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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this project was to determine, to the extent possible, and show on USGS 1:100,000 topographic maps, the traditional use areas of aboriginal groups in New Mexico from a review of the available literature. When found, information on properties that could be considered traditional cultural properties was recorded.

The primary source of information for mapping traditional use areas is the materials generated by cases before the Indian Claims Commission (ICC). Because of the importance of this body of data to this project, the history, purpose, and procedures of the ICC are reviewed.

Under our legal system, the United States government cannot be sued without its consent. Before 1946, an Indian group wanting to sue the government had to persuade congress to pass a jurisdictional act which allowed that tribe to sue the government for claims defined in the act. Eventually, the volume of requests (142 acts were passed) prompted congress to enact the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 (25 U.S.C.A. §§ 70-70v) (Getches and Wilkinson 1986:185; ICC 1978:2). This act created the Indian Claims Commission and allowed tribes to file certain kinds of claims against the government until August 13, 1951. The 852 claims filed resulted in over 600 cases before the ICC. The workload for the Commission was far greater than anticipated and the time allowed to resolve the cases was extended in 1957, 1961, 1972, and 1976. In 1978, the ICC was dissolved with 68 of the 617 cases still pending. The unresolved cases were transferred to the Court of Claims and a number are still on the docket of the Claims Court (Getches and Wilkinson 1986:185-188; Rosenthal 1990:xi).

One of the most utilized provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act allowed tribes to file claims involving disputes over land they had owned or
occupied and had been taken by treaty or otherwise without payment agreed to by the tribe (Getches and Wilkinson 1986:185). To prove such a claim, a group had to demonstrate that the tribe had "Indian title" to the land; that is, they had occupied the land exclusively and for a long time (ICC 1978:1). The extent of use and occupancy, the exclusiveness of that use, and that it was for a long time were inferred from all of the facts and circumstances presented as evidence in the case. Gathering and presenting this evidence required the assistance of historians, ethnohistorians, ethnologists, and archaeologists (Rosenthal 1990:147; Sutton 1985:17). For the ICC, the extent of use and occupancy often coincided with the area used for subsistence by all members of the tribe. However, use could be agricultural, religious, hunting and gathering, or even sporadic hunting if it did not conflict with another tribe's use of the area. Raiding in an area was insufficient to defeat claim of title and could not create Indian title. A tribe could permit use of land by others without defeating its title, but common use of an area would defeat a claim of title for both groups. Under the appropriate circumstances, as few as 20 to 50 years could satisfy the "for a long time" requirement (ICC 1978:7-9).

Proceedings before the ICC were adjudicary with both sides represented by teams of attorneys. A case began when any identifiable group of American Indians filed a complaint prior to August 13, 1951. When the issue concerned land, the complaint usually outlined the area of Indian title and when and how it was taken by actions of the United States government (including when the government allowed private parties to take the land) or it focused on specific areas that had been taken. The government, represented by the Justice Department, responded with an answer that usually denied that the group inhabited the entire area, that the use was not exclusive, and that the government had not taken the land. After the
complaints had all been filed, the ICC combined several claims or aspects of claims into single cases for trial, especially when the same area was claimed by more than one group and the evidence to be presented would be duplicative (as in the Acoma, Laguna, and Navajo case).

Both sides prepared for and participated in evidentiary hearings where expert witnesses such as anthropologists, historians, and ethnohistorians gave their opinions on tribal locations and delineation of boundaries (ICC 1978:3-4). Since "facts" are hard to come by when dealing with prehistoric and early historic times, the ICC often asked the expert witnesses for theories, interpretations, and the rationale behind their opinions (Rosenthal 1990:124). Proving use and occupancy required examining habits, customs, and ways of life. Groups that had wide and extensive migrations succeeded when they produced evidence of political composition, subsistence activities, and intensive use of particular areas exclusive of other groups. They failed when they could not demonstrate that the group maintained a distinct tribal identity (Kaplan 1985:74-75).

In addition to the experts, members of the claimant's group often testified as to how the boundaries were determined and past and present use of the area. This often included identifying shrines, former homes, and areas used for farming, hunting, gathering, and grazing.

After the hearings, the experts were usually asked to document their testimony for the ICC. This was not done in the earlier cases but later, when hearings were held before a single commissioner, the written testimony and transcripts from the hearings became the primary evidence considered. A panel of three commissioners would study the case material, often asking for more information from one or both sides, and reach a decision. Formal opinions, published in the Indian Claims Commission reporter (Ind. Cl. Comm.), have three
In the findings of fact the commission outlines the "facts" as determined after weighing the evidence. These facts usually include the identification of the area of Indian title identified by the claimant as well as the area the ICC determined had been taken by the government. The ICC accepted area often coincided, at least in part, with that presented by the claimants. However, it could also represent a compromise based on stipulations of boundaries between the Indian parties and since the ICC eliminated those areas that were parts of confirmed land grants or concern private land disputes that had already been litigated, the ICC accepted area of Indian title often bore little resemblance to what a group considered its aboriginal area.

The second part of the opinion provides the legal basis for the decision and is followed by an order directing the parties on how to proceed to the next stage. The second and third stages of a case placed a value on the land that was taken followed by a determination of offsets for benefits conferred on the group by the government. The later was subtracted from the final award (Rosenthal 1990:121). Appeal of an ICC decision was to the U.S. Court of Claims (now the Claims Court) then to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The boundaries identified in the ICC cases are not always equivalent to an aboriginal or traditional use area. Identification of an aboriginal use area became a required finding by the ICC, but is lacking in many of the cases litigated early in the process (ICC 1978:4). While a complete analysis of the ICC decisions concerning New Mexico is well beyond the scope of this project, the following examples illustrate how the cases were brought, the kinds of evidence presented, and the basis of the decisions.

