

Americans, so this request is beyond its scope.

Exhibit 3. Authorities

1. Many commenters asked that we list each treaty in which the United States and tribes have recognized reserved rights to natural resources. Some commenters noted that we mention treaties quite a bit, without recognizing that many tribes do not have treaties. Some commenters asked that we include particular statutes through which Congress has stated the United States' legal relationship with tribes. *Response:* We are unable to add references to all the treaties and statutes that refer to individual tribes. They are too numerous to list in this document. Many tribes have several treaties or statutes, or both, with some overturning or modifying earlier citations. Individual treaties and statutes are more appropriately addressed through training at the local level.

2. Several commenters recommended we include the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*) to the authorities section. *Response:* We have added the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

3. The authorities section should include the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among the U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Energy, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Interagency Coordination and Collaboration for the Protection of Indian Sacred Sites, December 6, 2012. *Response:* We have added this MOU to the exhibit.

Alaska-Specific Concerns

1. We received several comments that focused on concerns specific to Alaska. Many commenters stated that while ANCs are not tribal governments and are not treated as sovereigns, the United States has a responsibility to consult with ANCs on the same basis as Indian tribes under Executive Order 13175. They recommended that we include the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2004 (Pub. L. 108–199) in the authorities section. In addition, several commenters noted that, while the Service has stated that it will adopt an Alaska regional policy, the national policy must also address the Service's relationship with ANCs. Commenters pointed out that many national level proposals and plans have a substantial and direct impact on ANCs and other Alaska Native entities, so ANCs should be considered on the national level. *Response:* We have adopted these comments. We have added authorities

about consultation with ANCs to the authorities exhibit. We have included the requirement to consult with ANCs in sections 1 and 3 of the policy. In addition, the Alaska Region (Region 7) is in the process of drafting an Alaska-specific policy. Also in response to these comments, we have added a definition of Alaska Native Corporation to the definitions exhibit.

2. Commenters from Alaska voiced concern that because the term "inter-tribal organization" is undefined, this provision might be interpreted as a limit on the agency's ability to consult with any group that is not a tribe or authorized by a tribe to consult on its behalf. *Response:* We have broadened the scope of "Alaska Native Organization (ANO)" to include a broad array of organizations that represent Alaska Natives, including, but not limited to, ANOs under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

3. Commenters asked that the training and professional development opportunities anticipated by the Service for tribal governments should be extended to ANCs. Some stated that ANCs are valuable sources of traditional knowledge, have significant interests in receiving technical information, and asked that these policy provisions be expanded to include them. *Response:* We will consult with ANCs on the same basis as we consult with tribes, and we will also work with ANCs in all areas permissible by law.

4. Some commenters believe that under ISDEEA, ANCs have the same status as tribes for the provision of many contract services. *Response:* ANCs are entitled to contract under title I of the ISDEEA. With respect to title IV self-governance funding agreements, 25 U.S.C. 458bb establishes that tribes are eligible to participate in the Department's Tribal Self-Governance Program. The regulations for the Program also allow consortia, defined as "an organization of Indian tribes that is authorized by those tribes to participate in self-governance."

Dated: January 20, 2016.

Daniel M. Ashe,

Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–01615 Filed 1–26–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–20039;
PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Intent To Repatriate a Cultural Item: Binghamton University, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Binghamton University, in consultation with the appropriate Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, has determined that the cultural item listed in this notice meets the definition of a sacred object. Lineal descendants or representatives of any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice that wish to claim these cultural items should submit a written request to Binghamton University. If no additional claimants come forward, transfer of control of the cultural items to the lineal descendants, Indian tribes, or Native Hawaiian organizations stated in this notice may proceed.

