not be Native American (medically marked and/or labeled specimens). We note that while these ancestral remains are certainly archaeological, there is no way to determine the provenance of where they were removed. Further, the 95 minimum number of individuals is represented by thousands of smaller disarticulated and commingled skeletal and dental remains.

As per the policy under section "Protecting Previously Unreported Items Potentially Subject to NAGPRA or CalNAGPRA" these ancestral remains are now managed and preserved securely and there is absolutely no research or instructional use, in accordance with the requirements of Section V.J.2 Since it is possible that these ancestral remains are subject to NAGPRA or CalNAGPRA our campus will comply with all applicable portions of the policy (e.g., Consultation, Inventory/Summary completion, and respectful treatment), NAGPRA (including 43 C.F.R. § 10.13), CalNAGPRA, and campus policies and procedures.

---

[1] The accessioned material included both NAGPRA and non-NAGPRA eligible remains (medical), and were returned to the appropriate holdings in the Hearst Museum. Note, there was one sub-set of ancestral remains that were found to be in the control of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians and part of a group of ancestors that had already been repatriated to the Santa Ynez Band in 2018. The Santa Ynez Band was immediately notified of this unexpected and upsetting finding, and a formal campus investigation into this occurrence is underway. The ancestral remains have since been physically returned to the Santa Ynez. We have confirmed that there are no other ancestral remains in this space that are under the control of the Santa Ynez or any other Tribe.

What we seek from the NAHC: While we have determined that these ancestral remains are most certainly archaeological, it is possible that not all are Native American ancestors, and it is possible that some are from other parts of the world or various States. **However, with the well-known historical legacy of collecting ancestors that led to this teaching collection in the former Lowie Museum, later the Hearst Museum and Department of Anthropology, for over a century, we feel that the preponderance of evidence suggests that the *majority* are indeed ancestors from the State of California. However, since we will not be able to determine a precise cultural affiliation, we ask the NAHC Commissioners for any guidance on whether our federal notice should be based on the ICC "Tribes of California" designation (or all federal tribes) and how you would like us to handle this relative to CalNAGPRA as we begin consultation in order to determine disposition of these ancestral remains.**

Sincerely,

Sabrina C. Agarwal
Chair, NAGPRA Advisory Committee
Professor of Anthropology
University of California at Berkeley
agarwal@berkeley.edu
510-207-9900

On behalf of the UC Berkeley NAGPRA Advisory Committee:

Phenocia Bauerle (Director, Native American Student Development, Crow Nation)
Daniel Fonseca (Cultural Resource Director, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians)
Vincent Medina (Ohlone Indian Tribe, cultural leader of 'Itmay Cultural Association)
Beth Piatote (Associate Professor of Native American Studies, Nez Perce/Colville Confederated Tribes)
Creed Stedman (United Auburn Indian Community)

cc:
Tom Torma (NAGPRA Liason and interim Repatriation Coordinator, UC Berkeley)
Chris Treadway (Chancellor's Designee for NAGPRA, UC Berkeley)
Linda Rugg (Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Berkeley)
David Robinson (Legal Counsel, UC Berkeley)
Lourdes Demattos (Associate Director, UCOP Research Policy Analysis and Coordination Office)