The Isleta claim concerned two specific tracts of land, both of which were parts of Spanish land grants. Here, the ICC looked at documentary evidence
concerning only those parcels and determined that title to one of the tracts had been negotiated away in an action before the Pueblo Lands Board and the other parcel, while still used by Isleta, had become private property through a Spanish grant that was confirmed by the Court of Private Land Claims (Pueblo de Isleta v. The United States of America, 7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 619, 1959).

Taos claimed 300,000 acres based on Indian title. The ICC immediately subtracted the land included in confirmed Spanish and Mexican land grants and cases previously decided by the Pueblo Lands Board from the claim area. This left two parcels which the ICC agreed had been taken for inclusion in the National Forests. In this particular case, the ICC accepted the boundaries delineated by Taos (minus the confirmed grant and private land claims) since they were supported by the evidence presented and because the defendant did not rebut this evidence. Florence Hawley Ellis and Myra Ellen Jenkins testified about archaeological sites in the area, life ways of the Taos residents, the kinds of use made of the area, and the exclusivity of use in the area outlined. Residents of Taos Pueblo identified shrines, ceremonial, hunting, gathering, and grazing use areas within the boundaries and described how knowledge of these boundaries had been passed from generation to generation (Pueblo of Taos v. The United States of America, 15 Ind. Cl. Comm. 666, 1965).

The Acoma/Laguna/Navajo case illustrates how stipulations can influence the presentation of a case. The ICC considered these three claims together because of an overlap in areas claimed. Ultimately, Acoma and Laguna agreed on a stipulated boundary. When the parties agree on a boundary, it is accepted by the court and does not enter into the litigation. If they had not stipulated a boundary, each group would have presented evidence on their use of the area and, since neither could prove exclusive use, both claims to the overlapping area
would be denied. Neither of the Pueblos could agree with the Navajos on common boundaries. As a result, Acoma, Laguna, and the government presented evidence on the exclusiveness of the Pueblos use of the overlap, leading to often testy testimony and questioning of methods between the expert witnesses for the pueblos and the government, and those for the Navajo.

Testimony given by Florence Hawley Ellis, Myra Ellen Jenkins, Alfred E. Dittert, and Warde Alan Minge was found to generally support the claim of the Pueblo groups. This testimony included the identification of archaeological sites, legendary history, grazing and herding areas, shrines, and other uses as well as a concise history of the area. The Navajo’s experts, David Brugge and Robert Bands, testified that Acoma and Laguna had not used all of the area claimed and that parts were also used by the Navajos and Apaches. Pueblo informants testified to the veracity of the boundaries and of their current use of the area in question. The ICC recognized that much of the archaeological evidence was open to different interpretations but found that the many kinds of evidence given supported Acoma’s and Laguna’s claims. They concluded that Navajo use of the area was either raiding or temporary occupation at the invitation, sufferance, or permission of the Pueblos or the U.S. government, and could not defeat the Pueblo’s claim of Indian title.

While the ICC largely accepted the boundaries proposed by the Pueblos, they subtracted the areas of confirmed Spanish and Mexican land grants and parcels of private land litigated before the Pueblo Lands Board. The government was found liable for failing to protect the Pueblo’s rights to the remaining area (Pueblo of Laguna. Pueblo de Acoma. The Navajo Tribe of Indians v. The United States of America, 17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 615 (1967); Pueblo de Acoma, Pueblo of Laguna, The
Navajo Tribe of Indians v. the United States of America, 18 Ind. Cl. Comm. 154 (1967)).

Claims made by more nomadic groups were treated somewhat differently. The Mescalero Apaches submitted a claim for use and occupancy of the portion of New Mexico extending from the Rio Grande east to the Texas border and from 35° latitude south to the Mexico border. Here, the government argued that the Mescaleros had no tribal organization or unity, that a number of bands cooperatively used the entire range, and that the use was not exclusive. The ICC concluded that the Mescaleros formed a distinct ethnic group whose most concrete expression of unity was in the recognition of the common right of all Mescalero Apaches to subsistence resources throughout the area claimed. Historical documentation placed the Mescaleros in the area and there was no evidence that any other group made an attempt to establish residence in the area. Raiding by other groups could not destroy the Mescalero's Indian title to the area.

Testimony presented for the Mescaleros included an exhaustive study of the subsistence patterns and sociopolitical organization by Harry W. Basehart and evidence supporting the boundaries presented by Alfred B. Thomas. The principal government witness, Averam B. Bender, maintained that much of the area was claimed on the basis of raids and could not constitute valid Indian title. The ICC disagreed with the government but ultimately concluded that the claim to the northeastern part of the Staked Plains east of the Pecos River was not substantiated by the evidence and that area was omitted from the final award. Also omitted were confirmed Spanish and Mexican land grants along the Rio Grande (The Mescalero Apache Tribe and the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation v. The United States of America, 17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 100 (1966)).
Each case before the ICC was unique as was much of the evidence presented. The ICC accepted all forms of evidence from pot sherds to testimony on religious use areas by contemporary residents and appear to have to relied on multiple lines of evidence including visual evidence such as maps. Actual boundaries of the area of Indian title were not always in dispute or part of a decision. In the Isleta case, the claim was for two specified areas and the aboriginal use area was not considered at all. Similarly, when boundaries were stipulated, as in the Acoma and Laguna aspects of that case, or when Spanish, Mexican or other confirmed grants or private land claims are within the area claimed, the ICC did not evaluate evidence for boundaries in these areas.

