NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT CONSULTATION/ DOCUMENTATION GRANT TO TRIBES AND MUSEUMS FINAL PROJECT REPORT

The Final Project Report must be submitted within 90 days of the end of the grant, or within 90 days after the completion of the project work, whichever is sooner. Failure to submit a timely and acceptable Final Report places a grantee in noncompliance with the terms of the Grant Agreement, and will result in payments being withheld, or NPS may require repayment of grant funds already paid to the grantee.

Grant Number ____ _____ - _40_ _10__ - GP _524 ____ _____ _____	
Name of Tribe/Museum: Delaware Tribe of Indians	
Contact Name: Brice Obermeyer	**Contact Number: 918-335-7026**
Contact Email: bobermeyer@delawaretribe.org	**Website: www.delawaretribe.org**
Grant Period: Start date_10_/_1__/_2010___ End date _6__/_30__/_2012___	
Project Title: FY 2010 NAGPRA Document Grant, Delaware Tribe of Indians	

Answer the questions in Parts I – IV on a separate sheet of paper. Use 12-point font. Label all pages with the grant number and name of tribe/institution. (10 page maximum)

Part I. Administrative

1. List any amendments to the original Grant Agreement including extensions and/or modifications to the Scope of Work or Budget as listed in the Grant Agreement. Provide the National Park Service approval dates.

Part II. Project Description

1. Briefly summarize the results of the project accomplished under this grant.
2. Describe any differences between the planned results as listed under the Scope of Work and Deliverables in the Grant Agreement and the actual results.
3. List all key partners and participants (museums, tribes, institutions, individuals) in the grant and briefly describe their participation in the project.
4. Beyond the grants deliverables, what was the larger impact of the project on your institution/community?
5. As applicable, explain any plans for ongoing funding, expansion, modification, or replication of the project.
6. Provide any other data required by the Grant Agreement's NPS Special Condition or instructions.

Part III. Experience

Answers to the following questions will help the National NAGPRA Program improve its support to museums and tribes in their efforts to effectively meet the goals of NAGPRA.

1. Other than funding, what were the major obstacles you faced in implementing your grant?
2. Provide two specific suggestions of how the National NAGPRA Grant Program could better support your grant implementation efforts.
3. Add any additional comments/ thoughts here.

Part IV. Attachments

A. Financial Information: Please provide the original and one copy of your financial information.

1. Using the budget provided in the Grant Agreement or the approved budget modification (if applicable) submit a final Work-Cost expense report showing the budget versus actual work-costs.
2. Explain any differences between the planned and actual work-costs.
3. Attach a signed copy of the final SF-425 *Federal Financial Report.*
4. Attach a SF-270 *Request for Advance or Reimbursement* requesting your final payment.
5. If applicable, attach a SF-425 *Federal Cash Transactions Report* showing the liquidation of any cash advances.

B. Deliverables

- Include one copy of any required Deliverables as outlined in your Grant Agreement.
- If any publications were produced with the assistance of this grant, enclose **one** copy of the publication.

Part V. Statistical Information

Your responses should include only those human remains, cultural items, activities, individuals and institutions that were directly involved or impacted by grant funded activities between the project start and end dates.

Repatriation

__5___ # of consultations conducted

__86__ # of human remains identified for repatriation

__0__ # of sacred items and/or objects of cultural patrimony identified for repatriation/disposition

__0___ # of Notices of Intent to Repatriate generated as a result of this grant

__4___ # of Notices of Inventory Completion generated as a result of this grant

Education/Training

__0__ # of trainings/workshops presented by grantee as a result of this grant

__0__ # of people attending trainings/workshops presented by grantee

__3__ # of outside trainings/workshops attended by grantee with support from this grant

__2__ # of people attending outside trainings/workshops with support from this grant

Community Involvement

__3__ # of tribes participating in the grant

__3__ # of museums participating in the grant

__0__ # of other institutions participating in the grant

__0__ # of other individuals participating in this grant

Did grant funds support your involvement in a collaborative or consortium? Yes No X

What is the name of the collaborative/consortium? _____

How many tribes/museums participate in the collaborative/consortium? _____

Authorized Signature Paula Pechonick Date 6/27/2012

Title Chief Phone 918-337-6590

Print Name PAULA PECHONICK Email _____

The National Park Service requires the original copy of the Final Report Cover Sheet and all documentation listed under Part III Financial Information.

PLEASE NOTE: Emailed and faxed copies of the final report and administrative documents will no longer be accepted.

Address final reports to:

National Park Service
National NAGPRA Program
1201 Eye Street, NW (2253)
Washington, DC 20005
ATTENTION: NAGPRA Grants

Note: Mail delivered by the U.S. Postal Service is typically delayed by two weeks or longer, and is subject to irradiation prior to delivery. If you are mailing compact discs, photographs, booklets, or other sensitive materials, these may be damaged in the irradiation process. Please consider using a courier service for such items.

If you have any questions regarding the final report, please contact Sangita Chari, NAGPRA Grants Coordinator at 202-354-2203 or via email at NAGPRA_Grants@nps.gov.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

170 North East Barbara

Bartlesville, Oklahoma, 74006-2746

Telephone: (918) 337-6590 Fax: (918) 337-6591

June 27, 2012

National Parks Service

Part IV. A. 2. Explain the differences between the planned and actual work-costs

The fringe benefits were calculated at a lower rate than should have been and this allowed for extra money in these categories.
The travel costs were exactly $1,106.64 more than anticipated due to the rising cost of transportation.
The supplies category was understated in the proposed budget by 171.92. All the supplies that were purchased for the program were used for the NAGPRA project only.
The report states that GL 61000 was never submitted in with the grant but GL 61001 was. There was a change is accounting staff sometime during the grant period and the GL 61001 was no longer being used. The two GL's mean exactly the same thing and the Indirect cost was calculated at 14.68%. The total of the two, which is 11495.41, is the total Indirect Cost charged to the grant. The budget was misstated by exactly 193.41. The total for that line item should have been the $11,495.41.

If you have any questions please contact Jade Johnson at 918-337-6597 or by email at jjohnson@delawaretribe.org

Thank you,

Jade B Johnson

Jade Johnson
Chief Financial Officer
Delaware Tribe of Indians

Attachments: Budget to Actual, SF 425 and SF-270

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe

Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Unposted Transactions Included In Report

211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.

From 10/1/2009 Through 6/22/2012

		Total Budget - Original	Current Year Actual	Total Budget Variance - Original
	Revenues			
41201	Federal grants	89,796.00	59,017.95	(30,778.05)
49001	Refunds and reimbursements	0.00	6.00	6.00
	Total Revenues	89,796.00	59,023.95	(30,772.05)
	Expenditures			
51101	Salaries and wages	57,000.00	57,000.00	0.00
51121	Soc security employer contribu	3,534.00	3,302.23	231.77
51122	Medicare Employer Contribution	826.50	772.48	54.02
51211	SUTA Employer Contribution	2,451.00	956.68	1,494.32
51521	Worker's Compensation Insuranc	991.50	934.00	57.50
51533	Travel	10,000.00	11,106.64	(1,106.64)
51534	Per Diem	2,011.00	2,473.75	(462.75)
51535	Mileage	0.00	0.00	0.00
53303	Food Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00
54208	Supplies	180.00	351.92	(171.92)
55003	Postage	0.00	0.00	0.00
55999	Miscellaneous	1,500.00	1,408.89	91.11
61000	Indirect Costs	0.00	8,023.21	(8,023.21)
61001	Administrative Indirect Charge	11,302.00	3,472.20	7,829.80
	Total Expenditures	89,796.00	89,802.00	(6.00)
	Excess Revenue over (under) expenditures	0.00	(30,778.05)	(30,778.05)
	Net change in fund balance	0.00	(30,778.05)	(30,778.05)

FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORT

(Follow form instructions)

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted	2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned by Federal Agency (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)	Page	of
US Department of Interior, National Parks Service	40-10-GP-524	1	1 pages

3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including Zip code)
Delaware Tribe of Indians, 170 NE Barbara, Bartlesville, OK 74006

4a. DUNS Number	4b. EIN	5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)	6. Report Type	7. Basis of Accounting
120635318	73-0948981		☐ Quarterly ☐ Semi-Annual ☐ Annual ☉ Final	☐ Cash ☒ Accrual

8. Project/Grant Period From: (Month, Day, Year)	To: (Month, Day, Year)	9. Reporting Period End Date (Month, Day, Year)
6/01/2009	06/30/2012	6/30/2012

10. **Transactions**	Cumulative
(Use lines a-c for single or multiple grant reporting)	
Federal Cash (To report multiple grants, also use FFR Attachment):	
a. Cash Receipts	76327.00
b. Cash Disbursements	89796.00
c. Cash on Hand (line a minus b)	(13469.00)
(Use lines d-o for single grant reporting)	
Federal Expenditures and Unobligated Balance:	
d. Total Federal funds authorized	89796.00
e. Federal share of expenditures	89796.00
f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations	0.00
g. Total Federal share (sum of lines e and f)	89796.00
h. Unobligated balance of Federal funds (line d minus g)	0.00
Recipient Share:	
i. Total recipient share required	0.00
j. Recipient share of expenditures	0.00
k. Remaining recipient share to be provided (line i minus j)	0.00
Program Income:	
l. Total Federal program income earned	0.00
m. Program income expended in accordance with the deduction alternative	0.00
n. Program income expended in accordance with the addition alternative	0.00
o. Unexpended program income (line l minus line m or line n)	0.00

	a. Type	b. Rate	c. Period From	Period To	d. Base	e. Amount Charged	f. Federal Share
11. Indirect Expense	Fixed Carry Forwar	14.68%	6/01/2009	6/30/2012	tot. dr csts less exp, pt	11495.41	11495.41
				g. Totals:		11495.41	11495.41

12. *Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation:*

13. Certification: By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate, and the expenditures, disbursements and cash receipts are for the purposes and intent set forth in the award documents. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 18, Section 1001)

a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official	c. Telephone (Area code, number and extension)
Paula Pechonick, Chief Delaware Tribe of Indians	918-337-6590
	d. Email address: ppechonick@delawaretribe.org
b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official: Paula Pechonick	e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year): 6/30/2012
	14. Agency use only:

Standard Form 425 - Revised 6/28/2010
OMB Approval Number: 0348-0061
Expiration Date: 10/31/2011

Paperwork Burden Statement
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0348-0061. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0061), Washington, DC 20503.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe
Normal Trial Balance
211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.
From 10/1/2009 Through 6/22/2012

Account Code	Account Title	Debit Balance	Credit Balance
11101	Tribe Grants Account		13,476.56
15201	Grants Receivable		17,309.05
22101	Accrued FIT	21.54	
22111	Accrued Soc Sec		10.92
22112	Accrued M/C		3.06
41201	Federal grants		59,017.95
49001	Refunds and reimbursements		6.00
51101	Salaries and wages	57,208.89	
51121	Soc security employer contribu	3,302.23	
51122	Medicare Employer Contribution	772.48	
51211	SUTA Employer Contribution	956.68	
51521	Worker's Compensation Insuranc	934.00	
51533	Travel	11,106.64	
51534	Per Diem	2,473.75	
54208	Supplies	351.92	
55999	Miscellaneous	1,200.00	
61000	Indirect Costs	8,023.21	
61001	Administrative Indirect Charge	3,472.20	
	Balance 211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.	0.00	
	Report Total	89,823.54	89,823.54
	Report Difference	0.00	

89802.00

89802.00
26.007

89796.00

89796.00
-76327.00 Fed pmts - previously Rec'd

Subtotal → 89796.00

13469.00

Total Outlays to date, Cash basis

REQUEST FOR ADVANCE OR REIMBURSEMENT

(See instructions on back)

OMB APPROVAL NO. 0348-0004

PAGE 1 OF 2 PAGES

1. TYPE OF PAYMENT REQUESTED
a. *"X" one or both boxes* ☐ ADVANCE ☑ REIMBURSEMENT
b. *"X" the applicable box* ☑ FINAL ☐ PARTIAL

2. BASIS OF REQUEST ☑ CASH ☐ ACCRUAL

3. FEDERAL SPONSORING AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT TO WHICH THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED
National Park Service

4. FEDERAL GRANT OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NUMBER ASSIGNED BY FEDERAL AGENCY
40-10-GP-524

5. PARTIAL PAYMENT REQUEST NUMBER FOR THIS REQUEST
11

6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
73-094891

7. RECIPIENT'S ACCOUNT NUMBER OR IDENTIFYING NUMBER

8. PERIOD COVERED BY THIS REQUEST
FROM *(month, day, year)* 4/30/12
TO *(month, day, year)* 6/22/2012

9. RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION
Name: Delaware Tribe of Indians
Number and Street: 170 NE Barbara
City, State and ZIP Code: Bartlesville Ok 74006

10. PAYEE *(Where check is to be sent if different than item 9)*
Name:
Number and Street:
City, State and ZIP Code:

11. COMPUTATION OF AMOUNT OF REIMBURSEMENTS/ADVANCES REQUESTED

PROGRAMS/FUNCTIONS/ACTIVITIES ►	(a)	(b)	(c)	TOTAL
a. Total program outlays to date *(As of date)*	$ 89,796.00	$	$	$ 89,796.00
b. *Less:* Cumulative program income				0.00
c. Net program outlays *(Line a minus line b)*	89,796.00	0.00	0.00	89,796.00
d. Estimated net cash outlays for advance period				0.00
e. Total *(Sum of lines c & d)*	89,796.00	0.00	0.00	89,796.00
f. Non-Federal share of amount on line e				0.00
g. Federal share of amount on line e	89,796.00			89,796.00
h. Federal payments previously requested	76,327.00			76,327.00
i. Federal share now requested *(Line g minus line h)*	13,469.00	0.00	0.00	13,469.00
j. Advances required by month, when requested by Federal grantor agency for use in making prescheduled advances — 1st month				0.00
2nd month				0.00
3rd month				0.00

12. ALTERNATE COMPUTATION FOR ADVANCES ONLY

a. Estimated Federal cash outlays that will be made during period covered by the advance	$
b. *Less:* Estimated balance of Federal cash on hand as of beginning of advance period	
c. Amount requested *(Line a minus line b)*	$ 0.00

AUTHORIZED FOR LOCAL REPRODUCTION

(Continued on Reverse)

STANDARD FORM 270 (Rev. 7-97)
Prescribed by OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110

Delaware Tribe of Indians

13. CERTIFICATION		
I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the data on the reverse are correct and that all outlays were made in accordance with the grant conditions or other agreement and that payment is due and has not been previously requested.	SIGNATURE OR AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL Paula Pechonick	DATE REQUEST SUBMITTED June 27, 2012
	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND TITLE PAULA PECHONICK, Chief	TELEPHONE (AREA CODE, NUMBER, EXTENSION) 918-337-6590

This space for agency use

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0004), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please type or print legibly. Items 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11e, 11f, 11g, 11i, 12 and 13 are self-explanatory; specific instructions for other items are as follows:

Item *Entry*

2 Indicate whether request is prepared on cash or accrued expenditure basis. All requests for advances shall be prepared on a cash basis.

4 Enter the Federal grant number, or other identifying number assigned by the Federal sponsoring agency. If the advance or reimbursement is for more than one grant or other agreement, insert N/A; then, show the aggregate amounts. On a separate sheet, list each grant or agreement number and the Federal share of outlays made against the grant or agreement.

6 Enter the employer identification number assigned by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, or the FICE (institution) code if requested by the Federal agency.

7 This space is reserved for an account number or other identifying number that may be assigned by the recipient.

8 Enter the month, day, and year for the beginning and ending of the period covered in this request. If the request is for an advance or for both an advance and reimbursement, show the period that the advance will cover. If the request is for reimbursement, show the period for which the reimbursement is requested.

Note: The Federal sponsoring agencies have the option of requiring recipients to complete items 11 or 12, but not both. Item 12 should be used when only a minimum amount of information is needed to make an advance and outlay information contained in item 11 can be obtained in a timely manner from other reports.

11 The purpose of the vertical columns (a), (b), and (c) is to provide space for separate cost breakdowns when a project has been planned and budgeted by program, function, or

Item *Entry*

activity. If additional columns are needed, use as many additional forms as needed and indicate page number in space provided in upper right; however, the summary totals of all programs, functions, or activities should be shown in the "total" column on the first page.

11a Enter in "as of date," the month, day, and year of the ending of the accounting period to which this amount applies. Enter program outlays to date (net of refunds, rebates, and discounts), in the appropriate columns. For requests prepared on a cash basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements for goods and services, the amount of indirect expenses charged, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the amount of cash advances and payments made to subcontractors and subrecipients. For requests prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, outlays are the sum of the actual cash disbursements, the amount of indirect expenses incurred, and the net increase (or decrease) in the amounts owed by the recipient for goods and other property received and for services performed by employees, contracts, subgrantees and other payees.

11b Enter the cumulative cash income received to date, if requests are prepared on a cash basis. For requests prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, enter the cumulative income earned to date. Under either basis, enter only the amount applicable to program income that was required to be used for the project or program by the terms of the grant or other agreement.

11d Only when making requests for advance payments, enter the total estimated amount of cash outlays that will be made during the period covered by the advance.

13 Complete the certification before submitting this request.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe
Normal Trial Balance
211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.
From 10/1/2009 Through 6/22/2012

Account Code	Account Title	Debit Balance	Credit Balance
11101	Tribe Grants Account		13,476.56
15201	Grants Receivable		17,309.05
22101	Accrued FIT	21.54	
22111	Accrued Soc Sec		10.92
22112	Accrued M/C		3.06
41201	Federal grants		59,017.95
49001	Refunds and reimbursements		6.00
51101	Salaries and wages	57,208.89	
51121	Soc security employer contribu	3,302.23	
51122	Medicare Employer Contribution	772.48	
51211	SUTA Employer Contribution	956.68	
51521	Worker's Compensation Insuranc	934.00	
51533	Travel	11,106.64	
51534	Per Diem	2,473.75	
54208	Supplies	351.92	
55999	Miscellaneous	1,200.00	
61000	Indirect Costs	8,023.21	
61001	Administrative Indirect Charge	3,472.20	
	Balance 211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.	0.00	
	Report Total	89,823.54	89,823.54
	Report Difference	0.00	

89802.00

89802.00
16.007

Subtotal → 89796.00

89796.00
- 76327.00 - Fed pmts previously Rec'd

Total Outlays to date, Cash basis 13469.00

Delaware Tribe of Indians
170 North East Barbara
Bartlesville, Oklahoma, 74006-2746
Telephone: (918) 337-6590 Fax: (918) 337-6591

June 27, 2012

National Parks Service

Part IV. A. 2. Explain the differences between the planned and actual work-costs

The fringe benefits were calculated at a lower rate than should have been and this allowed for extra money in these categories.
The travel costs were exactly $1,106.64 more than anticipated due to the rising cost of transportation.
The supplies category was understated in the proposed budget by 171.92. All the supplies that were purchased for the program were used for the NAGPRA project only.
The report states that GL 61000 was never submitted in with the grant but GL 61001 was. There was a change is accounting staff sometime during the grant period and the GL 61001 was no longer being used. The two GL's mean exactly the same thing and the Indirect cost was calculated at 14.68%. The total of the two, which is 11495.41, is the total Indirect Cost charged to the grant. The budget was misstated by exactly 193.41. The total for that line item should have been the $11,495.41.

If you have any questions please contact Jade Johnson at 918-337-6597 or by email at jjohnson@delawaretribe.org

Thank you,

Jade B Johnson

Jade Johnson
Chief Financial Officer
Delaware Tribe of Indians

Attachments: Budget to Actual, SF 425 and SF-270

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe

Statement of Revenues and Expenditures - Unposted Transactions Included In Report

211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.