DATES: Representatives of any Indian tribe that believes it has a cultural affiliation with the cultural item should contact Binghamton University at the address below by February 26, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Nina M. Versaggi, Public Archaeology Facility, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY 13902–6000, telephone (607) 777–4786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3005, of the intent to repatriate a cultural item in the possession of Binghamton University that meets the definition of sacred object 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 cultural item. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

History and Description of the Cultural Item(s)

During the middle to late 1960s, the Anthropology Department at Binghamton University acquired a False Face mask made by an artist from the Six Nations, in Ontario, Canada. A typed index card accompanying the

mask reads: "Broken Nose, Seneca Nation, Snapping Turtle Clan, Six Nations Reservation—Ontario." The mask is carved wood with a black face with a red mouth, with a hole on one side (right side, facing out), and a pointed chin. The mask face has holes in the nose and metal eye inlays surrounding center eyeholes. The face is framed with yellow hair, and there are carved lines on the face.

On March 11, 2003, Binghamton University hosted a consultation meeting for federally recognized tribes to review NAGPRA summaries as part of the process of determining cultural affiliation. A group of traditional representatives from the Cayuga Nation; Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe (previously listed as the St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians of New York); Seneca Nation of Indians (previously listed as the Seneca Nation of New York); Tonawanda Band of Seneca (previously listed as the Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians of New York); and the Tuscarora Nation, met privately after the open consultation. In January of 2013, letters were sent to Seneca representatives asking for comments or claims on the mask. On September 22, 2015, Scott Abrams, Acting Director of the Seneca Nation of Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Officer contacted Binghamton University and formally requested repatriation of the Seneca mask. Binghamton University asked other Seneca representatives if they agreed. No comments were received.

Determinations Made by Binghamton University

Officials of Binghamton University have determined that:

- Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(3)(C), the one cultural item described above is a specific ceremonial object needed by traditional Native American religious leaders for the practice of traditional Native American religions by their present-day adherents.
- Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the sacred object and the Seneca Nation.

Additional Requestors and Disposition

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the sacred object should contact Nina M. Versaggi, Public Archaeology Facility, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY 13902–6000, telephone (607) 777–4786, before February 26, 2016. Repatriation of the sacred object to the Seneca Nation of Indians (previously listed as the Seneca Nation of New York) Tribal Historic

Preservation Office may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

Binghamton University is responsible for notifying the Cayuga Nation; Delaware Nation, Oklahoma; Delaware Tribe of Indians; Oneida Nation of New York; Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin; Onondaga Nation; Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe (previously listed as the St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians of New York); Seneca Nation of Indians (previously listed as the Seneca Nation of New York); Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma; Stockbridge Muncie Community, Wisconsin; Tonawanda Band of Seneca (previously listed as the Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians of New York); and Tuscarora Nation that this notice has been published.

Dated: December 28, 2015.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2016–01591 Filed 1–26–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

**[NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–20020;
PPWOCRADNO–PCU00RP14.R50000]**

Notice of Inventory Completion: Fowler Museum at the University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, and California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Fowler Museum at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) and the California Department of Transportation have completed an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects, in consultation with the appropriate Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, and have determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and associated funerary objects and present-day Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations. Lineal descendants or representatives of any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice that wish to request transfer of control of these human remains and associated funerary objects should submit a written request to the California Department of Transportation. If no additional requestors come forward, transfer of control of the human remains and associated funerary objects to the lineal descendants, Indian tribes, or Native Hawaiian organizations stated in this notice may proceed.

DATES: Lineal descendants or representatives of any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice that wish to request transfer of control of these human remains and associated funerary objects should submit a written request with information in support of the request to the California Department of Transportation at the address in this notice by February 26, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Tina Biorn, California Department of Transportation, P.O. Box 942874 MS 27, Sacramento, CA 94271–0001, telephone (916) 653–0013, email tina.biorn@dot.ca.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 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 physical custody of the Fowler Museum at UCLA and under the control of the California Department of Transportation. The human remains and associated funerary objects were removed from Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, CA.

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.

Consultation

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by the Fowler Museum at UCLA professional staff in consultation with representatives of Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians of the Santa Ynez Reservation, California, and the following nonfederally recognized Indian groups: Barbareno Chumash Council; Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians; Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation; Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians; Gabrielino/Tongva Indians of California Tribe; Gabrielino/Tongva Nation; Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council; Northern Chumash Tribe; San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians; Ti'at Society; and the Traditional Council of Pimu.

History and Description of the Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects

In 1966 and 1967, human remains representing at minimum, 108 individuals were removed from Xucu