Research Methods

For mapping the traditional land use areas in this study, the ICC claimant's presentation of their aboriginal use area was generally used. Even if these boundaries could not be proven to the satisfaction of the ICC, these areas represent the group's concept of their aboriginal use area. Factors relevant in the ICC proceedings, such as exclusiveness of use and confirmation of land grants are irrelevant to whether an area is considered part of the group's aboriginal territory. In the rare cases where the government's estimate of the aboriginal area lies outside that of the claimant, the larger area was used for depicting the traditional use area (TUA) on the maps produced during this study.

Several of the ICC maps used to produce the TUA lines are reproduced in the Garland Publishing series. In many instances, these were inserted into volumes containing the ICC formal opinions by the series editor, and are not completely identified as to who produced the map or even which side submitted it. In other instances, maps were located and copied at the National Archives. In still
others, the cases indicate there should be maps but none were published and the case materials are not at the National Archives (for example, the San Ildefonso and Santo Domingo cases).

When the ICC maps could not be located, the area claimed was so restricted that information on the traditional use area was not presented, or there was no ICC case, more traditional sources were relied on. The literature on all groups was searched for confirming or conflicting information on traditional use areas and to identify potential traditional cultural properties. Sources were located by reviewing published and unpublished bibliographies, including the Smithsonian Institution's, *Handbook of North American Indians*, references in the sources reviewed, and through key word searches and card catalogs at the University of New Mexico Zimmerman Library and the Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology library.

Once the information was collected, it was filed by tribe. All sources on a group, and those on more general topics, were reviewed, and a traditional use area was determined. When available, this consisted of the ICC exhibits, sometimes modified to include reservations or areas indicated by other sources. Otherwise, areas described in anthropological and historical sources were used. When no source discussed use areas, the reservation was treated as the traditional use area. Outlines of the traditional use areas were marked on a map of the entire state for ease in identifying which of the 1:100,000 topographic maps to consult. These outlines are referred to as the TUA boundary or line throughout this report.

No attempt was made to include areas that might be claimed on the basis of remote ancestry. These areas are not clearly defined by the tribes involved, and there is no basis for precise delineation. Only the Hopis make extensive claims
based on the movements of their ancestors, and their TUA line includes these areas.

Table 1 summarizes the basis for the TUA line, additional areas that are potential areas of interest to each group (based on origin myths, migrations, and tribal affiliations), and gives a subjective evaluation of the reliability of the TUA line.