From 10/1/2009 Through 6/22/2012

		Total Budget - Original	Current Year Actual	Total Budget Variance - Original
	Revenues			
41201	Federal grants	89,796.00	59,017.95	(30,778.05)
49001	Refunds and reimbursements	0.00	6.00	6.00
	Total Revenues	89,796.00	59,023.95	(30,772.05)
	Expenditures			
51101	Salaries and wages	57,000.00	57,000.00	0.00
51121	Soc security employer contribu	3,534.00	3,302.23	231.77
51122	Medicare Employer Contribution	826.50	772.48	54.02
51211	SUTA Employer Contribution	2,451.00	956.68	1,494.32
51521	Worker's Compensation Insuranc	991.50	934.00	57.50
51533	Travel	10,000.00	11,106.64	(1,106.64)
51534	Per Diem	2,011.00	2,473.75	(462.75)
51535	Mileage	0.00	0.00	0.00
53303	Food Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00
54208	Supplies	180.00	351.92	(171.92)
55003	Postage	0.00	0.00	0.00
55999	Miscellaneous	1,500.00	1,408.89	91.11
61000	Indirect Costs	0.00	8,023.21	(8,023.21)
61001	Administrative Indirect Charge	11,302.00	3,472.20	7,829.80
	Total Expenditures	89,796.00	89,802.00	(6.00)
	Excess Revenue over (under) expenditures	0.00	(30,778.05)	(30,778.05)
	Net change in fund balance	0.00	(30,778.05)	(30,778.05)

FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORT

(Follow form instructions)

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted	2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned by Federal Agency (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)	Page	of
US Department of Interior, National Parks Service	40-10-GP-524	1	1 pages

3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including Zip code)

Delaware Tribe of Indians, 170 NE Barbara, Bartlesville, OK 74006

4a. DUNS Number	4b. EIN	5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)	6. Report Type	7. Basis of Accounting
120635318	73-0948981		☐ Quarterly ☐ Semi-Annual ☐ Annual ☒ Final	☐ Cash ☒ Accrual

8. Project/Grant Period From: (Month, Day, Year)	To: (Month, Day, Year)	9. Reporting Period End Date (Month, Day, Year)
6/01/2009	06/30/2012	6/30/2012

10. **Transactions**	Cumulative
(Use lines a-c for single or multiple grant reporting)	
Federal Cash (To report multiple grants, also use FFR Attachment):	
a. Cash Receipts	76327.00
b. Cash Disbursements	89796.00
c. Cash on Hand (line a minus b)	(13469.00)
(Use lines d-o for single grant reporting)	
Federal Expenditures and Unobligated Balance:	
d. Total Federal funds authorized	89796.00
e. Federal share of expenditures	89796.00
f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations	0.00
g. Total Federal share (sum of lines e and f)	89796.00
h. Unobligated balance of Federal funds (line d minus g)	0.00
Recipient Share:	
i. Total recipient share required	0.00
j. Recipient share of expenditures	0.00
k. Remaining recipient share to be provided (line i minus j)	0.00
Program Income:	
l. Total Federal program income earned	0.00
m. Program income expended in accordance with the deduction alternative	0.00
n. Program income expended in accordance with the addition alternative	0.00
o. Unexpended program income (line l minus line m or line n)	0.00

11. Indirect Expense	a. Type	b. Rate	c. Period From	Period To	d. Base	e. Amount Charged	f. Federal Share
	Fixed Carry Forwar	14.68%	6/01/2009	6/30/2012	tot. dr csts less exp, pt	11495.41	11495.41
				g. Totals:		11495.41	11495.41

12. *Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation:*

13. **Certification: By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate, and the expenditures, disbursements and cash receipts are for the purposes and intent set forth in the award documents. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 18, Section 1001)**

a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official	c. Telephone (Area code, number and extension)
Paula Pechonick, Chief Delaware Tribe of Indians	918-337-6590
	d. Email address
	ppechonick@delawaretribe.org
b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official	e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year)
Paula Pechonick	6/30/2012
	14. Agency use only:

Standard Form 425 - Revised 6/28/2010
OMB Approval Number: 0348-0061
Expiration Date: 10/31/2011

Paperwork Burden Statement
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0348-0061. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0061), Washington, DC 20503.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe
Normal Trial Balance
211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.
From 10/1/2009 Through 6/22/2012

Account Code	Account Title	Debit Balance	Credit Balance
11101	Tribe Grants Account		13,476.56
15201	Grants Receivable		17,309.05
22101	Accrued FIT	21.54	
22111	Accrued Soc Sec		10.92
22112	Accrued M/C		3.06
41201	Federal grants		59,017.95
49001	Refunds and reimbursements		6.00
51101	Salaries and wages	57,208.89	
51121	Soc security employer contribu	3,302.23	
51122	Medicare Employer Contribution	772.48	
51211	SUTA Employer Contribution	956.68	
51521	Worker's Compensation Insuranc	934.00	
51533	Travel	11,106.64	
51534	Per Diem	2,473.75	
54208	Supplies	351.92	
55999	Miscellaneous	1,200.00	
61000	Indirect Costs	8,023.21	
61001	Administrative Indirect Charge	3,472.20	
	Balance 211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.	0.00	
Report Total		89,823.54	89,823.54
Report Difference		0.00	

89802.00

89802.00
26.007

89796.00

89796.00
-76327.00 - Fed pmts previously Rec'd

13469.00

subtotal → 89796.00

Total Outlays to date, Cash basis

REQUEST FOR ADVANCE OR REIMBURSEMENT

(See instructions on back)

OMB APPROVAL NO. 0348-0004

PAGE 1 OF 2 PAGES

1. TYPE OF PAYMENT REQUESTED
a. *"X" one or both boxes* ☐ ADVANCE ☑ REIMBURSEMENT
b. *"X" the applicable box* ☑ FINAL ☐ PARTIAL

2. BASIS OF REQUEST ☑ CASH ☐ ACCRUAL

3. FEDERAL SPONSORING AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT TO WHICH THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED: National Park Service

4. FEDERAL GRANT OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NUMBER ASSIGNED BY FEDERAL AGENCY: 40-10-GP-524

5. PARTIAL PAYMENT REQUEST NUMBER FOR THIS REQUEST: 11

6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 73-094891

7. RECIPIENT'S ACCOUNT NUMBER OR IDENTIFYING NUMBER:

8. PERIOD COVERED BY THIS REQUEST
FROM *(month, day, year)*: 4/30/12
TO *(month, day, year)*: 6/22/2012

9. RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION
Name: Delaware Tribe of Indians
Number and Street: 170 NE Barbara
City, State and ZIP Code: Bartlesville Ok 74006

10. PAYEE *(Where check is to be sent if different than item 9)*
Name:
Number and Street:
City, State and ZIP Code:

11. COMPUTATION OF AMOUNT OF REIMBURSEMENTS/ADVANCES REQUESTED

PROGRAMS/FUNCTIONS/ACTIVITIES ►	(a)	(b)	(c)	TOTAL
a. Total program outlays to date *(As of date)*	$ 89,796.00	$	$	$ 89,796.00
b. *Less:* Cumulative program income				0.00
c. Net program outlays *(Line a minus line b)*	89,796.00	0.00	0.00	89,796.00
d. Estimated net cash outlays for advance period				0.00
e. Total *(Sum of lines c & d)*	89,796.00	0.00	0.00	89,796.00
f. Non-Federal share of amount on line e				0.00
g. Federal share of amount on line e	89,796.00			89,796.00
h. Federal payments previously requested	76,327.00			76,327.00
i. Federal share now requested *(Line g minus line h)*	13,469.00	0.00	0.00	13,469.00
j. Advances required by month, when requested by Federal grantor agency for use in making prescheduled advances — 1st month				0.00
2nd month				0.00
3rd month				0.00

12. ALTERNATE COMPUTATION FOR ADVANCES ONLY

a. Estimated Federal cash outlays that will be made during period covered by the advance	$
b. *Less:* Estimated balance of Federal cash on hand as of beginning of advance period	
c. Amount requested *(Line a minus line b)*	$ 0.00

AUTHORIZED FOR LOCAL REPRODUCTION

(Continued on Reverse)

STANDARD FORM 270 (Rev. 7-97)
Prescribed by OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110

Delaware Tribe of Indians

CERTIFICATION

13.	SIGNATURE OR AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	DATE REQUEST SUBMITTED
I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the data on the reverse are correct and that all outlays were made in accordance with the grant conditions or other agreement and that payment is due and has not been previously requested.	Paula Pechonick	June 27, 2012
	TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND TITLE PAULA PECHONICK, Chief	TELEPHONE (AREA CODE, NUMBER, EXTENSION) 918-337-6590

This space for agency use

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0004), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please type or print legibly. Items 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11e, 11f, 11g, 11i, 12 and 13 are self-explanatory; specific instructions for other items are as follows:

Item	*Entry*
2	Indicate whether request is prepared on cash or accrued expenditure basis. All requests for advances shall be prepared on a cash basis.
4	Enter the Federal grant number, or other identifying number assigned by the Federal sponsoring agency. If the advance or reimbursement is for more than one grant or other agreement, insert N/A; then, show the aggregate amounts. On a separate sheet, list each grant or agreement number and the Federal share of outlays made against the grant or agreement.
6	Enter the employer identification number assigned by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, or the FICE (institution) code if requested by the Federal agency.
7	This space is reserved for an account number or other identifying number that may be assigned by the recipient.
8	Enter the month, day, and year for the beginning and ending of the period covered in this request. If the request is for an advance or for both an advance and reimbursement, show the period that the advance will cover. If the request is for reimbursement, show the period for which the reimbursement is requested.
Note:	The Federal sponsoring agencies have the option of requiring recipients to complete items 11 or 12, but not both. Item 12 should be used when only a minimum amount of information is needed to make an advance and outlay information contained in item 11 can be obtained in a timely manner from other reports.
11	The purpose of the vertical columns (a), (b), and (c) is to provide space for separate cost breakdowns when a project has been planned and budgeted by program, function or

Item	*Entry*
	activity. If additional columns are needed, use as many additional forms as needed and indicate page number in space provided in upper right; however, the summary totals of all programs, functions, or activities should be shown in the "total" column on the first page.
11a	Enter in "as of date," the month, day, and year of the ending of the accounting period to which this amount applies. Enter program outlays to date (net of refunds, rebates, and discounts), in the appropriate columns. For requests prepared on a cash basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements for goods and services, the amount of indirect expenses charged, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the amount of cash advances and payments made to subcontractors and subrecipients. For requests prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, outlays are the sum of the actual cash disbursements, the amount of indirect expenses incurred, and the net increase (or decrease) in the amounts owed by the recipient for goods and other property received and for services performed by employees, contracts, subgrantees and other payees.
11b	Enter the cumulative cash income received to date, if requests are prepared on a cash basis. For requests prepared on an accrued expenditure basis, enter the cumulative income earned to date. Under either basis, enter only the amount applicable to program income that was required to be used for the project or program by the terms of the grant or other agreement.
11d	Only when making requests for advance payments, enter the total estimated amount of cash outlays that will be made during the period covered by the advance.
13	Complete the certification before submitting this request.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe
Normal Trial Balance
211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.
From 10/1/2009 Through 6/22/2012

Account Code	Account Title	Debit Balance	Credit Balance
11101	Tribe Grants Account		13,476.56
15201	Grants Receivable		17,309.05
22101	Accrued FIT	21.54	
22111	Accrued Soc Sec		10.92
22112	Accrued M/C		3.06
41201	Federal grants		59,017.95
49001	Refunds and reimbursements		6.00
51101	Salaries and wages	57,208.89	
51121	Soc security employer contribu	3,302.23	
51122	Medicare Employer Contribution	772.48	
51211	SUTA Employer Contribution	956.68	
51521	Worker's Compensation Insuranc	934.00	
51533	Travel	11,106.64	
51534	Per Diem	2,473.75	
54208	Supplies	351.92	
55999	Miscellaneous	1,200.00	
61000	Indirect Costs	8,023.21	
61001	Administrative Indirect Charge	3,472.20	
	Balance 211 - NA Graves Protection & Repat.	0.00	
Report Total		89,823.54	89,823.54
Report Difference		0.00	

89802.00

89,802.00

16.007

89796.00 subtotal

89796.00

-76327.00 Fed pmts previously Rec'd

13469.00

Total Outlays to date, Cash basis

Part I. Administrative

1. List any amendments to the original Grant Agreement including extensions and/or modifications to the Scope of Work or Budget as listed in the Grant Agreement. Provide the National Park Service approval dates.

No amendments to the original Grant Agreement were necessary.

Part II. Project Description

1. Briefly summarize the results of the project accomplished under this grant.

All project objectives were completed with substantial assistance from the FY 2010 NAGPRA Documentation Grant. We hired a project assistant, Gregory Brown, who updated and completed our digital database of museum inventories (**objective A**) and Brice Obermeyer and Greg Brown attended the NAGPRA training offered by the National Preservation Institute as well as the NAGPRA at 20 Symposium (**objective B**). We also completed a tribally approved report (resolution included) on Delaware Burial Practices in the Archaeological Record (retitled, "Traditional Delaware Funerals"). This report was shared with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry (hereafter *collaborating museums*) and the Delaware Nation and the Stockbridge Munsee (hereafter *Delaware descended tribes*) (**objective D**). Based on our grant supported consultations and internally funded research, each of the collaborating museums has completed, or is working on, corrections to their Notices of Inventory Completion for their Delaware affiliated collections (**objective C**). We have also digitally reunited several Delaware affiliated collections that are shared with the Delaware affiliated collections of our collaborating museums (**objective E**) and completed a report on the treatment histories of Delaware affiliated collections at our collaborating museums (**objective F**). A more detailed description of our accomplishments is appended to this report.

2. Describe any differences between the planned results as listed under the Scope of Work and Deliverables in the Grant Agreement and the actual results.

Scope of Work:

Objective A. Update existing digital database of museum inventories: No differences between the planned results and the actual results

Objective B. Attend the NAGPRA trainings offered by the National Preservation Institute, October 4-7, 2010 in Phoenix and NAGPRA at 20 Symposium in Washington, DC.: The only difference between the planned results and actual results was that Brice Obermeyer was unable to attend the NPI training in Phoenix but did attend and complete the NPI training in San Diego on October 25-26, 2011.

Objective C. Work with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry to publish revised Notices of Inventory Completion: We had anticipated that each of our collaborating

museums would be able to publish at least one correction to their Notice of Inventory Completion in the federal register by the completion of the grant period based on the information we provided under this grant and through consultation. However, none of the collaborating museums were able to publish a revised Notice. The New York College of Dentistry has completed and submitted a draft revision of their Notice of Inventory Completion that affiliates their collection with the Delaware Tribe rather than the Cherokee Nation. However, the submitted draft has not been published in the federal register. The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology has also completed and submitted their Notice of Inventory Completion that will affiliate their collections with the Delaware Tribe, rather than with the Cherokee Nation. However, the submitted draft has not been published in the federal register. The State Museum of Pennsylvania is currently working on two revisions for their Notice of Inventory Completion. The first revision is to affiliate the collection with the Delaware Tribe rather than the Cherokee Nation. The second is a revision to the number of human remains and funerary objects from the Wapwallopen site; a collection on which we intend to move forward with a repatriation request after the revised Notice is published. Neither of the SMOP corrections were completed by the end of the grant period so we wrote our own versions of the corrected notices and have submitted them to the SMOP and have included our versions here as part of our grant deliverable. Our office has been actively consulting with each institution as the work through the revision process.

Objective D. Provide information on Delaware funeral practices to the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry to support existing claims of items not listed in the Notices of Inventory Completion: No differences between the planned results and the actual results

Objective E. Work with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry to reunite items from their collections that are in the possession or control of other museums: We originally planned to physically reunite the shared collections from our collaborating museums but found that digital methods were more effective for two practical reasons. First, physically reuniting the collections would have required de-accessioning the collections and taking possession of the remains. Since we were not prepared to take possession of the remains, we felt that another option would be necessary. Second, we discovered during our consultations that several of the collections at our collaborating museums were shared with institutions with whom we had yet to consult and whom had either not documented these shared collections or had documented such collections as culturally unidentifiable. As a result, we could not physically reunite the collections in their entirety until we had the opportunity to consult on these other collections and seek to affiliate the collections with the Delaware Tribe. Funding for such additional consultations was requested in our FY 2012 NAGPRA Documentation and Consultation Grant proposal.

To address these two practical challenges, we digitally reunited the collections on our NAGPRA website that is devoted to identifying all of the museums and private individuals who hold collections related to the NAGPRA collections at our collaborating museums. The website is http://delawaretribe.org/culturesite/delaware-tribe-historic-preservation-office/ This site is periodically updated as new information comes to light. Access to the site is password protected

but a password will be provided upon request to our office.

Objective F. Document the treatment histories of Delaware collections at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry: No differences between the planned results and the actual results

Deliverables:

a. A comprehensive final report that includes the impact of the trainings on the NAGPRA program and the results of all consultation efforts with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry: No differences between the planned results and the actual results

b. A copy of the Delaware Tribe's report on Delaware Funeral Practices in the Archaeological Record: No differences between the planned results and the actual results

c. Copies of the revised Notices of Inventory Completion that will be submitted by the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry as a result of the project: We planned to have a copy of at least three revised Notices (one for each museum). However, only the New York University College of Dentistry and the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology have completed a correction to their Notice of Inventory Completion. We have provided a copy of our suggested revisions for the State Museum of Pennsylvania's Notice of Inventory Completion but they have yet to approve our version or provide us with their own draft corrections.

d. A copy of the final report on the treatment histories of the Delaware collections the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry: No differences between the planned results and the actual results

3. List all key partners and participants (museums, tribes, institutions, individuals) in the grant and briefly describe their participation in the project.

Collaborating Museums: Each of the Collaborating Museums hosted us for a consultation visit and have been active participants in our grant supported research.

A representative from the **New York College of Dentistry**, Lauren Sieg, met with Greg Brown for a one day consultation visit. The New York University College of Dentistry currently (summer 2011) has one set of human remains from a single site (the Broadway and Isham Site in the Bronx, New York). The consultation with Greg Brown took place on August 5, 2011, at Alexandria, Virginia. They discussed the status of the skull and NAGPRA documentation. Given the small size of their collection (one skull), a longer visit was not necessary.

Representatives from the **Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology** hosted a two day consultation visit. On July 25 and 26, 2011, Brice Obermeyer, Greg Brown, Bonnie Thaxton, and James Jackson from the Delaware Tribe visited the Peabody Museum for consultation. We were met by curators Sandra Dong, Kelly Ferguson, Diana Loren, and Stuart Heebner; head NAGPRA curator Patricia Capone; and intern Stephanie Tapia. At that time we were given documentation (including a spreadsheet index of documents produced by Ms. Tapia) and were shown the ethnographic objects and some of the funerary objects from the site. The museum staff informed us of the collection history and prepared their collections for our viewing. We provided the museum with ethnographic information about Delaware funerary practices while also adding information about certain objects within their collection.

Representatives from the **State Museum of Pennsylvania** hosted a two day consultation visit. On July 28 and 29, 2011, Brice Obermeyer, Greg Brown, Bonnie Thaxton, and James Jackson from the Delaware Tribe visited the State Museum of Pennsylvania for consultation. We were met by curators Kurt Carr and Janet Johnson. At that time we were given documentation and were shown the ethnographic objects and some of the funerary objects from the sites. The museum staff informed us of the collection history and prepared their collections for our viewing. We provided the museum with ethnographic information about Delaware funerary practices while also adding information about certain objects within their archaeological and ethnographic collections.

On August 16, 2011, Greg Brown returned to the museum to view the objects again and to record notes written on the actual artifact boxes, which appear to sometimes be more complete than the notes in the inventory. At that time he also finished photocopying the field notes for the Wapwallopen site.

On February 21-24, 2012, the Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office funded Greg Brown's travel to meet again with the State Museum of Pennsylvania (SMOP) to carry out further research in order to complete the final reconciliation of information about the **Wapwallopen**, **Printz Park**, and **Overpeck** sites. This work included pulling the boxes of human remains and funerary objects (stored in Hollinger boxes in the SMOP lab), matching the material with the catalog records, and correcting the catalog and inventory records as needed. Field notes and photographs were also consulted, and in several cases additional individuals or funerary objects were added to the list based on their provenience or typological similarity to other funerary objects (for example, a few beads found in unprovenienced fill at the Wapwallopen site were added to the funerary objects after comparing them with other beads found in known burial contexts).

Delaware descended tribes (Delaware Nation and the Stockbridge Munsee): Each of the Delaware descended tribes received a copy of our report on Traditional Delaware Funerals and the Treatment Histories of Delaware Affiliated Collections at our collaborating museums.

4. Beyond the grants deliverables, what was the larger impact of the project on your institution/community?

In the process of completing the grant deliverables, our office has gained a greater awareness of, and appreciation for, the effectiveness of digital media for tribal documentation and repatriation efforts. Our NAGPRA website along with our digital database has allowed us to compile information on over 40 Delaware affiliated sites; most of which have collections that are shared by more than one museum. Our web-based platform allows us to document and view all of these scattered collections in one virtual location while also identifying all of the institutions with which we will need to consult, or from which we will need to repatriate when we are ready to rebury a collection.

The utility of our web-based platform has inspired our tribe to apply this model as a way to integrate our geographically separated tribal offices. The Delaware Tribe is headquartered in Bartlesville, Oklahoma but has tribal offices in four other locations in Oklahoma and Kansas. We are currently in the process of integrating the communication between these offices using the same platform that we found useful to help us re-unite museum collections and collaborate with staff from several museums.

5. As applicable, explain any plans for ongoing funding, expansion, modification, or replication of the project.

Our office submitted an application for a FY 2012 NAGPRA Documentation and Consultation grant that seeks federal funding to carry out consultations and research that will lead to the comprehensive listing of all of the Notice of Inventory Completions for all of the human remains and funerary objects from two significant Delaware burial sites; the Abbott Farm Complex and the Chambers Site. These two sites were identified during consultations with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology on their Abbott Farm collection and with the State Museum of Pennsylvania on their Chambers Site collection; both of which were carried out with support from this FY 2010 Documentation Grant. During these consultations we learned that at least four other museums also hold collections from the Abbott Farm Complex and the Chambers Site. However, we have not had an opportunity to consult with the four additional museums and each museum is at different stages in their documentation process.

The NAGPRA funding requested would allow us to consult with the New Jersey State Museum, the Field Museum of Natural History and the American Museum of Natural History on their collections from the Abbott Farm Complex and with the Carnegie Museum of Natural History on their collection from the Chambers Site. While we will also consult with each museum on their other collections, our grant supported consultations will focus on work that will lead to a NAGPRA inventory for the Chambers Site, a cultural affiliation study for both sites and the publication of four Notices of Inventory Completion; one from each of the additional museums. We will also document the treatment histories of the collections in preparation for a repatriation of both sites.

6. Provide any other data required by the Grant Agreement's NPS Special Condition or instructions.

No other data is required.

Part III. Experience
Answers to the following questions will help the National NAGPRA Program improve its support to museums and tribes in their efforts to effectively meet the goals of NAGPRA.

1. Other than funding, what were the major obstacles you faced in implementing your grant?

Objective E: Reuniting Museum Collections - Our most significant obstacle came during work to complete Objective E. We had intended to reunite all of the collections at our collaborating museums before the end of the grant period. However, we found that the collections at our collaborating museums were so widely distributed among other museums and private individuals, that it was not possible (both legally and logistically) to physically reunite the collections before moving forward with repatriation.

Obective C: Revised Notices of Inventory Completion - Our second obstacle that we faced was the distance between our office and the museums. Our requests to correct the Notices were well received, but work on the revisions either slowed or bogged down after we returned from our consultation visits when we were not physically present at the museum. All the museums agreed that a correction should be posted in the register, but only two had been submitted by the end of the grant period. Encouraging continued work on the corrections through e-mail correspondence seemed to slow the process. Perhaps a time window within which museums must respond to requests for a correction would help ensure a timely response.

2. Provide two specific suggestions of how the National NAGPRA Grant Program could better support your grant implementation efforts.

1. Enable the online database to search the Culturally Unidentifiable Database by collection:

The online databases on the National NAGPRA website are a very useful resource for tribes to use to find documented culturally affiliated museum collections. As it currently stands, tribes are able to find collections if the collection is affiliated with their tribe. It is not clear from the database that other museums may also have a portion of the same collection and/or if other museums may have determined these same shared collections as culturally unaffiliated. Thus, it is only through the tribe's own diligence (and sometimes luck) that such unaffiliated, but shared, collections are identified. If it were possible to enable the Culturally Unidentifiable database to search by collection, this would be a useful tool for tribes to use in order to identify all of the museums that hold a portion of a collection that is intended for consultation and/or repatriation.

2. Provide a place on the National NAGPRA website for tribes to update their contact information and areas of interest for NAGPRA related collections:

During the course of our grant work, we found that the contact information and areas of interest for the Delaware Tribe was either incorrect or did not exist. Realizing that this is likely a result of our tribe's recently restored federal acknowledgment, we would suggest providing a password protected portion of the site to all grant recipients where they may log in and periodically update certain information (contact information and areas of interest in particular) so that tribes can

ensure that correct and most recent information is provided to museums and public agencies.

3. Add any additional comments/ thoughts here.

Part IV. Attachments

A. Financial Information: <u>Please provide the original and one copy of your financial information</u>.

1. Using the budget provided in the Grant Agreement or the approved budget modification (if applicable) submit a final Work-Cost expense report showing the budget versus actual work-costs.

2. Explain any differences between the planned and actual work-costs.

3. Attach a signed copy of the final SF-425 *Federal Financial Report.*

4. Attach a SF-270 *Request for Advance or Reimbursement* requesting your final payment.

5. If applicable, attach a SF-425 *Federal Cash Transactions Report* showing the liquidation of any cash advances.

B. Deliverables

- Include one copy of any required Deliverables as outlined in your Grant Agreement.

a. A comprehensive final report that includes the impact of the trainings on the NAGPRA program and the results of all consultation efforts with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry: See Attached

b. A copy of the Delaware Tribe's report on Delaware Funeral Practices in the Archaeological Record: See Attached

c. Copies of the revised Notices of Inventory Completion that will be submitted by the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry as a result of the project: See Attached

d. A copy of the final report on the treatment histories of the Delaware collections the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry: See Attached

- If any publications were produced with the assistance of this grant, enclose **one** copy of the publication.

No publications have been produced but we intend on submitting the attached manuscript, "Traditional Delaware Funerals," for publication in the Wicazo Sa Review.

Deliverable A

A comprehensive final report that includes the impact of the trainings on the NAGPRA program and the results of all consultation efforts with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe of Indians
FY 2010 NAGPRA Consultation and Documentation Grant #40-10-GP-524
Deliverable A: Comprehensive Final Report

Status of our digital database of museum inventories:

The Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office has compiled a Microsoft Access-based digital database that tracks human remains, associated and unassociated funerary objects, possible sacred objects, and other material reported to us by various museums. The database also contains digitized copies of all correspondence, summaries, and inventories sent to us as part of our NAGPRA consultations.

This database was redesigned in 2010 as part of this grant project and now includes material from 69 museums that have reported to us on over 14,000 individual object or human remain records (well over 120,000 individual objects), 400 documents, and data on over 1000 sites from counties with a historically recorded Delaware presence. (Note that these totals include numerous inventories that have subsequently been determined to be culturally unaffiliated with the Delaware Tribe but we have included them in our database because they were sent to our office.)

Impact of the NAGPRA trainings offered by the National Preservation Institute, October 4-7, 2010 in Phoenix and NAGPRA at 20 Symposium in Washington, DC.:

As part of preparation for this project, Project Assistant Greg Brown attended National Park Service-sponsored NAGPRA training in Phoenix, Arizona, on October 4-5, 2010. Training included "NAGPRA: Determining Cultural Affiliation" (Instructors: Mary Anne Kenworthy and Megon Noble) and "NAGPRA: Summaries, Inventories, and Federal Register Notices" (Instructors: Jaime Lavallee, J.D, LL.M. and Megon Noble).

Brice Obermeyer attended the National Park Service-sponsored NAGPRA training sessions in San Diego, California. The trainings sessions were "NAGPRA: Determining Cultural Affiliation" (Instructors: Mary Anne Kenworthy and Megon Noble) and "NAGPRA: Summaries, Inventories, and Federal Register Notices" (Instructors: Jaime Lavallee, J.D, LL.M. and Megon Noble).

The cultural affiliation session clarified the process for determining cultural affiliation as provided by the NAGPRA legislation. The session was important in that it provided us with basic definitions at the start of the project and also provided us with examples of how various other tribes and museums are approaching the subject. It helped frame our approach to interacting with our major cooperating museums, by suggesting possible avenues to explore and interweave the various lines of evidence—that is, for example, ways to incorporate traditional knowledge in combination with archaeology and historical sources. This approach helped inform our attempts to use modern remembrances of traditional Delaware funeral practices to suggest possible archaeological patterns that might result from those types of behaviors, and to look for those patterns in the archaeological record (based on field notes and maps) as a way of identifying possible funerary objects and/or unrecognized funerary deposits.

The cultural affiliation training also brought home an important realization that museums and agencies do not follow the NAGPRA defined culturally affiliation process and often only consult with tribes after the museum has determined the cultural affiliation of a collection. In our experience, most museums primarily rely on archaeological evidence for determining cultural affiliation. The training demonstrated that archaeology is only one of ten lines of evidence to use for determining cultural affiliation that should be equally weighted with other lines of evidence including geographical and ethnographic evidence. We intend to use this training to encourage museums to equally consider all lines of evidence for determining cultural affiliation.

The Summaries, Inventories and Notices session provided a good refresher course on the differences between summaries, inventories and notices and when/why each are produced. On a practical level, this training session was extremely helpful for understanding and ultimately helping museums to write the appropriate inventories, summaries, and notices.
Also useful was that the session clarified why, in our experience, some museums believe that they have submitted the required documentation to satisfy their NAGPRA obligations but were still lacking in some way. For instance, some museums with which we have worked have submitted an inventory for a culturally affiliated collection but had yet to draft a Notice of Inventory Completion. The museum in this case felt that they had met the requirements by submitting the inventory but did not realize that they were also responsible for seeing that the Notice be published as well. We have and will continue to clarify this with museums during our consultations to ensure that both required documents are submitted as well as use the training to assist museums with writing the appropriate documents.

Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Brice Obermeyer and Project Assistant Greg Brown attended National Park Service's series of seminars celebrating the 20th anniversary of NAGPRA, called "NAGRPA at 20," November 15 and 16, 2010, in Washington DC. Seminars and lectures attended included: "The Beginning: Remembering our Past," "NAGPRA's Impacts on Communities: Does Repatriation Heal?," "Native American and Federal Agencies NAGPRA Experiences," "The NMAI Act and NAGPRA," "Consultation Matters: Past, Present and Future," "Graves Protection and NAGPRA," "Implementing New NAGPRA Regulations: CUI Rule," "Science as Lines of Evidence," "Traditional Knowledge as Evidence," "Strengthening the Purpose of NAGPRA: Exploring Ways to Increase Accountability," "International Repatriation: Returning to Country," and "The Future of NAGPRA."

Results from the Delaware Tribe's consultations with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology (PMAE), the State Museum of Pennsylvania (SMP) and the New York University College of Dentistry (NYUCD)

Peabody Museum of Archaeology

On July 25 and 26, 2011, Brice Obermeyer, Greg Brown, Bonnie Thaxton, and James Jackson visited the Peabody Museum for consultation. We were met by curators Sandra Dong, Kelly Ferguson, Diana Loren, and Stuart Heebner; head NAGPRA curator Patricia Capone; and intern Stephanie Tapia. At that time we were given documentation (including a spreadsheet index of documents produced by Ms. Tapia) and were shown the ethnographic objects and some of the

funerary objects. We also provided the PMAE with information on Delaware funeral practices in support of our claims to items that may have not have been listed in their Notice of Inventory Completion that was published in 2007 in the federal register. The 2007 Notice listed 19 individuals and 16 funerary objects as culturally affiliated with the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians.

The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University currently (fall 2011) has human remains, associated funerary objects, and unassociated funerary objects from several sites. These are divided into two categories: sites around the **Abbott Farm Complex** in Trenton, NJ, and **isolated burial** sites elsewhere in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

The **Abbott Farm Complex** is a part of a large complex of archaeological sites (Lalor Field, Rowan Farm, Deutzville, Riverview Cemetery, Trenton Gas Works) in Trenton, New Jersey, in what is now the Abbott Farm Historic District, a National Register landmark. A few sites, such as Riverview Cemetery and the Trenton Gas Works, are outside the Historic District but are still nearby and for the purposes of this summary are considered part of the complex. Several archaeological excavations have been carried out at Abbott Farm for more than a century beginning with Ernest Volk's extensive excavations and collections in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Volk's work and subsequent archaeological excavations revealed that the Abbott Farm complex is a multi-component (with prehistoric and historic components) occupational site that represents a continuous chain of villages which occupied the eastern bluff rim along the lower Delaware River.

Our consultations and research on the Abbott Farm collection at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology found that over 100 individuals have been excavated from the Abbott Farm site and we have been able to locate at least 109 of these individuals with 94 identified funerary objects that are now curated in at least three other museums beyond the Peabody. Of the 109 identified individuals, the Peabody holds 15 individuals and 50 Funerary Objects; all of which have been published in the Federal Register as culturally affiliated with the Delaware Tribe. A number of burials were removed by the Indian Site Survey in during the 1930s by a crew under the direction of Dorothy Cross and these burials are housed at the New Jersey State Museum. The New Jersey State Museum holds 34 individuals and 0 Funerary Objects that have been affiliated with the Delaware Tribe and the inventory was last updated in 2011, but the Notice of Inventory Completion has yet to be published.

Other material from the Abbott Farm Complex is currently in the collections at the American Museum of Natural History and the Field Museum in Chicago, both of which had connections with Ernest Volk and others. Both the American Museum of Natural History and the Field Museum in Chicago have determined their Abbott Farm collection as Culturally Unidentifiable. The Field Museum of Natural History (with 17 MNI and 26 Funerary Objects) last updated their Abbott Farm inventory in 2010 but the Notice of Inventory Completion has not been published in the Federal Register. The American Museum of Natural History (with 43 MNI and 18 Funerary Objects) last updated their Abbott Farm inventory in 2004 but the Notice of Inventory Completion has not been published in the Federal Register. To date, we have only consulted with the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology and have initiated consultations with the New Jersey State Museum (with support from a FY 2004 Documentation Grant). We have

yet to consult with the Chicago Field Museum or the American Museum of Natural History.

PMAE also holds 4 identified individuals, 2 associated funerary objects and 3 unassociated funerary objects from **isolated burials** that were removed from five different counties in New Jersey. There is very little documentation other than the county from which the remains and objects were removed and the name of the collector. Most of these remains were collected in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

We also consulted with the PMAE on the treatment history of the collection. PMAE staff recommended that we assume that everything has been treated and that we should use the necessary precautions in handling the materials as part of the repatriation process.

The PMAE is currently drafting a revision of their Notice of Inventory Completion that will affiliate their collections with the Delaware Tribe, rather than with the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians. No other corrections have been identified at this time.

State Museum of Pennsylvania

Our consultations with the State Museum of Pennsylvania have been ongoing since as early as 1999 on their Delaware culturally affiliated human remains and funerary objects. The original Notice of Inventory Completion for the SMP collection was posted in 2000 and lists 58 individuals and 18,341 funerary objects that were removed from 5 prehistoric and early historic Delaware cemeteries (**Overpeck, Montgomery, Chambers, Wapwallopen and Printz Park**) in Pennsylvania. In 2007, the SMP published a correction to the 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion that assigned a cultural affiliation with the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians as a result of the Delaware Tribe's judicial termination. Since that time, the Delaware Tribe was restored federal acknowledgment in 2009 and our office has gained a more complex understanding of the collection history from each site. Our grant funded consultations have sought to make corrections to the original 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion and the 2007 correction while also identifying other institutions with shared collections with the SMP sites.

On July 28 and 29, 2011, Brice Obermeyer, Greg Brown, Bonnie Thaxton, and James Jackson visited the State Museum of Pennsylvania to re-initiate our more than a decade worth of consultation and research. We were met by curators Kurt Carr and Janet Johnson. At that time we were given further documentation and were shown the ethnographic objects from the Frank Speck collection. We viewed a selection of the funerary objects from each of the culturally affiliated sites and provided information on Delaware funeral practices. Our most significant discovery was the identification of a traditional wooden grave maker found in an 18th century grave that had been mislabeled as a coffin remnant. Based on our ethnographic information on current funerary practices, we were able to correctly identify the object.

On August 16, 2011, Greg Brown returned to the museum to view the objects again and to record notes written on the actual artifact boxes, which appear to sometimes be more complete than the notes in the inventory. At that time he also finished photocopying the field notes for the

Wapwallopen site.

On February 21-24, 2012, the Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office funded Greg Brown's travel to meet again with the State Museum of Pennsylvania (SMOP) to carry out further research in order to complete the final reconciliation of information about the **Wapwallopen, Printz Park**, and **Overpeck** sites. This work included pulling the boxes of human remains and funerary objects (stored in Hollinger boxes in the SMOP lab), matching the material with the catalog records, and correcting the catalog and inventory records as needed. Field notes and photographs were also consulted, and in several cases additional individuals or funerary objects were added to the list based on their provenience or typological similarity to other funerary objects (for example, a few beads found in unprovenienced fill at the Wapwallopen site were added to the funerary objects after comparing them with other beads found in known burial contexts).

A number of small inconsistencies in the records were found and corrected based on a thorough study of the field notes, maps, and photographs. At the Overpeck site, for example, the original 2000 Notice included 142 unassociated funerary objects listed from catalog 36BU5/163. Review of the map shows that it is nowhere close to the well-defined cemetery zone, and the nature of the artifacts from 163 (chipping debris, an arrow point, two pebbles, and 134 pottery fragments) are totally unlike what was found in the cemetery contexts. For that reason we chose to eliminate it from the unassociated funerary objects list in the revised notice.

Because of the complexity of the sites, which are either shared between more than one institution (the **Chambers** site) or missing a detailed site report (the **Montgomery** site), these latter two were not pulled during this Feburary 21-24 visit, and will have to be checked at a later time.

The sites at the SMP include the following:

The **Overpeck** site is a multi-component site with components from the (possibly) Early Late Woodland, Late Woodland, and Contact period. The cemetery area seems to date to the early Contact period (circa AD 1550). The site was first excavated in 1947 by John Witthoft and Scottie MacNeish but that excavation did not reportedly excavate burials. In 1962, members of the Forks of the Delaware Chapter of the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology obtained permission from Bethlehem Steel to carry out a salvage operation on the site. After consultation with then-State Archaeologist John Witthoft, the excavation was begun and led to the discovery of a small Indian cemetery with 13 burials. According to the site report in *Pennsylvania Archaeologist*, "It had been agreed at the onset of excavations that each Chapter member was to retain the artifacts he or she excavated, but that a record of each feature and each artifact was to be provided to the Chapter as a permanent record. Regrettably, not everyone complied with this request and the records vary widely in both detail and reliability" (pg 9). Chapter members recorded 14 burials and provided them to Witthoft for study. Unfortunately, any associated funerary objects do not seem to have accompanied the skeletal material.

According the Notice of Inventory Completion, there are 6 MNIs and 0 AFOs from this site. As this did not conform to the 14 known burials and funerary objects listed in the site report, we researched further to locate the entire collection. We are waiting to receive information on 7

additional burials (or 7 additional MNIs?) apparently donated to the State Museum of PA but had remained in possession of a local advocationalist that is now reportedly willing to return the remains to the SMP. Once returned, this should bring the total to 13 (or hopefully 14, as one of the missing burials is a double burial of a woman and an infant). This would account for all the described burials in the site report. The SMP also reported no associated funerary objects in their 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion, but their artifact inventory and other records suggest that there are a few at the museum and potentially several others that may still be in the possession of the excavators. After a review of their non-affiliated collection and the site report, we have identified what we feel are 4 AFOs in the museum's possession and at least 24 more in the possession of the 1962 excavators. With the human remains returned and the funerary objects corrected, the SMP will revise their 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion for the Overpeck site.

After consultation in February 2012, it was determined that the Overpeck material actually consists of three sets of donations, only the first of which had been accepted at the time of the 2000 Notice. Donation 1 (by William Strohmeier and Elmer Erb of Chapter 14 of the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeologist, two of the original excavators) was reported in the 2000 Notice and included six sets of human remains. Donation 2 was accepted in 2011 and includes catalog numbers 36BU5/212 through 36BU5/218. It was catalogued last fall and thus was not part of the 2000 Notice. Donation 3 is a set of what Janet Johnson thinks is two individuals. Details of the donation are still being worked out, and the material has not been received by the SMOP.

The **Montgomery** Site (36CH60) is a Historic period site (AD 1700-1733) in Chester County, Pennsylvania, excavated by Marshall Becker of West Chester University in 1978. The artifacts recovered from the site were donated to the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the museum's Notice of Inventory Completion stated that it had 15 burials and 2206 funerary objects from this site. The report on this site by Becker also suggests that only 15 burials were excavated. However, burial sheets from SMP also list Burials 21 and 22, though there are no records for what we would presume are burials 16-20. Confusingly, Marshall Becker has also published subsequent manuscripts since his site report in which he states that there were 22 burials.