**Table 1. Summary of Traditional Use Areas and Potential Areas of Interest.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Source of TUA Line</th>
<th>Potential Areas of Interest</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acoma</td>
<td>ICC map: Acoma’s Exhibit 1a</td>
<td>Chaco Canyon; Kito de los Frijoles</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua Apaches</td>
<td>ICC map prepared by Schroeder: Chiricahua Apache Localities 1797-1876</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>good; Chiricahua Apaches were present throughout the area indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti</td>
<td>Harrington’s 1916: Map 28 and ICC map, Cochiti’s Map 1b</td>
<td>the area south of Jemez to the Rio Grande and east to San Marcos and that between Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde</td>
<td>fairly accurate; lines are approximate because of scale and may extend too far west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanches and Kiowas</td>
<td>Royce’s 1899 map as used in the ICC case</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>both groups raided into this area; may be too inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>Ellis 1974:140-141 verbal description</td>
<td>more of the Galisteo Basin</td>
<td>the claim is based on affinity to all pueblo groups and includes the original homes of these; may be too inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleta</td>
<td>Ellis 1979:351 verbal description</td>
<td>Manzano Mountains and area inhabited by the Jornada Mogulon</td>
<td>seems reasonable but may be conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemez</td>
<td>Saado 1982:64</td>
<td>Pecos Pueblo grant; Navajo Reservoir area; areas with Casa, Sanbrito, Los Pinos phase sites and Gallina sites</td>
<td>good but details may not be accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jicarilla Apaches</td>
<td>ICC case, Jicarilla’s Exhibit M. aboriginal use area: Gordon et al. 1976 after p. 182</td>
<td>the remainder of the Jicarilla Reservation</td>
<td>good but maps differ in details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Source of TUA Line</td>
<td>Potential Areas of Interest</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipan Apaches</td>
<td>no TUA in New Mexico: Mayhall (1962:193), Opler (1982:386), Royce's Texas map as used in the ICC cases, Richardson (1928:142): Schroeder (1974:589)</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>fair: west boundary is artificial and recent, east boundary may be good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>ICC case, Intervenor's Rebuttal Exhibit - estimated extension of line for Texas</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>estimate: no line was given for New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescalero Apaches</td>
<td>ICC case, map - Mescalero Apaches, 1846-1880</td>
<td>could extend as far north as Las Vegas, New Mexico</td>
<td>good; Mescalero Apaches were present throughout the area; the claim to the N portion is weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>ICC case, unnumbered exhibit, combination of Navajo's and the government's lines</td>
<td>Chaco Canyon, Aztec, and Mesa Verde area</td>
<td>good; Harrington's (1916) information supports the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>ICC case, Navajo exhibit, Map 8</td>
<td>possibly all the way to the Rio Grande</td>
<td>Navajo were present throughout the area indicated by the TUA line; may be too inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picuris</td>
<td>no sources describe a TUA</td>
<td>may extend as far as Jicarilla Peak</td>
<td>reservation boundary is probably too conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque</td>
<td>no sources describe a TUA</td>
<td>may include areas claimed by other Towa and Tiwa groups</td>
<td>reservation boundary is probably too conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia</td>
<td>Kilis (1979:363) verbal description</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>good but details may vary and it may be conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe</td>
<td>composite of the current reservation, joint reservation with Santo Domingo, and early land claim (Brayer 1939:78-79)</td>
<td>Chaco Canyon and Aztec Ruin area, El Kito de los Frijoles</td>
<td>area marked is probably too conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso</td>
<td>ICC case, verbal description of area of aboriginal title and Harrington (1946:278)</td>
<td>Upper San Juan, Chama, Galisteo, Basin, Middle Rio Grande, Ojo Caliente</td>
<td>fair, some details are estimated and the TUA line is probably conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Source of TUA Line</td>
<td>Potential Areas of Interest</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>composite of the reservation boundary and Harrington (1916)</td>
<td>north and northwest of the reservation, including the Chama Valley and as far as Mesa Verde</td>
<td>fair, details are estimated and the TUA line is probably too conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>ICC case, estimated from Ellis's identification of Santa Ana sites</td>
<td>Galisteo Basin, Paako - Tijeras Canyon area, and the Chaco Canyon to Mesa Verde area</td>
<td>fair, details are estimated as no map shows the area claimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>ICC case, Santa Clara Exhibit 1</td>
<td>the areas north and east of the TUA line and the route to Pecos Pueblo</td>
<td>fair, but may extend farther east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo</td>
<td>composite from the ICC case, verbal description from original case and general map of the enlarged southeast turquoise mine claim area, the current reservation boundaries and points between</td>
<td>more of the Galisteo Basin, the Chaco Canyon to Mesa Verde area, and the El Rito de los Frijoles</td>
<td>fair at best, the verbal descriptions are hard to map and lines are estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suna</td>
<td>no TUA in New Mexico, Gerald (1974:70-71)</td>
<td>none identified but as intervenors in an ICC case, the Sunas and Mansos claim to be the indigenous occupants of the Nesilla Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos</td>
<td>ICC case, government's Exhibit 101</td>
<td>south to and including Ojo Caliente and the Black Mountains</td>
<td>good, based on ICC testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuque</td>
<td>ICC case for Nambe - verbal description and reservation boundaries</td>
<td>Chaco Canyon to Mesa Verde area and the Rio de los Frijoles</td>
<td>the TUA line is probably too conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortugas</td>
<td>no information on a TUA was found and no line drawn</td>
<td>none identified but they could claim interest in the TUA's of the southern Tiwa pueblos and Isleta del Sur, and the area once inhabited by the Piros and Toapiros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utes</td>
<td>general map based on Delaney (1974, Map 2)</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>fair, details are estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Source of TUA Line *</td>
<td>Potential Areas of Interest</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta del Sur</td>
<td>ICC case, Intervenor's exhibit</td>
<td>could claim an interest in the TUA areas of Ysleta, Taos, and Acoma and the area once inhabited by the Piro and Tohono</td>
<td>fair at best, estimated from a map showing the use area in Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zia</td>
<td>ICC case, Defendant's exhibit showing joint use area of Zia, Santa Ana, and Jemez and the Zia Reservation boundary</td>
<td>Chaco Canyon to Mesa Verde area</td>
<td>fair to good; based on distribution of &quot;Zia&quot; sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>area of Zuni sovereignty (Pforcement and Hart 1985)</td>
<td>could claim areas farther north and south</td>
<td>fair, boundaries are estimates due to map scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* complete references are found in the section for that group

Report Format

In addition to the maps, a brief report on each tribe includes the following information:

1:100,000 maps:

This section identifies the names of the USGS 1:100,000 maps that cover a tribe’s traditional use area. When an entire map is included in the TUA, it is indicated. 1:100,000 topographic maps come in three series, USGS, USGS/BLM, and BLM. Many of the USGS series maps are no longer available. These were used when possible because they have less color, making the TUA lines more visible. Otherwise, the USGS/BLM maps were the second choice. If neither of these could be obtained, the BLM edition topographic maps were used.

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The documentary source or sources for the TUA line and modifications of the boundaries in the source are identified. For example, when a reservation boundary extends beyond the TUA area, the reservation boundary is usually included within the TUA line.
Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Other sources that support, confirm, or suggest alternative boundaries are identified.

Evaluation: This section provides a subjective evaluation of the area marked.

Potential Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional use Areas:

Parker and King (n.d. 1) define a traditional cultural property as one that has derived its significance from "the role the property plays in a community's historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices."

General. General properties tend to be rather vaguely located and removed from the current use area. A summary identifying remote or ancestral lands outside the TUA boundary that may be of concern to the group is included when applicable.

Specific. Specific properties are identified places. Only those properties identified as shrines, as places with religious or mythological significance, places where ceremonies are held, or those identified as ancestral homes are included as specific properties. When possible, the township and range are given for specific properties with an indication of whether the feature is labeled on the topographic maps or when the location is estimated. The scale and generalized nature of many of the maps prevent precise location of many features. No attempt was made to give township and range for sites that have Laboratory of Anthropology numbers or to correlate traditional properties with sites listed in the HPD, NMCRIS files.