In order to correctly identify the individuals from this site, we contacted Marshall Becker by e-mail who stated that he had donated all materials to the State Museum of Pennsylvania but he did not state how many burials were excavated in 1978. We also contacted Heather Wholey (Becker's successor at West Chester University) and she also searched for other material in the West Chester collections. She was unable to locate any human remains or funerary objects with provenience information that would place them with the Montgomery site. Thus, it appears that as many as seven sets of human remains may either be missing, not collected or misreported in some fashion. We have since identified some discrepancies in the SMP files and will need to conduct additional research on this collection before we can make a revision to the original 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion.

The **Chambers** Site (36Lr11) is a historic Delaware site once known as Kuskuskie's Village (AD 1763-1776) that was located in what is today western Pennsylvania. During consultations with the State Museum of Pennsylvania we learned that there were a total of 79 burials excavated and that the State Museum of Pennsylvania is not in possession of much of the collection. The

State Museum of Pennsylvania's Delaware affiliated collection includes 8 MNI and 2,116 AFOs from the Chamber's Site; all of which appear in their 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion. Our subsequent research found that the Carnegie Museum of Natural History holds another 48 MNI and 3,012 AFO's and the Ft. Ligonier Museum holds 3 AFOs from the Chambers Site. A search of the NAGPRA Database of Notice of Inventory Completions revealed that neither the Carnegie Museum nor the Ft. Ligonier Museum have published a Notice of Inventory Completion nor have they completed an inventory for their Chambers Collection.

We have initiated consultation with the Carnegie Museum of Natural History at our own expense but have not consulted with Ft. Ligonier. Because of the considerable amount of time and expense that will be required to document these collections before reuniting them for repatriation, we have applied for a FY 2012 NAGPRA Documentation and Consultation Grant to support these needed consultation and documentation efforts.

The **Wapwallopen** Site (36LU43), also known as the Knouse Site, is an early Historic period site (AD 1744-1755) in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania that was excavated by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in 1978 with the permission of the landowner, PP&L. The excavation was led by Jamie McIntyre who was working for WCORPO (?) and the Dayton Museum of Natural History (now Boonshoft Museum of Discovery). At least 24 burials (representing 28 individuals) were recovered during the excavation and are at the State Museum of Pennsylvania, along with a large number of associated funerary objects.

The 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion listed 28 MNIs and 11,097 AFOs from this site. Our internally funded research, combined with the results from a layered GIS map of the site excavation by a student intern, found that there were actually 29 individuals and 11,150 AFOs collected from the Wapwallopen site in the possession of the museum. The museum has agreed with our revisions and is currently drafting a correction to the 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion. We have also drafted our own correction to the 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion and have provided a copy of it to the museum.

The **Printz Park** site (36De3) is a Late Woodland site (AD 1000-1500) excavated by Marshall Becker and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in 1976. The site appears to be in Governor Printz Park near Essington, Pennsylvania, just west of the Philadelphia International Airport. One burial (2 teeth and 1 rib fragment) was found during the cataloging for the collection. The site report does not identify a burial in the site description, though it does discuss a trench dug in 1976 between the foundations and the seawall where he found a series of pits, "probably Indian graves." There were no funerary objects identified for this site. Lacking such additional information, we have not requested any corrections to the 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion for this site.

Although we have learned a significant amount about the collection history of the 5 sites at SMP, we have also identified several corrections that need to be made in the original 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion. With so many necessary revisions, we have chosen to draft one revision for the 2007 correction and 4 separate revisions to the original 2000 Notice of Inventory Completion with each revision correcting a single site except for the Printz Park Site. The State Museum of Pennsylvania is currently drafting two revisions for their Notice of Inventory

Completion. The first is the revision of the 2007 correction for which the museum has agreed to affiliate the 5 sites with the Delaware Tribe rather than the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe. The second revision will be a correction to the number of human remains and funerary objects from the Wapwallopen site; a collection that is housed in its entirety at the SMP and on which we intend to move forward with a repatriation request after the correction is published. Further consultation and research will be needed before the corrections can be made for the Overpeck, Montgomery and Chambers sites.

Based on our consultations with SMP staff, it is our understanding is that there is no evidence that any of the remains and funerary objects have been treated, but there is also no documentation that indicates that they have not been treated.

New York University College of Dentistry

The New York University College of Dentistry currently (summer 2011) has one set of human remains from a single site (the Broadway and Isham Site in the Bronx, New York). Consultant Lauren Sieg was personally consulted by Greg Brown on August 5, 2011, at Alexandria, Virginia. They discussed the status of the skull and NAGPRA documentation. The Broadway and Isham Site is represented by one cranium (of a middle aged adult) collected in 1911 by Reginald Bolton from the corner of Broadway and Isham Streets, Bronx County, New York. There are no AFOs or UFOs. They were accessioned by the Department of Physical Anthropology at the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation in 1917. In 1956, the remains were transferred to Dr. Theodore Kazamiroff, New York University College of Dentistry. Other material from site was removed by Alanson Skinner in 1920 for the Heye Museum, possibly stored there. It is unclear whether the cranium is from the area where these two refuse pits were excavated, but it appears likely that this was the same site.

Since this consultation, Lauren has updated the 2009 Notice of Inventory Completion to reflect the affiliation of the Broadway and Isham skull with the Delaware Tribe of Indians (removing the references to the Cherokee Nation). We also learned that there is no evidence of any treatment to the skull that would pose any particular threats for repatriation or reburial. Lauren Sieg also believes that the NYUCD does not have any associated or unassociated funerary objects. She believes there is a possibility that the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) may have some remains excavated from the same site, and suggested that we send an official request that she can take to her supervisors (she now also works for NMAI). Our request was sent in late August and we have since learned more about the shared collections at NMAI.

Lauren Sieg sent a follow up letter on Sept 15, 201 that describes additional remains found in collection from Weir Creek Mound/Schley Avenue site (Throg's Neck), as well as a few other remains. What is identified here as the Throg's Neck site was included in an updated inventory from the New York University College of Dentistry by Lauren Sieg submitted in September 2011. Identified as NYUCD #58, the remains were removed from the Weir Creek Mound (Bronx County, New York), probably by M.R. Harrington and/or Alanson Skinner in 1917 or 1918. The remains were transmitted to the NYUCD in 1956. These remains are currently associated with other isolated burial sites that are candidates for repatriation and culturally unidentifiable human remains.

The New York College of Dentistry has completed a draft correction of their Notice of Inventory Completion that affiliates their collection with the Delaware Tribe rather than the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe. However, the submitted draft has not been published in the federal register.

Deliverable B

The Delaware Tribe's report on Delaware Funeral Practices in the Archaeological Record

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Traditional Delaware Funerals: An Ethnographic Approach for documenting Funerary Objects under NAGPRA.

Prepared by
Brice Obermeyer

DRAFT

Do Not Cite without the Author's Permission

Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office
1420 C of E Drive
Emporia, KS 66801
bobermeyer@delawaretribe.org
(918) 335-7026

Emporia State University
Rm 115D Butcher Ed. Center
1200 Commercial Street
Emporia, KS 66801
bobermey@emporia.edu
(620) 341-5724

Abstract

An ethnographic approach for documenting funerary objects is presented here in order to provide museums with a culturally informed model for identify funerary objects in Delaware affiliated collections under NAGPRA. Through collaborative research with modern traditionalists from the Delaware Tribe in eastern Oklahoma we present an ethnography of Delaware mortuary beliefs and traditional funeral practices. Through such ethnographic research, we demonstrate that a clearly defined cemetery and the graves within it meet the NAGPRA definition for a burial site. We also show that funerary objects that would be recovered from such a burial site would include all organic and inorganic remains found in direct association with human remains or were recovered from the grave, grave fill and grave surface. This article lists the types of funerary objects that would be found at a Delaware affiliated grave as well as those non-funerary objects that would be found at a Delaware burial site and beyond.

DRAFT

Introduction

An ethnography of contemporary Delaware mortuary practices is provided here to aid museums in their effort to correctly identify Delaware affiliated funerary objects according to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). The traditional Delaware funeral observance was still practiced in the 20th century and many elements of the ceremony continue today among some 21st century practitioners of the Delaware Tribe of Indians in eastern Oklahoma. While the evidence provided by contemporary observers will likely broaden interpretations that are given in a site's field notes or museum records, 21st century practitioners believe that based on their current and remembered practices, objects that are found in a clearly defined cemetery or in association with a grave were intentionally left to accompany the human remains found in that burial. The pages that follow will present evidence to support the conclusion that a clearly defined cemetery and the graves within it constitute a burial site from a Delaware cultural perspective. According to the NAGRA regulations, the objects found in such a burial site are funerary objects if they can be reasonably believed to have been placed there as part of a death rite or ceremony. Our research also identifies those objects that are used as part of a traditional Delaware funeral and are thus reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains as part of a traditional Delaware funeral and appropriately classified as funerary objects under NAGPRA.

While documenting the traditional funeral observance is an important resource for tribal members and researchers, our work should also be read as a call for museums to initiate and maintain meaningful tribal consultation early on in the documentation process. As our research demonstrates, it is only through a commitment to tribal

consultation that more accurate determinations of funerary objects can be confidently made. Excavation and museum records provide important lines of evidence but equally important are the beliefs and practices of the descendant communities who often sustain or remember stories about the very same funerary practices that were once used to originally inter the individuals and their funerary objects that now populate museum collections. It is only by viewing the provenience of such collections through the cultural lens provided by descendant groups that we can accurately arrive at the reasonable belief necessary for determining the funerary intent of an object. Here we show that complementing the archaeological record with an ethnographically informed framework for reasonable belief is the most accurate method for correctly identifying funerary objects according to NAGPRA and doing so responsibly can only be done through an ongoing relationship with representatives from potentially affiliated tribes during the documentation process.

Historic and Methodological Context

The Delaware Tribe of Indians primarily descends from the Munsee and Unami, two similar coastal Algonquin dialect groups whose aboriginal homeland was centered along the Delaware River and Lower Hudson Rivers in the Northeastern United States. Over the course of their forced removal to Oklahoma, these Munsee and Unami peoples were joined by other refugee groups from the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic region and later coalesced as the Delaware Tribe in what is now the state of Ohio by the late 18th century. Other Munsee and Unami speakers relocated to different reserves and settlements, taking up shared residence with other tribes in Canada, New York,

Wisconsin and western Oklahoma. The so-called main body of the Delaware Tribe underwent a series of removals from Ohio, through Indiana, Missouri and Kansas, until ultimately being moved to the Cherokee Nation which is now a portion of eastern Oklahoma (Obermeyer 2009a: 37-48). It is here in the rural areas north and east of Tulsa, Oklahoma that Munsee and Unami continued to be spoken into the 20th century. Some Delaware tribal members continue to observe many elements of traditional funeral observance. It is in consultation with such eastern Oklahoma traditionalists where the linguistic and ethnographic research for this report was conducted.[1]

[Removal Map Here – Obermeyer 2009a:46]

While many of the languages of the refugee coastal Algonquin groups fell out of use before the 20th century, Munsee and Unami continued to be spoken as two closely related dialects by members of the Delaware Tribe into the 20th century. The last generation of Munsee speakers passed by the mid 20th century and the last Unami speaker passed in 2003.[2] The dialect spoken or remembered by most Delaware traditionalists in eastern Oklahoma is Unami and most contemporary tribal members refer to the Unami dialect as their "Lenape" or "Delaware," or in rare cases, "Indian" language. Intensive language documentation efforts have been carried out since the

---

[1] For more on the contemporary Delaware and the cultural divisions between traditionalist and Christian Delaware families in eastern Oklahoma, see Obermeyer (2009b).

[2] The last recognized native speaker of Unami passed in 2003. Today, some tribal members are able to speak but were not raised with Unami as their first language. Most tribal members can remember their parents or grandparents who were native speakers. Munsee was less commonly known among the Delaware Tribe with the last speakers having passed by the mid 20th century. Munsee was also spoken by a handful of Delaware who remained behind in Kansas following the Delaware Tribe's removal to the Cherokee Nation although the language is no longer spoken among modern Kansas Munsee descendants (Michelson 1912).

early 1960's by Jim Rementer with this last generation of Unami speakers, and he has been a participant in traditional Delaware funerals over the past 50 years. Jim's important linguistic work and first-hand experience now allows us to understand how the Unami dialect (hereafter referred to as Lenape) and 20th century traditionalists would frame the way in which native speakers would talk about and view their burial sites and funerary practices.[3]

The production and research for this report was funded by a National Park Service - NAGPRA Documentation/ Consultation grant (40-10-GP-524) awarded to the Delaware Tribe in 2010. As the Director for the Delaware Tribe's Historic Preservation Office, I worked in partnership with the Delaware Tribe's Elder's Committee and Cultural Preservation Committee to carry out ethnographic research on traditional funeral practices and it is with their consent that this manuscript has been made public. Federal funding also allowed our office to collect published and unpublished sources on 20th century Delaware funeral practices and carry out 10 recorded interviews in 2011 with modern practitioners of traditional Delaware funerals. The interviews were transcribed, coded and analyzed in order to establish the shared beliefs and practices among those tribal members who continue to carry out the traditional observance. Such interviews also enabled us to identify the funerary objects that are used as part of the traditional observance. What resulted is a rich and compelling primary and secondary ethnographic data set on the subject of traditional Delaware funerals that remains on file at the Delaware Tribe's Historic Preservation Office.

---

3 For more on the Jim Rementer's work and the Delaware Tribe's National Science Foundation-funded language preservation efforts, please visit the Lenape Talking Dictionary at http://www.talk-lenape.org/

It is in the performance of the traditional funeral that modern traditionalists express one aspect of their shared Delaware identity and in turn perpetuate the observance in the present. The continuation of the observance today demonstrates a remarkable resiliency among contemporary practitioners who have found ways to adapt to, and accommodate, imposed burial laws and customs that would otherwise have rendered the traditional funeral obsolete. Although our research and Delaware collaborators tell us that considerable changes have taken place over the past 50 years, the focus here is on presenting traditional Delaware funerary practices and beliefs in their entirety, many of which are still known but unable to be fully practiced. While some elements of the traditional observance have reluctantly been dropped in response to external pressures, many elements of the ceremony continue to be routinely carried on for those friends and relatives who wish to be buried in the traditional fashion.

There are several ethnographic sources on the traditional Delaware funeral ceremony in the 20th century (Dean n.d., 1984; Harrington 1913; Kinietz 1946; Michelson 1912; Sieg 2008; Speck 1937; Vogelin 1944; Weslager 1972: 441-442). Such literature provides an exhaustive and remarkably consistent account of the traditional ceremony as it was practiced by traditionalists in eastern Oklahoma. Lauren Sieg's (2008) work is unique among such literature as she provides an important comparison of the archaeological evidence from Late Woodland and Historic period sites on the Upper Delaware River with the ethnographic evidence on Delaware funerals acquired from historical sources and through recent consultations with culturally affiliated tribes. Although her significant work identifies important and very useful consistencies between the archaeological and ethnographic record, the focus of her report is to determine the cultural affiliation of the burials and identified funerary objects at a

particular place, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.[4] Our contribution adds a 21st century update to the ethnographic record on traditional Delaware funerals with a complementary focus on implementing a broader understanding of Delaware mortuary beliefs and practices for identifying a Delaware burial site and documenting the funerary objects within it through ongoing consultation with culturally affiliated tribes.

Identifying a Funerary Object according to NAGPRA

NAGPRA is a congressional act that became law on November 16, 1990 with the intent of documenting and repatriating Native American human remains and funerary objects in museum collections to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated federally recognized tribes (Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.). Implementing the intent of the law is done with reference to what appear to be clear definitions for identifying Native American human remains and funerary objects provided in the law and accompanying implementing regulations (43 CFR 10). The relevant definitions for identifying a funerary object from the NAGPRA law and regulations are reviewed here. Although the definitions appear straightforward, the language in the definitions allows for multiple lines of evidence to be used in the documentation of a funerary object.

NAGPRA specifically applies to only Native American human remains and funerary objects, and thus determining if human remains and funerary objects are

---

[4] Sieg (2008: 72-74) identifies several important consistencies between contemporary traditional funerals and the archaeological record of Delaware sites on the Upper Delaware River. Among such consistencies are the burial of the deceased in fine clothing, the graveside funeral feast, graves oriented with the head to the east to face the afterlife in the west, the burial in a coffin or wood lined grave, the distribution of property, and the inclusion of necessary items and tokens of affection in the deceased's grave.

Native American is the first step of analysis. According to the NAGPRA regulations, "*Native American* means of, or relating to, a tribe, people, or culture indigenous to the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii." Remains and objects that are found in clearly prehistoric contexts in the United States are typically classified as Native American without further consideration. However, remains and objects found in protohistoric and historic cemeteries, or whose original provenience is unknown, must undergo further analysis in order to determine the identity of the human remains. Such analysis of the human remains is generally performed by a physical anthropologist that is tasked with examining the skeleton for phenotypical markers that are generally shared among Native American and/or prehistoric American populations.[5] Objects that are found in association with identified Native American remains are generally considered Native American objects. If the remains are not collected, the attribution of the remains as Native American is generally made in the field and the objects are similarly classified.

However, not ALL objects found in prehistoric contexts or in association with human remains are considered Native American funerary objects as NAGPRA includes a more concise definition. NAGPRA defines Native American funerary objects as, "items that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have

---

[5] The NAGPRA definition for human remains does include important provisions that limit the return of all human remains that may be in museum collections. As defined by NAGPRA, "*Human remains* means the physical remains of the body of a person of Native American ancestry. The term does not include remains or portions of remains that may reasonably be determined to have been freely given or naturally shed by the individual from whose body they were obtained, such as hair made into ropes or nets. For the purposes of determining cultural affiliation, human remains incorporated into a funerary object, sacred object, or object of cultural patrimony, as defined below, must be considered as part of that item." This definition then clearly requires the determination that the human remains are Native American and that they were not freely given or naturally lost. In rare cases in which the ancestry cannot be determined by osteological analysis, such remains may also undergo DNA testing, usually not but always with the consent of the potentially affiliated tribes.

been placed intentionally at the time of death or later with or near individual human remains." Under NAGPRA, a funerary object is defined with reference to two criteria: 1) whether the object was placed **with or near individual human remains**, and 2) whether the object was placed in such a relationship **as part of a death rite or ceremony**.

According to NAGPRA, the Native American human remains do not have to be present in a museum's collection, or to have even been collected, for the object to be determined a funerary object.[6] For purposes of completing the summary and inventory requirements under NAGPRA, the regulations distinguish between two types of funerary objects. *Associated funerary objects* are, "those funerary objects for which the human remains with which they were placed intentionally are also in the possession or control of a museum or Federal agency." These objects may or may not have been found within the burial pit itself. According to NAGPRA, funerary objects can also be "objects that were made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains." This stipulation adds items that were exclusively made for a burial without a further requirement that they were once placed "with or near" human remains. A coffin that was made for a burial that was never used in a ceremony or interred with human remains would be a good example of such an associated funerary object. *Unassociated funerary*

---

[6] Charles Clark and Jay Custer (2003) point out the very real possibility that funerary objects may be left in deposits that once, but no longer, contained human remains. In many cases, human remains deteriorate relatively quickly in the acidic soils of the Mid-Atlantic, leaving behind only the most durable elements (such as teeth) and the most durable of funerary objects. Thus, if the most durable bone elements were not buried or have been scattered through natural taphonomic processes, Custer's research suggests that it is entirely possible to find Delaware funerary objects in pits that no longer contain human remains. In those cases it may be necessary to carefully analyze a pit's artifact assemblage to look for objects (such as beads or jinglers in the case of Delaware remains) that may be funerary "markers," or even to look closely at "everyday" artifacts such as fire-cracked rock and lithic debitage to try to determine whether there are characteristics of such objects that suggest a funerary (and only funerary) function.

objects means, "those funerary objects for which the human remains with which they were placed intentionally are not in the possession or control of a museum or Federal agency." This may be the case when the human remains were not removed from the burial pit because of their poor condition, or where the human remains were removed but wound up in the collections of another institution. Funerary objects, whether associated or unassociated, are all subject to documentation and repatriation. The distinction made here is simply for reporting purposes.