References Reviewed:

Finally, most of the sources reviewed are listed, some of those contributing no information were omitted. A more general bibliography follows this introduction.
Problems Encountered

The actual mapping of the traditional land use areas presented a number of problems. Many of the ICC maps are on base maps with township and range or even sections marked and were easily transferred. The more generalized maps, such as those for Zuni (Ferguson and Hart 1985:Map 21) and the Utes (Petit 1982:4) are less precise. Scale was almost always a problem. The lines on some maps are a mile or more wide given the scale. In addition, lines on even the best maps seem to be somewhat arbitrarily placed. For example, different versions of the Jicarilla ICC maps vary slightly. In other cases, the verbal description of the claim area does not match the map or the landmarks (such as the Turquoise Trading Post in the Santo Domingo case) are not on the maps.

In addition to the general character of some maps, other problems arose in locating the traditional cultural properties. Often more than one place with the same name occurs (Cerro Colorado or Coyote Springs), the spelling of place names may vary between the sources and the map, and different sources may locate the same property in different places. Some sources list only the tribal name for a property so that location is not possible.

Finally, the treatment of tribes in the documentation reviewed is uneven. For some tribes there is an incredible amount of information, for others there is virtually none. Classic ethnographic sources, such as reports by Elsie Clews Parsons, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, and Leslie A. White, contributed very little information on traditional use areas. With few exceptions, concepts such as location or extent of use were not considered important and were not recorded. Some do have information on origin myths and other traditions, but without the land claims cases, information would be meager.
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ACOMA

1:1000 maps: Acoma, Belen, Fence Lake, Grants, Magdalena, Quemado, and Zuni.

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Indian Claims Commission [ICC] materials; maps include Acoma's Exhibit 1a (reproduced in Pueblo Indians V after p. 158); another map - Exhibit 1, prepared by Ellis and Dittert (reproduced in Pueblo Indians V after p. 262); Map 14, Rands's map with shrines, farms, livestock, wild plants, and place names (Pueblo Indians IV, pocket map). The legends for Acoma and Laguna are reversed on Rands's Map 14.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Minge (1991:xviii) has a general map with boundaries similar to those in the ICC case cited above.

Evaluation: Two factors suggest these boundaries are fairly accurate. Many of boundaries and/or markers are natural features, many with associated shrines. The boundaries overlap the Laguna, Zuni, Chiricahua Apache, and Navajo traditional use areas, and part of the eastern boundary abuts the Isleta Reservation. For ICC litigation purposes, Acoma and Laguna agreed on a stipulated boundary to avoid conflicting claims (roughly between Range 6 and 7W). This is well within the boundary identified by Acoma.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Benedict (1931:185) recounts a Cochiti tale that has all of the Keresans, including the Acomas and Lagunas, living together at the Mesa of the Stone Lions. The Acomas and Lagunas are said to have gone south through Peralta Canyon.

Ellis claims that the Acoma ancestors were two groups that united. One lived in the Acoma area since early times, the other inhabited Mesa Verde and

According to the ICC, the ancestors of the Acomas occupied a broad area from the Rio Grande west to El Morro, north to Mount Taylor, and an unidentifiable distance south of Acoma village (18 Ind. Cl. Comm. 167).

Garcia-Mason states that Acoma ancestors include four groups, one inhabited the pueblo since early times, another came around A.D. 1300 from Mesa Verde, and the other two migrated from the Cebolleta region (1979:454).

Gunn states that Acoma tradition indicates they inhabited the country west and south and fled to the rock for protection (1917:16). Tradition also tells of coming from a place a few days journey from the north (1917:68), possibly stopping in southwestern Colorado, where all the Keresans lived together. This group split with some going to the Rio Grande Valley and others to the west (1917:75-76).

Minge claims the Berryhill Ranch land contains shrines where religious leaders pray. They consider it equivalent to the Wailing Wall in religious significance. Annual religious ceremonies begin at a series of shrines west of St. Johns, Arizona, establishing a pathway for rain clouds across the Zuni Salt Lake, across El Malpais through the shrines and rock formations, and on to Acoma (1991:156).

Sedgewick says that Acoma, along with other Keresans, claim the Rito de los Frijoles as their ancestral home (1926:ix).

According to White, Acoma traditions tell of living on Mesa Encantada or K'atzim when a great storm came and destroyed the trail (1932:25). Their origin myth tells of part of the group stopping to live at Acoma and the rest continuing south (1932:145).
Summary: Areas outside the traditional use area that are not identified as specific areas of concern but may be of concern include Chaco Canyon and Rito de los Frijoles.

Specific

Rands (1974a:381-387): List of Acoma shrines (# shrine and boundary marker) [Map 14 reference]. Locations come from Rands's Map 14, Ellis's Exhibit 1, Ellis and Dittert's Exhibit 1A or from the topographical maps based on an identified landmark. * feature is on the topo maps.

[c]  # Cerro Carnero  
[g]  # Escoba (Broom Mt.)  
[1]  # Mesa Trigo  
[m]  # Picacho de Encinal (Picacho Negro)  
[n]  # Atarque Viejo de San Jose  
[o]  # Piedra de Azavache  
[3]  # large notch in Oso Ridge  
[4]  # Tinaja (Poblando ruin)  
[6]  # Mesa Aguila  
[7]  # Cerro Cabra (Cerro Alto)  
[8]  # Cerro Mujer (Cerros Mujeres)  
[9]  # Los Veteados  
[10]  # Cerro Techado (ruin)  
[14]  # Cerro Pelon (Cerrito Pelon)  
[15]  # Mesa Cochina  
[16]  # Cerro Mojino  
[17]  # Mesita  
[21]  # Grande Cueva (Bid Cave)  

T 9N, R 10W  
* T 5N, R 7-8W  
T 10N, R 6W  
* T 10N, R 6W  
T 10N, R 7W  
T 11N, R 9W  
* T 11N, R 14W  
T 8N, R 14W  
* T 7N, R 14W  
T 5N, R 14W  
* T 4N, R 14W  
* T 3N, R 14W  
T 6N, R 4W  
T 6N, R 2W  
* T 7N, R 2W  
T 9N, R 5W  
T 13N, R 5W
22] # Cerro Chivato * T 13N, R 6W
[23] # Laguna Redonda * T 12N, R 6W
[25] # Cerrito Zorillo (Sorillo) T 13N, R 7W
[30] # Mesa Blanca T 13N, R 11W
[34] # Alesna Cerro Alesna = * T 15N, R 7W
[35] # Arroyo Soguestoso T 2N, R 10W
[36] across the creek from Bell Peak T 2N, R 10W
[41] Canyon de los Castellos
[44] Casa de Dios T 8N, R 10W
[46] Cebolla Spring
[49] Cerrito Ortiz * T 12N, R 6W
[51] # Cerro Cochillo (Piedra Cochillo)
[52] Cerro Colorado there are at least 6 on the topo maps
[55] Cerro Snake Pit T 8N, R 3W
[56] Coyote Springs there are 3 on the topo maps
[59] east of Enchanted Mesa
[65] Kowina (ruin and spring)
[69] # Lomas Casar Vanados T 2N, R 11W
[70] lookout west of Oso Ridge
[81] Mount Taylor Peak * T 12N, R 7W
[82] Ojo del Gallo * T 10N, R 10W
[83] # eastern Ojo Escondido T 8N, R 2W
[84] # western Ojo Escondido T 9N, R 6W?
[90] spring on north side of Putney Mesa T 9N, R 9W
[99] Seven Cedars (Siete Sabinos) T 5N, R 6W on Rands; R 7W on topo.
[100] south of Old Acoma T 8N, R 7W
[101] spring between Victorio Mesa and Cerro del Oro
[102] spring in Juan Tafoya Canyon T 13N, R 5W
[103] spring in Spider Canyon T 8N, R 9W
[104] spring on trail to Salt Lake
[105] Suwanee * T 8N, R 3W
[111] Zuni Salt Lake * T 3N, R 18-19W
Eagle Peak in the Tularosa Mountains T 7S, R 17W
Concha, Arizona

Locations of shrines identified as still in use by the commission in 18 Ind. Cl.
Comm. 174-176:

On Rands's list but not identified by him as shrines:
[13] Pertocito at Tres Hermanos T 3N, R 7E

On Ellis and Dittert’s Map, Exhibit 1A:
[S-5] small caves in Malpais near Ice Caves T 9N, R 12W
[S-10] springs at Cebollita Canyon Cebollita Springs = T 7N?, R 9W
[S-11] Dripping Springs * T 8N, R 6W
[S-12] Petoche Mountains

Others:
[11A] Loma Casado
[12B] Alamo * T 2N, R 5-6W

Minge (1991:1-2) identifies and vaguely locates the following as villages once inhabited by Acomas:

Casa Blanca (now a Laguna village) * T 10N, R 6W
Kashkachuti
Washpashuka (60 miles north of Old Acoma)
Kuchta

Tsiama (Seama) * T 9N, R 7W

Tapitsiama (there are two possible settlements with this name -- one northwest of old Acoma between Crown Point and Coyote Trap and one 3 miles north of Old Acoma)

Katzima (Enchanted Mesa) * T 8N, R 7W

Heashokow (2 miles SE of Old Acoma)

Kowina (15 miles west of Old Acoma and south of Grants), a prehistoric Acoma village with religious significance (1991:140)
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Court Cases and Materials:


Transcript of Testimony, Docket 266, Pueblo de Acoma, July 14, 1953 and July 15, 1953 (Jose Ulario Garcia).

All materials filed under Docket #266 at the National Archives.
ICC, Acoma Exhibit 1 (reproduced in *Pueblo Indians V* after p. 262)
ICC, Defendant's Exhibit, Rands Map 14
(reproduced in Pueblo Indians IV, pocket map)
ARAPAHO

1:100,000 maps: none

Traditional Use Area:

Sources: Bender, working for the government and trying to prove the Jicarillas did not have exclusive use of northwestern New Mexico, notes that Cheyennes and Arapahos also ranged in Jicarilla territory and "penetrated toward the east of the Rio Grande" (1974:162).

Fowler places the Arapaho and Cheyenne territory in 1851 within Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, but nowhere near New Mexico (1982, Map 1).

Schroeder shows the Arapahos raiding or camping no closer than around La Jara, Colorado, between 1846 and 1852 (1974:135).