The standard of proof used for determining if an item was used as part of a death rite, or to have been intentionally placed with or near Native American human remains, is that of reasonable belief. Although reasonable belief refers to the so-called "common man" interpretation, belief is culturally relative and one's positioning and life experiences frame much of how a person views reality. How a person interprets the funerary intent of an object would thus be based on his or her experiences at death rites. If NAGPRA requires that we use reasonable belief to determine if an object was used as part of a death rite and placed with or near human remains as part of a death rite, and death rites vary from culture to culture, it is most appropriate to use a reasonable belief that is generally shared by the modern descendent community and that has developed based on experiences of the culturally affiliated group's funeral ceremonies. This report provides the ethnographic evidence based on such experiences at Delaware funerals from which to consider reasonable belief from the Delaware perspective.

The challenge presented by what we have identified as the first criterion is to determine how the object's geographic and stratigraphic vicinity to the human remains relates to the death rite itself. The terms "with or near" are relative rather than absolute

terms, and is subject to interpretation. NAGPRA itself does provide some additional guidance on how best to interpret the meaning of "with or near." The NAGPRA regulations state that "Funerary objects must be identified by a preponderance of the evidence as having been removed from a specific burial site of an individual affiliated with a particular Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization or as being related to specific individuals or families or to known human remains." This additional guidance adds the preponderance of evidence standard that requires that the majority of the evidence supports an interpretation. This standard requires more evidence than that of reasonable belief that an item was removed from a specific human burial site.

A burial site is defined as, "any natural or prepared physical location, whether originally below, on, or above the surface of the earth, into which, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, individual human remains were deposited, and includes rock cairns or pyres which do not fall within the ordinary definition of gravesite." Burial site is a location that, according to the NAGPRA definition, differs from an individual gravesite and can exist in a variety of culturally specific possibilities. Any location becomes a burial site because human remains were placed there as part of a death rite or ceremony or because it is defined as such by a particular Indian tribe.

Funerary objects are those items that were used as part of a death rite or ceremony and that can be shown by a preponderance of the evidence to have been removed from a burial site. The NAGPRA definition does not limit the documentation of funerary objects to those objects found at the bottom of a burial pit or in direct association with individual human remains. Objects that were removed from elsewhere on the burial site are considered funerary objects according to NAGPRA if they were also used as part of the death rite or ceremony.

The most common resolution to which most resort in order to determine if an object was placed with or near individual human remains is to consult the excavation records (if they exist) or any museum files that may contain information on the provenience of the object. Objects whose provenience place them in a grave deposit or removed from a grave are normally considered to have been intentionally placed "with or near" the human remains and are classified as funerary objects. However, the NAGPRA regulations do not specifically identify the geographic proximity to human remains as the sole reason for documenting an object as a funerary object. Rather, an object's placement at a burial site is only a contributing piece of evidence required to document the object as a funerary object. Additionally, NAGPRA does not specifically identify what sources are the most appropriate for documenting the extent of a burial site but rather leaves open the possibility for a wide variety of sites, possibly including not only fenced or unfenced marked "cemeteries" but also individual pits scattered within an amorphous settlement. NAGPRA does not limit the determination of a burial site to the museum records or excavation files but rather leaves open the possibility to use ethnographic evidence to determine what constitutes as a burial site. Thus, the first goal of this report is to identify what constitutes a burial site according to the ethnography of traditional Delaware burial practices.

Once the burial site is determined, the challenge presented by what we have identified as the second criterion is to determine if an object, which is now housed in a museum collection, was placed in a burial site as part of a death rite or ceremony. The second criterion requires that additional information about a death rite itself be considered. In most cases, the inventory compiler has never witnessed such ceremonies and, in most cases, no record or oral history exists for the actual funerary event for the

burials being documented. The most appropriate source for learning about such ceremonies then is the modern (or historic) ethnographic record on a culture's death rite, which will include information on the objects that are used during the event. A list of such items can be accessed through a review of a culture's ethnographic record on death rites and ceremonies. It is reasonable to believe that if there are objects in a museum collection that are similar to those objects that are used in modern or historically recorded funeral ceremonies of a culture, then such museum objects are appropriately classified as funerary objects if such objects show evidence that they were recovered from a NAGPRA defined burial site. The second goal of this report is to provide a list of those objects that would have been placed at a Delaware burial site as part of the traditional Delaware funeral ceremony and should be classified as funerary objects if they are removed from a burial site.

To complete our identified goals, we rely on historic and ethnographic evidence on Delaware mortuary beliefs and practices. Our review of such evidence begins with a descriptive account of the cultural context within which such traditional ceremonies take place, with a focus on highlighting those elements that are useful for identifying a Delaware burial site. The following section then provides a descriptive account of the traditional Delaware funeral that highlights the elements of the ceremony that are potentially useful for documenting funerary objects that are used as part of the ceremony. Beginning with the cultural context of a traditional funeral here will provide the appropriate context for understanding the specific practices involved in the traditional ceremony, which are described in the following section.

Linguistic Context of a Traditional Delaware Funeral: Using language to identify a Delaware burial site under NAGPRA

Elements of Lenape mortuary vocabulary and associated mortuary beliefs provide the necessary vantage for understanding how a burial site is viewed from a traditional Delaware cultural perspective. It is clear from such evidence that traditionalists view a clearly defined cemetery, as well as the graves within it, as a burial site. Such localities are treated with a respectful avoidance in the way that Lenape speakers discuss a cemetery space and the funeral events that have taken place in them. Clear boundaries are enforced in which the cemetery is viewed as a space for the deceased, and the living should observe certain practices if they should choose to enter such locations. Certain objects are not to be taken in a cemetery while others are expected to be left behind if they enter a cemetery context. Such practices indicate that Delaware traditionalists view the whole cemetery space as a single burial site within which individual graves are placed.

Delaware traditionalists are hesitant to discuss the final observance directly while maintaining a strict and rigid boundary between the world of the living and the world of the departed. The ways in which native speakers and their descendants discuss funerals express both a respectful avoidance of the subject as well as a desired finality. In contrast to English, there is no Lenape word that translates directly for the English word "funeral." However, the Lenape had a number of ways to refer to a deceased person and to the actual burial of the body that artfully express death without invoking the term directly. The word which means "He died" is "Ankel," but this was considered a very strong word to some speakers and the form, "Mata ahpii," which means "He is not here"

was often substituted. The burial itself has several Lenape terms to describe it. One is "Pokhakehoo," which translates literally as, "He broke the earth for him," while another is "Towëna," which means, "He lowered him." Still another is, "Hakink hala," which translates as "He was placed in the earth." Although there are many terms to describe the deceased person and the actual act of the burial itself, it is important to note that such terms describe an act rather than the burial or funeral observance itself. There is no all-encompassing term in Lenape that refers to the ceremony for the dead and it is considered bad taste to discuss the subject directly.

When native speakers would translate their understanding of a traditional funeral into English, they consistently would use a similar approach and expression that reflected the absence for a Lenape term to describe the event. Appropriate references to the traditional observance in its entirety are those expressions that did not directly identify the event or what was taking place. As Jack Longbone described in 1970, "Then the man that's going to put him away—we called it put him away—the man..., then they'd set up with him, and the man that's going to put him away, we call it put him away." Since there was no Delaware word for funeral, the last generation of Delaware speakers would refer to their funeral ceremony in English as "putting away" the deceased. Although the Delaware now use the English word "funeral" to describe their contemporary practice, there remains a careful respect for observing the appropriate customs of the traditional event.[7]

The expression, "putting away" is a phrase that is not only used for funerals but is pervasive in the Delaware lexicon. "Putting away" is used to describe other pivotal

---

[7] It is our understanding from personal communication with several tribal and museum representatives that this is a common approach among eastern woodland peoples.

moments in recent Delaware history when traditionalists carefully and thoughtfully chose to leave behind a practice out of respect for the important observance. One such moment was when the Delaware Big House leaders chose to "put away" their Big House Ceremony in 1924, only to be resurrected for short time during the end of World War II. It was put away again after the end of the war. Elders of today whose parents and grandparents were among those who made this difficult decision recall that they were told two complementary messages: that the Big House was a sacred event unique to the Delaware, and yet it should never be revived. Though the details of the Big House Ceremony were recorded by ethnographers working with the Big House followers in the 20th century, there has been no effort to revive the ceremony among contemporary tribal members out of respect for the sanctity of this event. The ceremony was put away and should never be brought back (Obermeyer 2007).

"Putting Away" is thus an approximate translation for a funeral but it also encompasses more than simply a ceremony. The term also expresses finality; the observance provides closure for the deceased and for the living. Like the Delaware Big House, a Delaware person is "put away," because he or she is loved and missed but should never be brought back, disturbed or resurrected after being rightfully and respectfully cared for in order to protect the memory of the deceased. Such closure then is protected among the living by following certain taboos after the funeral that also reflect the overall cultural context within which a Delaware observance takes place and is experienced.

A clear illustration of this desire to protect the world of the living from the memories of the deceased is in the Delaware way for avoiding the use of the deceased's name. It is not one's first choice to speak the name of the deceased, especially later in

the day, and using the name of the deceased is avoided if possible with passive references to the individual. Such passive phrases would include references such as, "one who has passed on," or, "my departed friend or relative." If one does have to speak the name of the deceased, then an "–a" is added to the ending of the name and the name is preceded by "naka," or "deceased one," to indicate that the individual is no longer with us. The Delaware explain that great care must be taken with the name of the deceased as the spirit of the deceased may want to return if they hear their name spoken.[8]

There are also prohibitions that are followed so as to protect the living from being taken to the afterlife by the departed. As explained in the next section, a deceased person's face is adorned with a red Indian paint called "Olaman" so that the creator will recognize the deceased as a Delaware. The Delaware will also paint the face in the same way with *olaman* for certain ceremonial occasions and the face paint must be removed before a person goes to sleep. If not, the departed will mistake the sleeping person for one who is deceased and will attempt to take him or her into the afterlife. A similar prohibition occurs with the hair. When a person dies, the hair is washed and is not greased afterward. The living must always grease or dress their hair in some way or the departed will make a similar mistake and attempt to take the person into the afterlife. Breaking these taboos is believed to result in the person becoming very sick and eventually dying.

Cemeteries are approached as spaces within which the deceased may still be present and is thus a space for the departed, not the living. As part of a larger cultural

---

[8] The prohibition against using the name of the deceased is recorded to have been practiced by the Delaware as early as the seventeenth century (Sieg 2008:69).

landscape, the cemetery is viewed as the home of the deceased and the living should take a certain approach and caution when entering such a foreign and potentially dangerous place. There are two Lenape words for cemetery. One of which is "ktemaksewakan" and can translate as either a, "cemetery," or as, "a pitiful state." Another word used is "mahchikamikink," which literally means, "at a bad place or bad land," probably referring to the sadness that is found at such a place. A space that is so sorrow-filled that it deserves one's pity adds a meaningful component to a burial space beyond that of a location that is designated for the dead. Because the spirit of the deceased may still reside at this sorrowful space, certain precautions are taken out of respect for those who have passed.

Certain items are not appropriate to be brought into a cemetery outside of a funeral observance. It is not appropriate to take food into a cemetery. If one does forget and carries food into a cemetery, it is appropriate to leave the food in the cemetery. As one tribal member explained the end of a graveside feast during a traditional funeral, "if you've already ate your plate, you know, it should be left to the animals. We just dump it out, at the cemetery, at the old cemetery north of Dewey." Other Delaware explain that the deceased are drawn by the food and may feel that the food was intended for them. If the food is taken out of the cemetery, the food will draw the deceased out of his or her appropriate home in the cemetery and back to the homes of the living. Thus, the Delaware avoid taking food into a cemetery unless it is intended for the graveside feast that takes place during a traditional funeral.

With the exception of salt, food is believed to be particularly enticing to the deceased and should be handed over freely when one is in a cemetery. But it is also intended to be shared with the deceased when consumed at times associated with the

afterlife. If a person is eating food outside after dark, the person will bite off a small piece of food and place it on the ground for the departed. The same is done with a drink. A person will take a small drink and spit it on the ground for the departed. The Delaware believe that one's spirit follows the setting sun to the afterlife and thus the night is associated with the time of the deceased. Food is shared with the departed if consumed after dark in order to appease any potential spirits.

Combining this practice of sharing food with the departed with the fact that there is no Lenape word for "trash," "refuse," "debris," or "waste" adds a more complex meaning to the food remains that are either left at a cemetery or shared after sundown elsewhere (as well as providing interesting avenues for interpreting all of the discarded objects, funerary and non-funerary, that may be left at a Delaware archaeological site). A person can be a wasteful person but using the term "waste" or "trash" as a noun is not something that exists within the Lenape lexicon. All items have a purpose, and for the objects such as food remains or tokens of affection that would be left in a cemetery, spat or left on the ground, they are more appropriately viewed as items that were intentionally placed rather than discarded. Their purpose was to provide nourishment, love and support for the deceased.

The traditional funeral observance is thus an event that is approached and discussed with a careful avoidance and respect and is performed for the purpose of helping the recently departed move from the world of the living into the world of the afterlife. Once escorted through the appropriate observances, the living taking great care to maintain a clear separation between themselves and the departed. To do so may require periodic offerings of food to help nourish and placate the departed, both in a cemetery and at night. With such an approach in mind, along with the understanding

that there is no Lenape concept of "trash," it is more reasonable to view ALL of the items that one may uncover in a past Delaware cemetery as objects that were very likely left behind intentionally and are not viewed as trash or refuse but have a specific purpose. Whether intentionally left or not, the remains found in a cemetery are appropriately believed to remain with the cemetery and the departed. Removing objects from a cemetery, both above and below the surface, is never appropriate because they are not viewed as trash but as objects that now have a funerary intent once they are brought into or left behind in the cemetery or in the presence of the departed.

The NAGPRA regulations clearly establish the definition for a burial site, and given the cultural context of traditional Delaware funerals, it is clear that a cemetery and the graves within it constitute a burial site according to NAGPRA. While a Delaware individual may be placed at the bottom of a grave pit, the burial site is a location that extends beyond the bottom of a pit, and can extend even beyond the grave pit itself according to the regulations. The linguistic evidence does indicate that the cemetery is viewed as a clearly bounded locality that is respectfully avoided. Once the deceased is "put away," speaking the deceased's name and discussing the deceased's funeral is also carefully avoided. The clearly defined cemetery is also a space from which certain objects are not to be removed and certain objects are to remain if they enter thus giving such items a function rather than refuse. From the Delaware perspective, then, a clearly-defined cemetery and the graves within it would constitute a burial site according to the NAGPRA regulations. Such a conclusion is further strengthened by the events that take place at a Delaware funeral, many of which involve keeping the cemetery and the objects in it separate from the world of the living.

Traditional Delaware Funerals: Using Ethnography to identify the objects used as part of a traditional Delaware funeral

An overview of the traditional Delaware funeral provided by modern practitioners will identify those objects that are commonly placed at a burial site and would therefore be classified as funerary objects under NAGPRA. In the following section, we describe the stages of a Delaware funeral with special attention given to those practices that place objects with or near the deceased as part of the traditional death rite. Our review begins with the preparations that are made for the burial, both before and after the deceased has passed. In the second stage, we describe the events that take place while in the presence of the departed ones at the cemetery or burial site. The final stage begins when the living return from the cemetery without the deceased and observe practices that cleanse the world of the living from contact with the deceased and encourage the deceased to move forward to the afterlife. The section concludes with a discussion that identifies those objects that would be classified as funerary objects and those that would be classified as non-funerary objects. Although our focus is on identifying those objects that would be classified as funerary objects and those that would not, the description that follows will identify such objects within the context of the significant events and practices that take place during a traditional Delaware funeral.

Preparations –

Grandma always had an apron on ...

When a person reaches middle age, he or she begins making preparations for their eventual funeral. The living person prepares by first making the traditional clothes in which they will be buried. One does not have to prepare the clothes themselves and may ask someone else to prepare the clothing. Traditional Delaware clothing refers to the Delaware style of eastern woodland ceremonial dress in which there is a men's style and a women's style of dress. Both men and women's clothes are constructed out of a combination of cloth, ribbon and deerhide to which beaded, quill and metal (German silver in most cases) embellishments would be added. The burial clothing may also include metal (German silver and copper), beaded or stone jewelry that would be worn as part of the burial outfit. Some will make traditional clothing for the afterlife while others may choose not to do so. Either way, beaded moccasins are also a part of the burial outfit and today most traditionalists continue to be buried in their Delaware style moccasins even if they choose not to make a traditional burial outfit. Once prepared, the person will wear the clothes at least one time at an event and then store the clothes until they are needed for the funeral. As one man describes,

> It used to be that people would prepare ahead of time, for their funeral. They'd make their burial clothes, they'd have their burial moccasins. And if you attended dances or any kind of public event, you should wear that. Your funeral clothes, at least one time. So you are not putting them on new when you die. And if you don't want to do the traditional clothing, then the thing to do would be to be buried in clothes that you wore every day, you don't go out and buy a new suit or something like that. Because they say if you have all new clothing, the Creator won't recognize you.

A family member or friend should be told where the clothes are stored so that they may be found for the funeral. Those who do not prepare traditional clothing are expected to be clothed in everyday clothing with which they are familiar. Special suits or new clothes are not normally used to dress a person once they have passed as they will be

unfamiliar and uncomfortable with the clothes. As one woman recalled, "Whatever they thought would look good on them. Back when our grandma was buried she wore them old long dresses, skirts and a blouse and an apron. Grandma always had an apron on." Everyday clothing or simply an outfit that the deceased had liked in life are the appropriate burial attire.

[Men and Women's Delaware Dress Picture Here]

When a person passes, a window is opened in the room so the soul can get in and out and make last-minute preparations. The deceased is laid with the head to the east and their feet to the west. As another woman explained,

> the old way that they used to do was that they would bring the body back to the house, and there would be that you had an east window that that body was supposed to lay east. Their head would be at the east. Because they'll never see the sun come up anymore. And that's why they're facing west. ... It's supposed to be, cause you'll never see morning again. So the west would be the last thing they see.

A black handkerchief is then placed on the person's face and all the pictures and mirrors are covered with a sheet (Dean 1984:63-64). The clothing of the deceased is collected into two bundles and tobacco is placed in each bundle in preparation to take to the cemetery. While this is taking place, word is spread of the upcoming funeral and the family identifies two male workers and two female workers to help with the observances. The workers should be friends of the deceased but not relatives. The workers will wash and dress the body in preparation for the burial. The two female workers are responsible for cleaning the deceased's home and cooking the meals for the family.

It is the male workers who are responsible for building the coffin and grave marker. The coffin is a simple plank board box constructed in a three-dimensional rectangular or elongated, body-shaped hexagon using nails to secure the separate boards. Any type of wood can be used other than cedar. Cedar is not appropriate for the coffin or the grave marker for reasons described later. The grave marker is constructed differently for men and women. One vertical board with a diamond cut in the top is used for men while two boards (one vertical and one horizontal) make a cross shaped marker with diamonds cut in the ends for women. As one man described,

> they made a wooden post. And the one for the women folks, they made a cross. It was just a wooden cross. And they'd always paint that cross. If it was a man, he just had a straight post, but on the top they'd cut that out like a diamond. And then they'd paint that diamond. That way they could tell who was buried there, you know, man or woman.

The two boards are attached by nails and the grave marker is either painted at that time or will later be painted at the graveside service in the cemetery. The painting will be abstract and the name or identity of the deceased is not indicated. Only the gender of the deceased is indicated by the type of post used.

[Gravemarker Photograph Here]

The family selects a "speaker" who will pray on behalf for the deceased and officiate the burial ceremony. The speaker must not be related to the deceased and is generally a well-respected individual within the community. The family appoints a person, usually a best friend, who will sit with the deceased at all times until the final interment. It is important that both the speaker and the best friend are not related to

the deceased. The family is grieving and is not expected to carry out many of the tasks in the traditional observance.

Once the preparations are made, the family will hold the funeral service as soon as possible after a person passes. The night before the burial, the family will host an all-night wake. As one man described,

> Oh, the night before the burial, we have what you call a wake, you know. I seen my grandpa and them all done with, with my mom, you know. And they would sit up all night and talk. They'd talk about that person, talk about anything, you know. Funny things, ... and then Uncle John, he'd say the prayer, grandpa would say a prayer. And they'd sit up all night with that person. When the sun comes up, it's over ... Different people would talk about this person, and if you stay there, then at midnight you can go home. Some of them want to stay there. You say your piece to that person.