These sources suggest than any Cheyenne and Arapaho presence in New Mexico was not sufficient to establish a traditional use area.
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Court Cases and Materials

Ekirch, Arthur A., Jr.
CHIRICAHUA APACHES


Traditional Use Area:

Source: The Indian Claims Commission map titled Chiricahua Apache Locales, 1797-1876 (reproduced in Apache Indians XII, after p. 472) is used for the TUA line.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Opler’s verbal description of the boundaries (Petitioner’s Proposed Findings of Fact 1964:71-73) indicate that the Rio Grande was the eastern boundary, the southern boundary extended into Mexico, the western line runs through Spur Lake, Luna, Reserve, and Glenwood, New Mexico, and the northernmost limits were in the vicinity of the Datil range and Quemado, New Mexico.

The Indian Claims Commission [ICC] did not accept the entire range proposed by the Chiricahua Apaches. The ICC’s western boundary followed the San Francisco and Tularosa Rivers and was over 30 km farther east in some areas. They also excluded the overlap with the Navajos and the Spanish land grants (19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 241-242).

The Navajo Tribe’s Proposed Findings of Fact places the northern border for the Chiricahua even farther north than that proposed by the Chiricahuas. The Navajo line extends through most of the Alamo Reservation and includes Alamocito Creek while the Chiricahua version is 4 to 10 km to the south of these.
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Evaluation: Sightings of Chiricahua Apaches recorded in historical documents indicate they were present throughout the area of the ICC claim (Schroeder's Map of Chiricahua Apache Locales 1797-1876). This presence may be sufficient to indicate traditional use of the entire area. The boundary overlaps with those of the Navajo, Zuni, and Acoma on the north.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Opler states that their sacred places include homes of the Mountain People and that places with markings on walls or rocks may be considered sacred. The Chiricahuas also had wayside shrines and places for offerings. These are used as places of contemplation and prayer by persons starting a perilous trip. One of these is on a mountain top (1965:312).

Specific

No references to specific properties were found.
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COCHITI

1:100,000 maps: Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line approximates Harrington's (1916) Map 28, which he identifies as the area claimed by the Cochitis. The eastern boundary has been modified to reflect that claimed in the Indian Claims Commission [ICC] case, Exhibit 16 (reproduced in Pueblo Indians V p. 31).

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: The Petition for Cochiti before the Indian Claims Commission (p. 2) claims they had aboriginal title and use of 25,000 acres east of the pueblo grant; an area described as north of the hills of Santa Cruz, east to the house of the little spring, south to the Santo Domingo grant, and west by the Cochiti Grant (Map 16).

Harrington places the approximate boundary between land claimed by San Ildefonso as home of their ancestors and that claimed by the Cochitis as home of their ancestors between Ancho Canyon and Frijoles Canyon (1916:278, 409).

Evaluation: Harrington's Map 28 is not drawn to scale; features are not in their true relationships making it difficult to transfer to the TAU maps. Because of this, the lines estimate the traditional use area. Most of the Cochiti shrines and sites fall in the east half of the area suggesting the line may extend too far to the west.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Benedict describes the relocations of the Cochitis from the Mesa of the Stone Lions. They went to the old pueblo of San Miguel (7 or 8 miles north of Cochiti on the west bank of the Rio Grande), then to Potrero Plateau near Cochiti
where they stayed until the Spanish moved them to a site east of the present Cochiti (1931:185-186).

Ford and others view the Keresans as occupant of the Mesa Verde and Chaco areas. From here they moved to the middle Puerco then to the Salado River Valley below Jemez occupying an area below Jemez to the Rio Grande, north to Frijoles Canyon, and east to San Marcos (1972:33, 39).


Lange says that the Cochitis claim no direct association with most of the ruins west of Cochiti in the Santa Fe National Forest. They do claim those in and adjacent to Frijoles Canyon, including those associated with the Stone Lions of Cochiti. The Cochitis lived at Potrero Viejo [Douglas 1917: T 17N, R 3E] from 1680 to 1692-93 (1959:8-10).

Lange states that a deep canyon in the Peralta called Ga’ectaya is an area of purification for men wanting to become brave warriors. A small black mesa near Peña Blanca is used to obtain power for the warrior (1959:235-236, citing unpublished manuscripts and field notes written in 1922 by Franz Boas and on file at the Library, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia).

**Summary:** The Cochitis may also claim the area south of Jemez to the Rio Grande and east to San Marcos and Chaco Canyon to Mesa Verde areas based on remote origins and ancestral movements (Ford et al. 1972).

**Specific (@ approximate location)**

Douglas (1917) lists the following as shrines and locations for the Cochitis:
World Center Shrine, Tsikomo Peak  T 21N, R 5E
Sierra de la Bola shrine  T 19N, R 3E

Ellis Transcript (p. 118-119) and Exhibit 19:

Pueblo de Los Vacas; ruin and principal shrine

[P] [Douglas 1917] T 18N, R 6E

Painted Cave  [Douglas 1917] T 17N, R 6E
Los Idoles  [Douglas 1917] T 17N, R 5E
Giant's Cave
unnamed shrines along the Rio Grande
1 in T 17N, R 6E
2 in @ T 16N, R 5E
1 in T 15N, R 6E
three shrines south of the Cochiti Grant  T 15N, R 5E

Friedlander and Pinyan (1980:25-26) note that Nipple Mountain or Gasickurtz (9 miles from Cochiti) has retreats for observing the solstice.