The wakes used to be held in the deceased person's home but in more recent times, the wake is held at a local funeral home or at the Delaware Tribe's Community Center. Wakes typically begin in the afternoon and last through the entire night, ending when the gathered family and relatives process to the cemetery on the following morning. Wakes provide an opportunity for friends and relatives to visit and comfort one another and pray for the deceased on the night before the interment. Although a pastime known as the "moccasin game" used to be played by those at the wake in the evening, it is no longer practiced. Typically, wakes involve friends and relatives sharing good memories about the deceased and praying for the deceased. At midnight, everyone gathers outside and a rifle is fired. Then, the speaker will pray for the departed and those assembled.

The face of the deceased is then painted with a red paint by the speaker. As one recalls,

> Well, for women it's about a nickel-sized spot on each cheekbone. And for the men it's usually two little stripes back of their eyes. It may be a long time ago that those differ according to clan, I don't know, but the women all I've ever heard of is the spot. And sometimes they'd paint the part [of

> the hair], back about two inches. ... I've heard several people say it's so that when they get to heaven they'll be recognized as Indian, or Delaware.

One dot is placed on each cheek of a woman and lines are traced back from the eye almost to the hairline on a man. The same paint is also sometimes applied to a centerline part in the hair. The Delaware believe that the paint marks one as Delaware and ensures that they will be recognized as such in the afterlife. The painting of the deceased's face at midnight is still practiced by contemporary practitioners.

Following the painting of the face, a midnight meal is served to all in attendance. After the meal, some will stay for the rest of the evening while others may leave and return in the morning. There is no expectation that one must stay through the entire night. Only the best friend is expected to stay with the body through the entire night although the speaker, workers and family do tend to stay with the deceased as well. At daybreak, another rifle shot is fired by the speaker and the women workers begin serving breakfast and gathering up the food that will be taken to the cemetery. The family of the deceased used to provide an animal to butcher (typically a domestic animal such as a hog or a steer) for the graveside feast but more recently, the family will provide the meal at an indoor facility that follows the interment. After everyone has eaten breakfast, those assembled will proceed to the cemetery. When the wakes were held in the home of the deceased, the speaker would lead the procession and the deceased would be at the end of the procession. The local funeral home that now makes the accommodations for the traditional funeral follows this observance and will bring the deceased to the cemetery once everyone has left the funeral home. It is believed that one should not look back during the procession as the spirit will fall behind if they do.

In the presence of the departed

When this sun goes down they go to another world.

It lights up another place.

He's facing that,

he goes down with that.

That's the reason they bury the head to the east ...

Once the deceased arrives at the cemetery, the graveside observances begin. The grave was traditionally hand-dug by the male workers and friends of the deceased. Relatives and children should not take part in digging the grave. Following this tradition, the local funeral home will oversee the digging of the grave in preparation for the graveside service in most cases unless the family requests that the grave be prepared by hand, which happens rarely today. The casket is then placed on supports over the top of, or beside, the grave pit. As one man described the graveside service,

> At the cemetery the casket is placed, with the head to the east, body facing the west, in preparation for its being lowered into the ground. The survivors stand in a line, running east and west, on the south side of the grave, facing north. The preacher, standing at the head facing west, talks to the survivors telling them their loved one is going home and they should be prepared to do the same at any time. He prays for the survivors again at this time. At the close of the prayer, the survivors walk in a clockwise direction around the casket to the preacher and shake hands with him. After all the survivors have done this all others in attendance do the same. At this time a notch is cut with a pocketknife in the southeast corner of the casket, not the lid, in the main part, which allows the spirit to escape as it is not be buried with the body. The casket is then lowered into its final resting place and any possessions of the deceased are placed upon it.
>
> The head of the deceased is placed toward the east. Some say the body faces east

in order to meet the sunrise while others explain that the deceased will never see

morning or dawn again. The speaker then stands at the head of the grave, speaks to those assembled and prays for the bereaved and the deceased. Once finished, the speaker shakes hands with those near him and sits down. Then, the friend who has been with the body all night, speaks to the deceased and encourages the deceased to move on to the afterlife and think of the living no more. Those assembled are then allowed to view the body one last time before it is lowered into the grave. Some families will place a set of everyday clothing in the casket with the deceased. Others will place the set of clothing on top of the casket before lowering it into the grave. Many families will place items that were important to the deceased in the casket. Such items would include mirrors and needles for women and feathers, knives and gourd rattles for men. The casket is then closed and lowered into the grave. Some families will also place a bundle of clothing either on or beside the casket after it has been closed and lowered into the grave. Those assembled will then move in a counter-clockwise motion and sprinkle tobacco, and sometimes earth, on the grave. Then, the male workers and friends return all of the dirt that was removed from the grave back into the grave so that there is a low mound when finished.

The Delaware believe that it is very important to ensure that all of the fill dirt is put back in the grave and that all of the dirt remains in the grave. A commonly-remembered event that many still discuss illustrates the importance of keeping all of the fill dirt in the grave. Adult tribal members recall the collective outrage that developed when a then-rather-popular elected leader took it upon himself to flatten all of the mounds in the Delaware Cemetery so that the cemetery would be more evenly landscaped and thus easier to mow. When word of what he thought was a good deed spread, he was quickly forced to resign his elected position and was never able to

achieve re-election. The fill dirt and the mound it creates is both an offering to the departed and a symbol of their presence. For some families, it is believed that the spirit is still present until the mound flattens naturally. For others, the mound is a lasting memory that the departed was interred according to traditional custom.

In much earlier times, a palisade was sometimes constructed around the mound. Today, what remains of the palisade is the wooden grave marker that is placed at the head of the grave. The plain wooden marker is decorated with four crosses painted in red Indian paint by the speaker or one of the male workers. The Delaware believe that the grave marker, once set in place, is not to be disturbed regardless of what happens. When the wooden marker eventually rots from natural exposure and collapses to the grave it is to not be disturbed and set back into the ground or fixed. The marker is intentionally left on the surface of the grave and will slowly decompose leaving only the iron nails on the surface as an indication of its former presence. The nails are not removed but intentionally left as part of the burial. During the last century most families have also purchased and will place a stone marker behind the wooden marker. The stone markers can be any size, style or color and will be inscribed with the deceased's name and birth and death dates. Modern traditionalists explain that is an adaptation they have chosen so that there is a lasting memorial for the deceased and a way of protecting the grave from potential disturbance in the future as memory fades of the location of the grave.

Once the grave is complete, the graveside feast is held, called "tahkwiphotin." In earlier times, the workers would spread two sheets or tarps at an open space in the cemetery to serve as the tables for the feast. The food brought by the family would be set out on one table and the food brought by the friends would be set out on the other.

The friends would eat the food provided by the family and the family would eat the food brought by the friends. Feast food is handled differently. Salt is never added to feast food as it was believed that salt ruins the taste for those who have departed (Dean 1984: 66). Feast food must also be prepared in a respectful, prayerful way by a clean, virtuous woman. Women who are menstruating are not allowed to handle feast food. At the cemetery, food must be handled and distributed in a respectful way as well.

Before eating, the speaker prays and six large pans are prepared for the two male workers, two female workers, speaker and the best friend who sat all night with the deceased. It is the best friend who "eats" for the deceased. Those assembled then wait until these six have eaten and then everyone else eats. Some families also recall that a very small portion of each type of food in the best friend's pan will be left at the head of the grave for the deceased although this is not generally practiced today. After the ceremony is over, these six are expected to take home what has been given to them which would include the pan and any uneaten food. The graveside feast is no longer held but contemporary funerals will recreate this event at a feast that is held inside, sometimes at the Delaware Tribe's Community Center. The family still provides food as do the non-relatives. The speaker, best friend and workers will eat first and the best friend is believed to "eat" for the deceased, leaving a little on their plate for the deceased when finished.

After the feast, a small fire is made at the head of the grave by either a spouse or a male worker. The fire can be very small, sometimes a collection of matches or small twigs, and is done before everyone leaves the cemetery. The fire is believed to keep the deceased warm and light his or her way to the afterlife. The two clothing bundles prepared before the wake are then given to the workers. If the deceased was a male, one

bundle is given to each male worker. If the deceased was a female, then one bundle is given to each female worker. It is expected that the recipients of the bundle will wear the clothing at least once. The graveside service is completed with the speaker announcing the end of the event and encouraging everyone to stay and visit for awhile and not rush off. Eventually, everyone leaves the cemetery as they wish and some remember that it was not appropriate to look back toward the cemetery after departing or it may encourage the deceased to follow.

Returning without the departed

After they're buried there, you know, we don't bother them anymore. We have our feast at our own home.

When everyone has left the cemetery and those assembled have returned home, the house of the deceased in cleansed with red cedar smoke. Red cedar leaves are sprinkled on hot coals that are smoldering in a pan or small pot, and a person will use an eagle fan to spread the rising cedar smoke to all areas of the interior of the house. The same will be done around the outside of the home and any items of the deceased that were kept as keepsakes by friends and relatives. Everyone who attended a funeral will cleanse themselves and everything they wore to the funeral with cedar smoke, by using either a fan or wafting the smoke with their hands. It is important to only use cedar once someone has returned home because cedar is not to be used at the cemetery. Cedar purifies the living space and returns the home to the living and separates it from the now-departed person.

For the next three days, someone is expected to return to the grave and light a small fire at the head of the grave, making a total of four fires at the head of the grave. Some families will also leave a small plate of food at the grave or eat the small plate of food at the head of the grave for the deceased. This can be done by a family member, one of the male workers, or the best friend. After the third day, it is believed by some that the deceased has begun the journey to the afterlife. According to Munsee tradition, the soul of the departed remains with the living for twelve days. Some Munsee descended families will thus hold a feast in the deceased person's home on the twelfth day after the person's death.

The family remains in mourning for one year following a relative's death. The family either remains at home or limits their travel to that which is necessary. The family members do not fully participate in social or ceremonial events during the year of mourning. They may attend such events but do not dance, sing or dress for the occasion. At the close of the year, the family may choose to hold a memorial feast for the deceased called a "Wihunge." If someone chooses to hold a memorial feast, then they are obligated to hold one every year for the rest of their life. The family of the individual who chooses to hold the feast is not obligated to continue the feast after the individual who choose to hold the feast has passed. The family hosting the feast will prepare all the foods that the deceased had liked and invite friends and relatives. The night before the feast, all of the food is placed in large pans, wrapped with tea towels and hung outside. The person holding the feast then prays and explains that the food is for those who have been put away. On the next morning, a tarp is placed on the floor in the home and the pans of food are unwrapped and set out for the invited quests. The host will then pray and explain that the food is for the departed and that the guests are eating for the

departed as was done at the graveside feast. One non-relative is chosen to eat for the deceased person in whose honor the feast is being held. Everyone will then eat and is encouraged to take food home with them when they are finished.

The observances carried out at the close of a traditional funeral thus mark the passage of the deceased to the afterlife where the deceased is encouraged to remain. A clear boundary is re-drawn at this time between the cemetery as the place for the deceased, and the home as the place for the living. As friends and relatives depart after putting away a loved one, they say their final farewells and will resume once again the respectful avoidance of the deceased and the cemetery space within which the departed are to remain.

Funerary Objects

From an overview of a traditional Delaware funeral, it is possible to identify those objects used during the event that would be considered funerary objects if they can be shown to have been removed from a Delaware cemetery. Remaining consistent with the three stages identified above, the objects are listed below according to the stages of the ceremony during which the objects were used. From such a list, we can identify the organic and inorganic elements of the objects and determine the location of such objects in association with the human remains or in the association with the grave filling event.

From this list, we can begin to also see how the ritual function of an object found in a Delaware grave can be determined from the depositional event from which it was recovered.

The objects used in preparation of the burial were intended to mark the individual as one who is leaving the world of the living to enter the afterlife. Such items serve to separate the deceased from their former lives. The burial clothing and the coffin are two items that are prepared to adorn and house the individual human remains in the afterlife. Although cloth, ribbon, hide and wood do not generally preserve in prehistoric burial contexts affiliated with the Delaware, it is not uncommon to find such 1) organic remains (cloth, ribbon, hide and wood) in association with Delaware affiliated remains from the historic period (17th century to the present). Beyond such organic elements, the burial clothing does include inorganic items that would preserve in prehistoric and historic contexts. Such items would include 2) the bead and metal embellishments on the cloths and moccasins, 3) the beaded, metal and stone jewelry worn along with the burial outfit and 4) the metal nails used in construction of the coffin. The red paint applied to the face is a third item used to identify the deceased as a Delaware in preparation for the afterlife. The red paint is made from crushed red ochre and the durable remains of the painting would appear archaeologically as 5) red ochre stains. Finally, tokens of affection including mirrors, knives, jewelry, household utensils and items, gourd rattles and feathers are placed with the deceased while the coffin is still open. These objects are made of 6) organic and inorganic materials such as metal, glass, beads, ceramic and stone. Since the burial outfit, jewelry and red ochre paint are worn by the deceased when buried and the deceased and tokens of affection are placed inside the coffin, the organic and durable objects associated with each (1-6) would be found in direct association or contact with the human remains, or at the bottom of a burial pit if the human remains did not preserve.

While such objects were used to prepare the individual for the afterlife, other objects were used in the presence of the departed at the cemetery and were either intended to aid the individual on their journey to the afterlife or mark the liminal nature of the deceased as the transition to the afterlife is made. The east-west oriented grave is first prepared intentionally so that the deceased will follow the setting sun to the afterlife. Once the deceased is lowered into the grave, objects such as additional clothing and tokens of affection are first either placed on top of the coffin or tucked in beside the coffin. Although the organic objects would not likely preserve outside of the coffin, the inorganic elements would again include 7) the beaded and metal embellishments from the clothing and 8) any stone, ceramic or glass implements left for the deceased. After the deceased is lowered into the grave, the congregants will also sprinkle a mixture of earth from the grave fill and tobacco into the grave as they make their final pass around the grave. Once everyone has left the graveside, non-family participants assist in ensuring that every bit of grave fill is returned to the grave pit. Given the importance that the Delaware place on ensuring that all of the grave fill remains with the grave, 9) soil from the grave fill and any organic and inorganic object that is found in the grave fill would be considered a funerary object regardless of its relative proximity to actual human remains. The wooden grave marker is also placed at the head of the grave while the grave fill is being returned to the grave. The wood remains from the grave maker could be found throughout the entirety of the grave pit since the bottom of the marker is placed at the bottom of the grave shaft. 10) The wood remains and the red ochre stains along with the metal nails used to make a female grave marker would also be included as a funerary object although the wood would be more likely to be found in association with historic graves. Once the grave is filled in and the

marker is set, the remains from the small fire and food offering made at the head of the grave are the last objects used in the presence of the departed. The remains from this final event would include 11) charcoal stains along with animal bones and ceramic remains from the food offering that is sometimes shared as well. Since the objects that are used in the presence of the departed are deposited into the grave as part of the grave filling event that takes place after the closed coffin has been placed in the grave, then the organic and inorganic objects associated with this stage (6-11) would be found mixed in the grave fill or on the surface of grave pit. Even if the human remains did not preserve, such objects would be found in the fill and/or on the surface of a pit. Some of this material would aslo be deposited, and possibly left, outside of grave pit fill yet within the confines of the cemetery, and even the material that was once in the grave fill could be scattered because of natural taphonomic processes and thus found archaeologically in the surrounding soils.

[Wappwallopen Wooden Grave Marker Here]

NAGPRA also identifies certain objects as associated funerary objects even if they are not recovered from a burial site. According to NAGPRA, funerary objects can also be "objects that were made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains." This stipulation adds items that were exclusively made for a burial without a further requirement that they were once placed "with or near" human remains. Such items that fall under this NAGPRA definition for that the Delaware exclusively make for burial purposes or to contain human remains would include the coffin, one's burial outfit and moccasins, and the grave marker. The remains of those objects would be 1) the organic

remains (cloth, ribbon, hide and wood) from the burial outfit, moccasins and coffin, 2) the bead and metal embellishments from the burial clothes and moccasins, 3) the beaded, metal and stone jewelry worn along with the burial outfit and 4) the metal nails used in construction of the coffin. 10) The wood remains and red ochre stains along with the metal nails used to make a female grave marker would also be an associated funerary object that was made exclusively for burial purposes. If it can be demonstrated that such objects were once used in the construction of a coffin or a grave marker or were once part of a burial outfit, then such objects are funerary objects even if they were not found at the burial site.

Non-Funerary Objects

While the NAGPRA definition for funerary objects includes a number of potential items, the regulations do exclude certain items that were used in a mortuary context from being classified as funerary objects. Potential funerary objects that would be considered non-funerary objects under NAGPRA would include the organic and inorganic objects that were used in a Delaware funeral but would not be found at a burial site (12-14), were offerings to the deceased but were not used as part of the death rite or ceremony (15-16), or were distributed or used to distribute to others as part of the death rite or ceremony (17-19). These three categories of non-funerary items and the objects associated with the traditional Delaware funeral that would fall under each category are identified below.

Certain objects would be used in a traditional Delaware funeral but would not classified as funerary objects because they were not recovered from a NAGPRA defined

burial site. Several items are used throughout the traditional service that are not typically deposited with the deceased at the burial site but remain in the home after the deceased is escorted to the cemetery. Other items are used only in the home or elsewhere following the graveside service. During the wake, the face of the deceased will be covered with a black handkerchief and the windows and mirrors are covered with sheets. During the wake, a rifle is fired at midnight and at daybreak. The (12) cloth remains from the handkerchief and the sheets as well as the bullet from the rifle shot are not taken to the cemetery and placed with the deceased. Since these items remain in the home, they are not considered funerary objects under NAGPRA even though they are used as part of the traditional rite. Similarly, the remains from the cedar smoking event that takes place in the homes of the deceased and those who attended the funeral would not be considered funerary objects either. The (13) charcoal stained iron or ceramic pot and the remains of the eagle feather fan are not taken to the cemetery and thus are not classified as funerary objects.

Feasting among the family and friends plays a central role throughout the traditional funeral. Large feasts are held both during the wake before the interment and at certain prescribed times following the graveside service. In modern times feasts may be held at the home of the deceased or at a special ceremonial place such as the tribal community center. Munsee descended families hold a feast at their home twelve days after the burial while other families elect to hold an annual memorial feast in remembrance of the deceased. The remains from such feasting and food sharing events, in a prehistoric context, could range in size from (14) a concentration of charcoal, ceramic and food remains at or near a residence or domestic space to a very large-scale midden deposition. Regardless, the remains from such feasting events would not be

considered funerary objects under NAGPRA though because such remains represented a feasting event that did not take place at a burial site.

NAGPRA would also exclude the remains from any food that was shared with the departed during one's visit to the cemetery after the death rite is complete from being classified as funerary objects. Portions of such (15) food remains that are left in the cemetery for the departed outside of the ceremony are not considered funerary objects. Although such remains would be found in a clearly defined cemetery and were left intentionally for the departed, such remains would not be considered funerary objects because they were not placed there as part of the death rite or ceremony. Additionally, any (16) food remains that were shared with the departed outside of the cemetery would not be considered funerary objects because they would not have been placed in a NAGPRA defined burial site and did not take place during the death rite. Even though the food remains were intentionally placed for the deceased, they were not used as part of the traditional ceremony and not placed in a burial site and therefore would not meet the NAGPRA regulations for a funerary object.

NAGPRA also excludes items that were used as part of the death rite but were not intended for the deceased, such as items distributed to others during the death rite. As the regulations state, "objects that were displayed with individual human remains as part of a death rite or ceremony of a culture and subsequently returned or distributed according to traditional custom to living descendants or other individuals are not considered unassociated funerary objects." According to this exclusion, we can identify those objects associated with feasting that were used in the traditional Delaware funeral but were subsequently distributed according to traditional custom. The graveside feast that was held after the grave was filled in was typically held on an open spot near the

grave but within the boundaries of the cemetery itself. The remains from this graveside feast would consist of (17) a concentration of charcoal, ceramic and food remains located near a grave or within the boundaries of a clearly defined cemetery. Although the remains from the graveside feast would be located in a NAGPRA defined burial site, the remains from such a feasting event would not be considered funerary objects under NAGPRA because such remains were intended to be distributed to other individuals as part of the Delaware funeral. Although the best friend is expected to "eat for" the deceased, all of the food that remains after everyone has eaten is bundled up into six parts and given to the four workers, best friend, and the speaker to take home. The (18) food, metal and ceramic remains from such distributed bundles would also not be considered funerary objects. Additionally the two clothing bundles that are prepared during the wake and taken to the cemetery are subsequently distributed to two workers at the end of the graveside feast. The (19) cloth and tobacco remains from the clothing bundles would also not be considered funerary objects because they were distributed to others as part of the ceremony.

Delaware Ethnography and NAGPRA: Conclusions and Recommendations

Linguistic and ethnographic evidence on traditional Delaware mortuary beliefs and practices as well as the traditional death rite provide important lines of evidence for documenting funerary objects under NAGPRA. Applying the NAGPRA definitions in light of the provided linguistic and ethnographic descriptions, we have identified what constitutes a burial site from the Delaware cultural perspective as well as the objects that should be legally classified as funerary objects under NAGPRA. According to

modern practitioners, a Delaware burial site consists of a clearly defined cemetery and the graves within it. The funerary objects that would be found at such a defined burial site are those objects that are reasonably believed to have been placed "with or near" human remains "as part of a death rite or ceremony." Our research demonstrates that the organic and inorganic objects that are found in direct association with human remains or are recovered from the grave, the grave fill and the grave surface are legally classified as funerary objects under NAGPRA because they were placed with individual human remains as part of a traditional Delaware funeral. While identifying the funerary objects, we have also identified those objects that would not be considered funerary objects even though they were used as part of the traditional death rite or were intentionally placed with individual human remains. Such work will provide museums with the appropriate guidance for documenting Delaware affiliated funerary objects in their collections while also documenting the continued practice of the traditional Delaware funeral by modern day practitioners. Adding ethnographic data obtained through ongoing tribal consultation efforts into consideration provides an invaluable resource for determining Delaware funerary objects according to the NAGPRA definitions that may otherwise be overlooked in museum documentation efforts.

While this work has added to our understanding of traditional Delaware funerals and the funerary objects that are used, we have also identified some potential difficulties that may arise in the documentation process, which is often reliant on the limited information provided in museum and excavation records. One question that remains is how to identify the boundaries of a clearly defined cemetery in the absence of historical records. Excavation records can be useful in providing the provenience of an object in relation to individual human remains but it is uncertain at this point if we can

confidently identify the boundaries of an unrecorded cemetery using archaeological methods alone. Protohistoric and historic-period sites, in our limited experience, seem to contain clusters of burials that suggest a delineated cemetery space, but because many of the sites were salvaged by test pitting and/or bulldozer scraping, it is not always clear whether the edges of these clusters can be delineated.[9] However, we are not aware of any such sites that show evidence for ephemeral features such as postmolds from a surrounding fence. Moreover, the boundaries of some Delaware cemeteries may be even more difficult to determine if the cemetery spaces and graves are (or may be) mixed with previous or subsequent occupations and residential areas. If clearly defined cemeteries do not appear in the archaeological record until relatively late, the problem of identifying a "burial site" associated with an individual burial becomes correspondingly more complicated.

A second question that remains is how to separate the different mortuary intents of feasting and food sharing in the archaeological record. We have identified a variety of feasting and food sharing events that take place at a burial site and beyond both as part of the traditional funeral and outside of the ritual. Under NAGPRA, it is true that the remains of most of this feasting and food sharing activity are not classified as funerary objects because the food was not placed in a burial site, was not placed as part of a death rite, or was intended to be distributed to others. Nonetheless, if one could identify this food-sharing area and separate it from food consumption and discard in "normal" living spaces, it would go a long way to helping to understand the spatial limits of the death rite itself in prehistoric times. Even if these objects are not repatriatable under

---

9 Sites that we have investigated containing what seem to be well-defined cemetery areas include Wapwallopen (36Lu43, 1744-1755 [McIntyre 1978]), Overpeck (36Bu5, ca. AD 1550 [Forks of the Delaware Chapter 14 1980]), and Montgomery (36Ch60, 1700-1733 [Becker 1978]).

NAGPRA, it would be valuable to see if one could delineate a "sacred space" around these earlier grave pits. Doing so would allow for an analysis of the types of objects that are recovered from such identified "sacred spaces," in the hopes of seeing whether there are yet-to-be-indentified mortuary items that are most often associated with such locals.

Under NAGPRA, it appears that only those food remains left at the head of the grave as part of the death rite can be rightfully claimed as funerary objects. It may be possible to use museum and excavation records to potentially segregate the food remains left at the head of the grave from those remains associated with the graveside feast and/or those remains that were placed in the burial site at a time outside of the actual death rite. Although answering such questions would be extremely useful for identifying Delaware burial sites and documenting the function of food remains at such sites, it remains to be seen if such concerns can be addressed using the limited information available.

Acknowledgments

Special gratitude is extended to Chief Paula Pechonick and the Delaware Tribe of Indians for providing the space and opportunity to carry out this important research. Thank you to the many tribal members and friends who were willing to contribute their knowledge about, and experiences at, traditional Delaware funerals. Further thanks are due to several archaeologists and students of the prehistoric Lenape in their original homeland, including Jay Custer, Michael Stewart, Greg Lattanzi, Eric Hollinger, and Dustin Cushman. This work also benefited immensely from the advice and counsel of Jim Rementer whose experience at over 100 traditional funerals combined with a life-long study of the traditional language was invaluable for this report. Special recognition

is also extended to Greg Brown, who oversaw or completed the transcriptions for this report, reviewed earlier drafts of this report and helped to compile much of the published and unpublished literature and interviews on traditional Delaware funerals. Sabbatical leave awarded by Emporia State University in the Fall 2011 semester allowed for the time and additional support to complete this report. Portions of this manuscript were presented at the 2011 Plains Anthropological Conference and the 2012 Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference.

References Cited

Becker, Marshall J.

1978 Montgomery Site 36Ch60—Late Contact Lenape (Delaware) Site in Wallace Township, Chester Co. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission Manuscript #7. Manuscript on file, State Museum of Pennsylvania.

Clark, Charles C. and Jay F. Custer

2003 Rethinking Delaware Archaeology: A Beginning. North American Archaeologist 24(1):29-82.

Dean, Nora Thompson

n.d. Death and Dying Seminar, Univ. of Missouri, 22 April 1975. Transcription in the Author's Possession.

1984 Lenape Funeral Customs. In *A Delaware Indian Symposium*, edited by Herbert C. Kraft, pp. 63-70. Anthropological Series Number 4, The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.

Forks of the Delaware Chapter 14

1980 The Overpeck Site. Pennsylvania Archaeologist 50(3):1-46.

Harrington, M.R.

1913 A Preliminary Sketch of Lenape Culture. *American Anthropologist* 15(2):208-235.

Kinietz, Vernon

1946 Delaware Culture Chronology. Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.

McIntyre, Jamie

1978 The Knouse Site: An Historical Site in Luzerne Co., Pa. Manuscript on file, State Museum of Pennsylvania.

Michelson, Truman

1912 Ethnological and Linguistic Field Notes from the Munsee in Kansas and the Delaware in Oklahoma. Manuscript 2776, National Anthropological Archives, Washington DC. Smithsonian Institution.

Obermeyer, Brice

2007 Salvaging the Delaware Big House Ceremony: The History and Legacy of Frank Speck's Collaboration with the Oklahoma Delaware. *In* Histories of Anthropology Annual, Vol. 3. Regna Darnell and Frederic Gleach, eds. Pp. 184-198. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

2009a Delaware Tribe in a Cherokee Nation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

2009b Delaware Country: Landscape, Identity, and Politics in an Oklahoma Indian Tribe. Plains Anthropologist 54(211):181-199

Sieg, Lauren

2008 Assessment of Cultural Affiliation of Human Remains and Funerary Objects from the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area: Bushkill, PA and Ethnography Program, Northeast Region: Boston, MA.

Speck, Frank G.

1937 Oklahoma Delaware Ceremonies, Feasts and Dances. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 7. The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

Voegelin, Erminie W.

1944 Mortuary Customs of the Shawnee and Other Eastern Tribes. Indiana

Historical Society Prehistory Research Series 2(4), pp. 227-444. Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.

Weslager, Clinton Alfred

1972 The Delaware Indians: A History. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

DRAFT

Deliverable C

The revised Notices of Inventory Completion that will be submitted by the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry

Delaware Tribe of Indians

June 20, 2012

Sherry Hutt, Program Manager
National NAGPRA Program
National Park Service
1201 Eye Street, NW (8TH floor)
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Dr. Hutt:

Enclosed please find two correction notices for culturally affiliated human remains and funerary objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania. These corrections update the lists of culturally affiliated groups in four previous notices: *Notice of Inventory Completion* (FR Doc. E7-14625, July 30, 2007); *Correction to Notice of Inventory Completion* (FR Doc E8-23694, October 7, 2008); *Notice of Intent to Repatriate* (FR Doc. E7-14578, July 30, 2007); and *Correction to Notice of Intent to Repatriate* (FR Doc. E8-23696, October 7, 2008). The Correction Notices submitted here reflect the restoration of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma's Tribal status in 2009. At the request of the Tribe, we write to add the Tribe to the culturally affiliated groups in the above notices. Below we summarize the details of the notices, the changes in Tribe status, and the consultation which results in this request for correction.

In the "Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs" list published in the Federal Register on August 11, 2009 (FR Doc. E9-19124), it is announced that the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma reestablished direct government-to-government relations with the United States through its reorganization under the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act and pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement between it and the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma. The previously published notices listed the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma to act on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma. The Correction notices replace the "Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma" with "Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma" in the list of culturally affiliated groups.

Human remains and funerary objects listed in these notices were reported in *Inventory of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania* and *Report on Unassociated Funerary Objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania*, submitted to the National NAGPRA Program on April 29, 1999. Addenda to the *Inventory of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania* and *Report on Unassociated Funerary Objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania* were subsequently submitted on June 15, 2007.

In the initial *Inventory of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania* and *Report on Unassociated Funerary Objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania* submitted to the National Park Service in 1999, the Peabody Museum determined cultural affiliation to the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma and Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma (the Stockbridge Munsee Community was added in 2008 after subsequent consultations).

However, at the time of the publication of the first *Notice of Inventory Completion* (FR Doc. E7-14625, July 30, 2007) and *Notice of Intent to Repatriate* (FR Doc. E7-14578, July 30, 2007), the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma's Federal recognition status had been overturned and the Tribe became part of the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma. In 2007, after consulting with the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma, and staff at the National NAGPRA Program, the Peabody Museum revised the cultural affiliation to list the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma to act on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma.

In 2011, the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma and the Peabody Museum conducted consultations under a National NAGPRA consultation grant obtained by the former. The Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma requested that its status of federal recognition be acknowledged through correction notices for the collections listed above. In an email dated April 2, 2012, the Cherokee Nation supported the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma's aim to represent itself in the repatriation of these collections.

Electronic copies of the notices will be sent to National NAGPRA via email. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Sandra Dong
NAGPRA Coordinator
(617) 495-9588 (voice)
(617) 495-7535 (fax)
sdong@fas.harvard.edu

Enclosures

Cc: Richard L. Allen, NAGPRA Contact, Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma
Tamara Francis, NAGPRA Contact, Delaware Nation of Oklahoma
Brice Obermeyer, NAGPRA Contact, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma
Sherry White, NAGPRA Contact, Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; Correction

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003, of the completion of an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects in the possession of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. The human remains and associated funerary objects were removed from Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer Counties, NJ, and Chester County, PA.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

This notice corrects the culturally affiliated groups listed in a Notice of Inventory Completion published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 72, No. 145, pages 41524-41525, July 30, 2007) and a Correction to Notice of Inventory Completion published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 73, No. 195, pages 58625-58626, October 7, 2008), by replacing "the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma" with "the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma." After publication of the notices cited above, the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma regained Federal Recognition as an Indian Entity according to the "Notice of Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs" published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 74, No. 153, pages 40218-40219, August 11, 2009). Thus, the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma no longer requires the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma to act on its behalf. Based on the restoration of Federal recognition, officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology have determined that there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Delaware people (from Middle Woodland through Historic period) and the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

In the **Federal Register** Vol. 73, No. 195, pages 58625-58626, October 7, 2008, paragraph numbers 5-7 are corrected by substituting the following paragraphs:

Officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (9-10), the human remains described above represent the physical remains of 19 individuals of Native American ancestry. Officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology also have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (3)(A), the 16 objects described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony. Lastly, officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects and the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Patricia Capone, Repatriation Coordinator, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, telephone (617) 496-3702, before [*insert date 30 days following publication in the* **Federal Register**]. Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects to the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology is responsible for notifying the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin that this notice has been published.

Dated:

Sherry Hutt,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Delaware Tribe of Indians

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; Correction

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003, of the intent to repatriate cultural items in the possession of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA that meet the definition of "unassociated funerary objects" under 25 U.S.C. 3001.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

This notice corrects the culturally affiliated groups listed in Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 72, No. 145, pages 41522-41524, July 30, 2007) and a Correction to Notice of Intent to Repatriate published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 73, No. 195, pages 58619-58620, October 7, 2008), by replacing "the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma" with "the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma." After publication of the notices cited above, the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma regained Recognition as an Indian Entity according to the "Notice of Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs" published in the **Federal Register** (Vol. 74, No. 153, pages 40218-40219, August 11, 2009). Thus, the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma no longer requires the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma to act on its behalf. Based on the restoration of Federal recognition, officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology have determined that there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Delaware people (from Middle Woodland through Historic period) and the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

In the **Federal Register** Vol. 73, No. 195, pages 58619-58620, October 7, 2008, paragraph numbers 5-7 are corrected by substituting the following paragraph:

Officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (3)(B), the 39 cultural items described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony and are believed, by a preponderance of the evidence, to have been removed from specific burial sites of Native American individuals. Officials of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology also have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the unassociated funerary objects and the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the unassociated funerary objects should contact Patricia Capone, Repatriation Coordinator, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, telephone (617) 496-3702, before [*insert date 30 days following publication in the* **Federal Register**]. Repatriation of the unassociated funerary objects to the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology is responsible for notifying the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin that this notice has been published.

Dated:

Sherry Hutt,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Inventory Completion: New York University College of Dentistry, New York, NY; Correction

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003, of the completion of an inventory of human remains in the control of the New York University College of Dentistry, New York, NY. The human remains were removed from Bronx County, New York.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

This notice corrects the name a culturally affiliated tribe. The tribe became known as the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma after federal recognition was restored on July 28, 2009, after the Notice of Inventory Completion was signed by the National NAGPRA Program, but before Notice was published in the Federal Register.

In the Federal Register (Vol. 74, No. 160, pp. 42106–7, August 20, 2009, paragraph number 5 is corrected by substituting the following paragraph:

Museum of the American Indian records identify the locality of origin of the remains as "Aboriginal burial, Broadway and Isham Streets, New York City." This location is in present-day Inwood, on the island of Manhattan, New York City, Bronx County. The cranial morphology of the human remains is consistent with an individual of Native American ancestry. Objects found at the Broadway and Isham Street location, but not in the museum's collection, suggest that the site dates to the late Late Woodland,

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Protohistoric or early Historic periods, AD 1400–1650. The Inwood area is documented historically, archaeologically and by tribal traditions as the territory of the Munsee Delaware-speaking people since at least the Late Woodland period. Manhattan was largely vacated by the Munsee during the late 17th and early 18th centuries, and the Munsee of Manhattan joined other Munsee communities to their north and west. Some Munsee people became part of the Stockbridge community that eventually settled in Wisconsin. Today, their descendants are members of the Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin. Other Munsee were integrated into Unami Delaware-speaking groups who moved through the Midwest and/or Texas before settling on reservation land in Oklahoma. Today, these groups are known as the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma. Consultation evidence supports the identification of remains from the Broadway and Isham Streets site as Munsee and the cultural affiliation of the remains as the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma, and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

In the Federal Register (Vol. 74, No. 160, pp. 42106–7, August 20, 2009, paragraph number 6 is corrected by substituting the following paragraph:

Officials of New York University College of Dentistry have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (9-10), the human remains described above represent the physical remains of one individual of Native American ancestry. Officials of New York University College of Dentistry have also determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Native American human remains and the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma, and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

In the Federal Register (Vol. 74, No. 160, pp. 42106–7, August 20, 2009, paragraph number 7 is corrected by substituting the following paragraph:

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the human remains should contact Dr. Louis Terracio, New York University College of Dentistry, 345 East 24th St, New York, New York, 10010, telephone 212-998-9917, before September 21, 2009. Repatriation of the human remains to the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of the Indians, Oklahoma, and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin, may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

In the Federal Register (Vol. 74, No. 160, pp. 42106–7, August 20, 2009, paragraph number 8 is corrected by substituting the following paragraph:

The New York University College of Dentistry is responsible for notifying the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma, and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin, that this notice has been published.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the human remains should contact Dr. Louis Terracio, New York University College of Dentistry, 345 East 24th St, New York, New York, 10010, telephone 212-998-9917, before [*insert date 30 days following publication in the* **Federal Register**] *(Federal Register calculates this date).* Repatriation of the human remains to the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of the Indians, Oklahoma, and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin, may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The New York University College of Dentistry is responsible for notifying the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma, and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin, that this notice has been published.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

ORIGINAL 2000 NOTICE

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects in the Possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA

AGENCY: National Park Service

ACTION: Notice

Notice is hereby given in accordance with provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 43 CFR 10.9, of the completion of an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects in the possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 43 CFR 10.2 (c). The determinations within this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of these Native American human remains and associated funerary objects. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations within this notice.

[[Page 64233]]

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by The State Museum of Pennsylvania professional staff in consultation with representatives of the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma (formerly Delaware Tribe of Western Oklahoma); and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma.

At an unknown date, human remains representing six individuals were removed during excavations at the Overpeck Site (36Bu5), Bridgeton Township, Bucks County, PA by William Strohmeir and Elmer Erb. In 1983, remains representing one of these individuals were donated to The State Museum of Pennsylvania by Mr. Strohmeir. Remains representing four of these individuals were donated to the museum by Mr. Erb the same year. In 1986, the Society of Pennsylvania Archaeologists purchased the last set of these remains from the estate of Mr. Erb and donated them to The State Museum of Pennsylvania. No known individuals were identified. No associated funerary objects are present.

Previous archeological investigations at the Overpeck Site identified 15th century proto-historic pottery styles characteristic of the Lenape (Delaware). Ethnohistorical accounts also place Lenape bands in the vicinity of the site during the early Colonial Period. There is no evidence to contradict this.

In 1978, human remains representing 15 individuals and 2,206 associated funerary objects were removed during excavations at the Montgomery Site

Delaware Tribe of Indians

(36Ch60), Wallace Township, Chester County, PA by Dr. Marshall Becker, West Chester University. Dr. Becker donated the remains and objects to The State Museum of Pennsylvania the same year. No known individuals were identified. The associated funerary objects include animal bone fragments; glass, seed, and wampum beads; brass bells; buckskin fragments; charcoal fragments; clothing fasteners; brass, silver, and iron buckles; copper and pewter buttons; glass bottle fragments; iron tools; coffin and regular nails; miscellaneous brass fragments; hinges; miscellaneous seeds and nuts; a pewter pipe; a stone scraper; fabric fragments; a thimble; unidentified organic material; and wood fragments.

The Euroamerican assemblage of objects dates the burials to the 18th century. Oral tradition, and ethnohistorical and archeological evidence place a ``Brandywine Band'' of the Lenape (Delaware) at the site circa A.D. 1730. There is no evidence to contradict this.

In 1976, human remains representing one individual were removed from the Printz Park Site (36De3), Tinicum Township, Delaware County, PA by Dr. Marshall Becker, West Chester University, while under contract to The State Museum of Pennsylvania. No known individual was identified. No associated funerary objects are present.

Ethnohistoric evidence and archeological evidence indicate that the remains most likely are associated with a protohistoric Lenape (Delaware) occupation, circa A.D. 1500 at the Prinz Park Site. There is no evidence to contradict this.

At an unknown date, human remains and funerary objects were removed from the Chambers Site (36 Lr11), Union Township, Lawrence County, PA by John A. Zukcia. In 1968, The State Museum of Pennsylvania purchased human remains representing eight of these individuals from Mr. Zukcia. No known individuals were identified. The State Museum of Pennsylvania also purchased 5,128 funerary objects removed during the same excavations at the Chambers Site. A total of 2,116 objects were associated with the 8 burials in the possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania. The remainder of the purchased objects are associated with burials currently in the possession of the Carnegie Museum, Pittsburg, PA. The associated funerary objects include brass, seed, glass, shell, and silver beads; brass bells; a brass kettle; buckskin fragments; iron buckles; brass, silver, and wood buttons; gun parts; Euroamerican ceramics; iron tools; knife blade fragments, box fragments; coffin and regular nails; hinges; leather fragments; charred maize cobs; mirror fragments; bracelets; danglers; brooches; rings; earrings; cufflinks; pendants; spoons; strike-a-lights; thimbles; textiles; wampum belt fragments; and wood fragments.

The Euroamerican assemblage of objects associated with the human remains dates the burials to the 18th century. Ethnohistoric and documentary evidence identify the Chambers Site as a Lenape (Delaware) occupation dating to A.D. 1763-1776. There is no evidence to contradict this.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

In 1978, human remains representing 28 individuals and 11,097 associated funerary objects were removed during excavations at the Wapwallopen Site (also known as the Knouse Site) (36 Lu43), Conyngham Township, Luzerne County, PA by The State Museum of Pennsylvania staff. No known individuals were identified. The objects include seed and glass beads; brass bell; buttons; a projectile point; brick fragments; charcoal fragments; gun parts; coffin nails; mirror fragments; miscellaneous objects made from iron, brass, and leather; seeds and nuts; medallions; jinglers; chain fragments; a bracelet; rings; spirals; silver brooch; shell pendant; kaolin and calumet pipes; stone tools; brass thimble; unidentified organic material; unidentified pottery sherds; a brass box; a whetstone; and wood coffin fragments.

The Euroamerican assemblage of objects found with the human remains dates the burials to the 18th century. Ethnohistorical evidence and documentary evidence identify the Wapwallopen Site as a Lenape (Delaware) occupation dating to A.D. 1744-1755. There is no evidence to contradict this.

Based on the above-mentioned information, officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania have determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.2 (d)(1), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of 58 individuals of Native American ancestry. Officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania also have determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.2 (d)(2), the 18,431 objects listed above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony. Lastly, officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania have determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.2 (e), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between these Native American human remains and associated funerary objects and the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma.

This notice has been sent to officials of the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma. Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Stephen G. Warfel, Senior Curator, Archaeology, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, 300 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120- 0024, telephone (717) 783-2887, before November 27, 2000. Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects to the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: October 16, 2000.

John Robbins,

Assistant Director, Cultural Resources Stewardship and Partnerships.

[FR Doc. 00-27395 Filed 10-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

Delaware Tribe of Indians

CORRECTION OF DELAWARE TRIBE DESIGNATION

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects in the Possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg; Correction

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003, of the completion of an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects in the possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA. The human remains and associated funerary objects were removed from Bucks, Chester, Delaware, awrence, and Luzerne Counties, PA.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

This notice corrects the identity of consulting parties and cultural affiliation in a Notice of Inventory Completion previously published in the Federal Register on October 26, 2000 (FR Doc 00-27395, pages 64232-64233) and corrected in the Federal Register on September 25, 2007 (FR Doc E7-21364, page 61672). The correction is the replacement of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma for the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma due to the former group's re-recognization of standing as a NAGPRA entity in 2009.

In the Federal Register of October 26, 2000, paragraph number 3 is corrected by substituting the following paragraph:

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by The State Museum of Pennsylvania professional staff in consultation with representatives of the Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

In the Federal Register of October 26, 2000, paragraph numbers 14 and 15 are corrected by substituting the following paragraphs:

Officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (9-10), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of 59 individuals of Native American ancestry. Officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania also have determined that, pursuant to 25

Delaware Tribe of Indians

U.S.C. 3001 (3)(A), the 18,487 objects described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony. Lastly, officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects and the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Janet L. Johnson, Curator, The State Museum of Pennsylvania, 300 North Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120-0024, telephone (717) 705-0869, before ***. Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects to the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The State Museum of Pennsylvania is responsible for notifying the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin that this notice has been published.

Dated: ***.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

CORRECTION OF NUMBERS FOR WAPWALLOPEN

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects in the Possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg; Correction

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003, of the completion of an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects in the possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA. The human remains and associated funerary objects were removed from Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Lawrence, and Luzerne Counties, PA.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

This notice corrects the inventory summary in a Notice of Inventory Completion previously published in the Federal Register on October 26, 2000 (FR Doc 00-27395, pages 64232-64233) and corrected in the Federal Register on September 25, 2007 (FR Doc E7-21364, page 61672). The correction is of numbers from the Wapwallopen Site (also known as the Knouse Site) (36 Lu43), Conyngham Township, Luzerne County, PA by the addition of one individual and 53 associated funerary objects.

In the Federal Register of October 26, 2000, paragraph numbers 12 and 13 are corrected by substituting the following paragraphs:

In 1978, human remains representing 29 individuals and 11,150 associated funerary objects were removed during excavations at the Wapwallopen Site (also known as the Knouse Site) (36 Lu43), Conyngham Township, Luzerne County, PA by The State Museum of Pennsylvania staff. No known individuals were identified. The objects include seed and glass beads; brass bell; buttons; a projectile point; brick fragments; charcoal fragments; gun parts; coffin nails; mirror fragments; miscellaneous objects made from iron, brass, and leather; seeds and nuts; medallions; jinglers; chain fragments; a bracelet; rings; spirals; silver brooch; shell pendant; kaolin and calumet pipes; stone tools; brass thimble; unidentified organic material;

Delaware Tribe of Indians

unidentified pottery sherds; a brass box; a whetstone; and wood coffin fragments.

The Euroamerican assemblage of objects found with the human remains dates the burials to the 18th century. Ethnohistorical evidence and documentary evidence identify the Wapwallopen Site as a Lenape (Delaware) occupation dating to approximately the 1740s AD through at least AD 1769. There is no evidence to contradict this.

In the Federal Register of October 26, 2000, as amended by the correction of September 25, 2007, paragraph number 14 is corrected by substituting the following paragraphs:

Officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (9-10), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of 59 individuals of Native American ancestry. Officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania also have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (3)(A), the 18,487 objects described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony. Lastly, officials of The State Museum of Pennsylvania have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Native American human remains and associated funerary objects and the Delaware Tribe of Indians; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

Deliverable D

The final report on the treatment histories of the Delaware collections the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the State Museum of Pennsylvania and the New York University College of Dentistry

Delaware Tribe of Indians

A Report on the Treatment Histories of the Delaware Affiliated Collections at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, New York University College of Dentistry and the State Museum of Pennsylvania.

Submitted as a deliverable for the Delaware Tribe's FY 2010 NAGPRA Documentation Grant

Funding from a FY 2010 NAGPRA Documentation Grant allowed us to research the treatment histories of the NAGPRA related collections at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, the New York College of Dentistry and the State Museum of Pennsylvania (collaborating museums). We are currently working with each institution on the documentation of NAGPRA-related material from approximately 23 Delaware affiliated sites in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. We carried out formal consultations with each institution in the summer of 2011, at which time was included research and discussion about the treatment histories of the collections.

It was necessary for us to research and document the treatment histories of these collections because we intend to move forward with the repatriation and reburial of these collections following their successful documentation. As part of the Delaware Tribe's reburial protocol, male tribal members are asked to briefly handle the human remains and funerary objects on the night prior to the morning reburial ceremony. We were concerned that such a protocol could expose tribal members to hazardous chemicals and needed to ensure through consultations with our collaborating museums that 1) the collections had not been treated and 2) if the museum representatives felt that there was a pressing need to test the collections.

1) Have the collections been treated?: As a result of our research and consultations, we learned that all three institutions hold no specific record-by-record treatment histories of their collections. Representatives from each museum universally stated that the treatment histories of the collections are very poorly documented; and the documentation is less complete for those collections that were accessioned in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Museum representatives also indicated that it is possible that their collections were treated or exposed to contaminants and recommended that we take precautions when handling the objects and remains. The suggested precautions were for tribal members to wear latex gloves.

2) **Is there a pressing need to test the collections?**: The museum representatives from each of the collaborating museums did not feel that there was a pressing need to test the collections. However, the museum representatives did indicate that testing the collections would be the only method for determining if the collections had been treated or exposed to hazardous chemicals.

Although the collections at each institution are poorly documented and there does not appear to be a pressing need to test the collections, each institution did provide further details regarding their collections during our consultations and correspondence, and such information is provided below.

Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University

On July 25 and 26, 2011, Brice Obermeyer, Greg Brown and tribal members Bonnie Thaxton, and James Jackson visited the Peabody Museum for consultation. We were met by curators Sandra Dong, Kelly Ferguson, Diana Loren, and Stuart Heebner; head NAGPRA curator Patricia Capone; and intern Stephanie Tapia. At that time we were given and reviewed several documents related to their Delaware affiliated collection (including a spreadsheet index of documents produced by Ms. Tapia) and were shown the ethnographic objects and some of the funerary objects from the Delaware affiliated sites.

The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University has human remains, associated funerary objects, and unassociated funerary objects from 13 Delaware affiliated sites. We divided these sites into two categories: sites around the Abbott Farm Complex (seven) in Trenton, NJ, and isolated burial sites (six) from elsewhere in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Although the museum did not have any records on the treatment histories of their Delaware affiliated collections, they did provide earlier correspondence that suggests the need for us to remain cautious when handling their collections. According to an October 7, 2008 letter from curatorial assistant Sandra Dong, "because many of the items came into the Peabody Museum's collection before it was realized that preservatives and solvents might be hazardous, records were not always kept where items were treated as part of collections management activities. As a consequence, the Museum does not know with certainty the extent to which the items which you will be receiving have been treated with hazardous materials. A chart detailing the use or possible use of chemicals in the Peabody Museum is enclosed [Appendix A]. Without physically testing each item, positive identifications of chemicals cannot be made."

The letter also states "the general practice among museums at the time when these items were acquired by the Peabody Museum was to use chemicals, which would arrest the growth of mold and preserve the items from deterioration caused by insects, oxidation, and/or moisture. There is no evidence indicating that the specific items to be repatriated to your group have been treated. However, it is possible that chemicals have been applied to the items."

Because it was standard practice to use preservative chemicals and the lack of documented evidence that the Delaware affiliated collections were not treated, we recommend that latex gloves be worn in the event that tribal members handle the remains and objects. We do not feel it is necessary to test the collections for the presence of hazardous chemicals because of the limited contact that tribal members will have with the remains and objects during a reburial ceremony.

New York University College of Dentistry

The New York University College of Dentistry (NYUCD) currently has one set of Delaware affiliated human remains from the Broadway and Isham Site in the Bronx, New York. Consultant Lauren Sieg was personally consulted by Greg Brown on August 5, 2011, at

Alexandria, Virginia. Greg and Lauren discussed the status of the remain and the NAGPRA documentation process, but did not view the skull.

At the consultation, Lauren stated that there is no evidence of any treatment to the skull that would pose any particular threats. She believes that the NYUCD does not have any associated or unassociated funerary objects related to the skull.

Although it is unlikely that the skull was treated, a follow up e-mail message from Lauren included the following information and suggestions, "As far as we know, the remains have not been treated. There is no record of treatment of them at the College or at the Museum of the American Indian (MAI). Some of the items from the old MAI storage facility in the Bronx test positive for mercury and lead due to the particulates that infiltrated the facility through the open windows. Since the remains were moved to the College of Dentistry in the 1950s, this is probably less of a concern for the remains from Broadway and Isham than for other items that stayed in the MAI storage facility for another 30 years before an HVAC system was installed. The precautions that you recommend are good ones to take."

Based on the the follow up message, we recommend that latex gloves be worn when handling the skull. We do not feel it is necessary to test the skull for the presence of hazardous chemicals because of the limited contact that tribal members will have with the skull during a reburial ceremony.

State Museum of Pennsylvania

On July 28 and 29, 2011, Brice Obermeyer, Greg Brown, and tribal members Bonnie Thaxton and James Jackson visited the State Museum of Pennsylvania for consultation. We were met by curators Kurt Carr and Janet Johnson. At that time we were given documentation related to the Delaware affiliated sites and were shown the ethnographic objects and some of the funerary objects from these sites.

The State Museum of Pennsylvania has human remains, associated funerary objects, and unassociated funerary objects from nine Delaware affiliated sites in Pennsylvania. We divided these collections into two categories: collections that include human remains (five), and collections that include funerary objects but do not include funerary objects (four).

Museum representatives explained that there are no known records of the use of pesticides or other treatments of the remains. They are under the assumption that remains and objects were not treated because it is not current museum practice to treat collections. However, the museum representatives cannot confirm that the collections were not treated by collectors prior to accession and they recommend that we should selectively test a sample of the collections before moving forward.

According to a follow up correspondence from curator Janet Johnson, "I am not aware of any treatment that would pose a health risk which is a concern for handling remains. I know that in a few instances some of our remains were either glued or shellacked by the private individuals

holding them in their personal collections prior to donation to the PHMC (Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission, parent organization of the State Museum of Pennsylvania)."

Because it is not current practice to treat collections and the lack of documented evidence that the Delaware affiliated collections were ever treated, we recommend that latex gloves be worn in the event that tribal members handle the remains and objects. Although the museum staff recommended that a selection of the collection be tested before moving forward, we do not feel that it is necessary to test the collection for the presence of hazardous chemicals because of the limited contact that tribal members will have with the remains and objects during a reburial ceremony.

USE OR PROBABLE USE OF CHEMICALS IN THE PEABODY MUSEUM/HARVARD UNIVERSITY FOR PRESERVATION OR PEST CONTROL PURPOSES. Revised 7/1998;1/2005

oduct/Trade Name Chemical Name	Approximate Dates of Use	Museum Location or Objects/Collections Treated	Reference
nic, aturate solution w. alcohol	1870s - early 20th century	'Poison' paper tags have been found on some objects of isolated accessions from 1874 to 1906. Arsenic presence confirmed on two items from accession 45-25 (in the Museum since the 1890s) and in association with some items in accessions 987-25 and 99-12.	Putnam to Winsor, 1894; 1995 testing of 'poison' paper tag (99-12); 1996 HU testing, two items in 45-25
dichlorobenzene	1932- 1988; 1991	Crystals/flakes placed in small boxes into some exhibition cases (1 to 2 x yr.); use in storage rooms, uncertain; North (Siberian) and South American furs; mixed collections, 1980s; a Greenland mummy in 1991.	Correspondence in department files; personal communication with prior museum preparators/ conservators
hthalene	1930s (unconfirmed time period)	Collection/building use, unknown/unconfirmed. Confirmed use on some Hoopa items (accessioned between 1909 and 1911) repatriated in 1998.	Inferred in letter of D.Byers to McHugh, 1932; See San Francisco St. U. Analytical Report, Palmer, 2000
nol ?	1932, tests only; actual use unconfirmed	Collection/building use, unknown/unconfirmed	Inferred in letter of D.Byers to McHugh, May 1932
dane[R] / izene hexachlorocylo- hexane ition (?.05-1.0%) with chlordane %)	1959; 1962	In Rooms 32 and 45 for the purposes of controlling silverfish. Confirmed presence on some Hoopa items accessioned between 1904 and 1911.	Correspondence in conservation department files. See San Francisco St. U. Analytical Report, Palmer. 2000
ona[R]; NoPest Strips[R] ; lorovos / 2,2 -dichlorovinyl ethyl phosphate	1980s	Use in Storage Room 45 and in storage rooms on the 6th floor in 1986. Use in proximity to some items in accession 985-27 prior to Museum's acquistion of the collection in 1985.	Correspondence in conservation department files
ylene oxide	1980s, early	Isolated use: off-site treatment; some textiles in accession 47-63-30; 2 Borneo shields; 5 African objects- museum numbers not recorded; and possibly a few Navajo blankets (unconfirmed whether treated with paradichlorobenzene or ethylene oxide).	Correspondence in conservation department files, July 1982; August and October 1983
ane[R] /Sulfuryl fluoride	1981	Room fumigation of African storage, Room 45 (unconfirmed)	Correspondence in conservation department files, February-May 1981

s. Note: The information above is as reliable as we know it at the present time (2005) though the Museum can give no guarantee that it is complete.

Delaware Tribe of Indians

USE OR PROBABLE USE OF CHEMICALS IN THE PEABODY MUSEUM/HARVARD UNIVERSITY FOR PRESERVATION OR PEST CONTROL PURPOSES. Revised 7/1998;1/2005

Product/Trade Name or Chemical Name	Approximate Dates of Use	Museum Location or Objects/Collections Treated	Reference
Larvex mothproof spray / Sodium fluosilicate with diethyl diphenyl dichloroethane	latter half of 20th century, probably	Room use in proximity to accession 985-27 prior to the Museum's acquistion of the collection in 1985	Correspondence in museum collection and conservation department files
Rexel® Flying insect killer and Raid® / Pyrethrins, Piperonyl butoxide, n-octylbicycloheptene dicarboximide	latter half of 20th century, probably	Room use in proximity to accession 985-27 prior to the Museum's acquistion of the collection in 1985.	Correspondence in museum collection and conservation department files
Thymol	mid-1970s to mid-1980s	Display case use in proximity to some objects from accession 985-27 prior to the Museum's acquistion of the collection in 1985.	Correspondence in museum collection and conservation department files
Exbello Cedarized Moth Proofer ®- terpene polychlorinates	mid-20th century	Room and/or display case use in proximity to accession 985-27 prior to the Museum's acquistion of the collection in 1985.	Correspondence in museum collection and conservation department files
Mercuric chloride		Mercury* presence on two 45-25 accessioned items, one with a 'poison' paper tag. Confirmed presence on some Hoopa items accessioned between 1904 and 1911.	1996 HU testing. San Francisco St. U. analytical report, Palmer, 2000
DDT/dichloro diphenyl trichlorethane (organochlorine)		Collection use, unknown/unconfirmed. Confirmed presence on some Hoopa items repatriated in 1998.	San Francisco St. U. analytical report, Palmer, 2000 (in curator and conservation department files)

Delaware Tribe of Indians

File Note: The information above is as reliable as we know it at the present time (2005) though the Museum can give no guarantee that it is complete.

PEABODY MUSEUM *of* ARCHAEOLOGY & ETHNOLOGY

October 7, 2008

Brice Obermeyer
Emporia State University
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
Butcher Education Center, Rm 115D
1200 Commercial, Box 4022
Emporia, KS 66801

Dear Dr. Obermeyer:

We are pleased to enclose two notices which were published in the Federal Register on October 7, 2008: Correction Notice of Inventory Completion for human remains and associated funerary objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania (FR Doc. E8-23694); and Correction Notice of Intent to Repatriate unassociated funerary objects from New Jersey and Pennsylvania (FR Doc. E8-23696). These correction notices include the addition of the Stockbridge Munsee Community to the cultural affiliated groups list.

Repatriation of these human remains, associated funerary objects, and unassociated funerary objects to the Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma, on behalf of the Delaware Tribe of Indians; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin may occur anytime after November 6, 2008, if no additional claimants come forward.

We look forward to the physical repatriation. Please let us know if you anticipate a timetable for the repatriation, and if we can do anything at the museum to facilitate the return. Please also let us know if you intend for the human remains to continue to be cared for by the museum, if you anticipate a timetable for that care, and if there are recommendations for care and handling during that time.

Lastly, under NAGPRA, museums are advised to notify those receiving repatriated items that there may be health and safety risks from exposure to or handling of certain types of items. The general practice among museums at the time when these items were acquired by the Peabody Museum was to use chemicals, which would arrest the growth of mold and preserve the items from deterioration caused by insects, oxidation, and/or moisture. There is no evidence indicating that the specific items to be repatriated to your group have been treated. However, it is possible that chemicals have been applied to the items.

Because many of the items came into the Peabody Museum's collection before it was realized that preservatives and solvents might be hazardous, records were not always kept when items were treated as part of collections management activities. As a consequence, the Museum does not know with certainty the extent to which the items which you will

be receiving have been treated with hazardous materials. A chart detailing the use or possible use of chemicals in the Peabody Museum is enclosed. Without physically testing each item, positive identifications of chemicals cannot be made.

If you would like to receive Material Safety Data Sheets on the use of particular pesticides, please let us know and we will send them to you.

The safe policy is to assume that the items were fumigated, rinsed in, or coated with chemicals, which are hazardous to you health and to take the appropriate precautions. At present, precautions taken by Peabody Museum staff include wearing latex gloves and lab coats when handling items, and thorough hand washing after handling items.

If you have any further question or concerns regarding pesticide use, please contact Patricia Capone, Repatriation Coordinator, at (617) 496-3702.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding these notices, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sandra Dong
Curatorial Assistant, Repatriation
617-495-9588 (voice)
617-495-7535 (fax)
sdong@fas.harvard.edu

Enclosures