Harrington (1916:411-441 and Map 28) notes the following potential traditional cultural properties:

[28-12] Tyuonyi; ruin where certain groups agreed to areas of exclusive use; Cochiti's earliest home  [Douglas 1917] T 18N, R 6E

[28-13] ceremonial cave  @ T 18N, R 6E

[28-26] Pueblo of the Stone Lions on the Potrero de las Vacas; second of the Cochiti villages built and inhabited in their migration southward  [Douglas 1917] T 18N, R 6E

[28-27] place where the two mountain lions sit; used by Cochiti secret religious society  @ T 18N, R 6E

San Miguel Pueblo; the third village built in their southward migration
@ T 18N, R 5E

[28-45] stone lions shrine on the Potrero de los Idolos

[Douglas 1917] @ T 17N, R 5E

[28-58] Old Cochiti; the first pueblo called Cochiti

[28-61] Kuapa ruin; inhabitants are said to have built the stone lions at Potrero de los Idolos; fifth village in Cochiti migration
@ T 17N, R 5E

[28-71] Cañada de Peralta - south bank; sixth and seventh sites of the Cochitis
@ T 16N, R 5E

[28-75] ceremonial cave in hills northwest of Cochiti Pueblo
@ T 16N, R 5E

Starr (1900:219-223) names and describes ten shrines (all are near Cochiti Pueblo):

Ki-e-ti-ne: north shrine, half a mile north of the village
T 16N, R 5E

Ai-wit-ya-me-yu: meeting area for hunters, just west of the north shrine
@ T 16N, R 5E

He-ro-ta ka-co me ni-cu: shrine, close to the two above
@ T 16N, R 5E

Yo-ni chu-ri tsa mic: stones placed in a circle, near others
@ T 16N, R 5E

U-ya-tsi-satc tsir-cti-mic: where rattles are placed

Ki-an-i-kar-pte tin-uc

Cro-tzu-nu ko-wi-ksi-a-pte-yu
Ko-ac-ku-le hu-tcan: where the shiwana are, west bank of river

Gite cu-ko: to the north, beyond the river at a cliff face
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COMANCHES AND KIOWAS


Traditional Use Area:

Source: Royce's map of the country claimed by the Comanche and Kiowa (1899, Pl. 164) is the source of the TUA line. This map was used to illustrate their claim of aboriginal ownership before the Indian Claims Commission [ICC] (26 Ind. Cl. Comm. 107).

Since few sources distinguish between the Kiowa, Kiowa Apache, and Comanche, they are treated together. A line at approximately the Red River could serve as a dividing line between the Kiowas to the north and the Comanches to the south (Mayhall 1962:193; Mooney 1898, Pl. 57); however, other sources maintain they shared a traditional use area.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Bender acknowledges that the Comanche and Kiowa ranged over the Jicarilla and Ute lands "toward the east of the Rio Grande" (1974:162).

Mayhall notes that the eastern part of New Mexico was part of the Kiowa homeland -- along the Cimarron and Canadian headwaters (1962:6). His map of the Kiowa range (1962:196) places their southern boundary slightly below the Red River, the western boundary just west of the Pecos River and east of the Canadian River.

Richardson shows the boundary of the Comanches and Kiowas in about 1820 as extending into New Mexico about halfway to the Canadian River from just below 35
degrees to the Colorado state line (1928:142). Mooney gives an almost identical range (1898, Pl. 57).

Thomas describes the Comanche territory in 1865 as extending to the Canadian River to where it crosses the New Mexico-Texas border then south along the state line (1974:141-142). He maintains that the line used by Royce, placing the Comanche boundary along the Pecos River, was erroneous (1974:147).

Royce draws his western line for the Kiowa, Comanche, and Kiowa Apache at the Vermejo, Canadian, and Pecos rivers (1899, Pl. 164).

Schroeder (1974:451-457) maps the documented historic encounters with the Comanches between 1694 and 1852. Unfortunately, his maps stop at Pintado Arroyo, below Anton Chico, and give no information for the southern portion of the state. He documents Comanche presence west of the Rio Grande and as far south as the map shows.

Stanley states that the Kiowas roamed the eastern slope now covered by Tucumcari, Roswell, Elida, Clovis, Fort Sumner, Portales, Tatum, Lovington, and Floyd (1968:5).

Wallace chronicles Comanche and Kiowa movements and raids. Their range in 1849 was reported as from 32 to 36 degrees latitude and 99 to 104 degrees longitude (1959:27).

Wardell (Kiowa-Comanche testimony 1974:71-74) recounts that the Kiowa Apaches joined the Kiowas in pre-Columbian times and have been affiliated ever since. Around 1790, the Kiowas and Comanches agreed on a common boundary at the Red River with the Kiowas to the north and the Comanches to the south. Wallace, however, states that the Comanches and Kiowas jointly shared the same country after 1790 (1959:2).
Evaluation: The Kiowas and Comanches raided an area well beyond that marked on Royce's map. Only Stanley (1968:5) and Wallace (1959:27) note their presence in the southern Plains. The alternative boundaries (Mooney and Richardson) seem too conservative.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

No references to general or specific traditional cultural properties were found in the literature reviewed.
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The Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians v. The United States of America. 1 Ind. Cl. Comm. 505 (1951).


Materials at the National Archives, Dockets 32, 257, 258, 259.

Memorandum re: Proposal to Settle Claims of Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes Set Out in Dockets 257 and 259A Before the Indian Claims Commission for a Total of $35,060,000. National Archives, Docket 257, Box 1.

Royce (1899) as modified for the ICC case (National Archives, Docket 257)
THE COMANCHE COUNTRY
AT ABOUT 1820
IMPORTANT TRADING POST
ESTABLISHED LATER
— BOUNDARY OF COMANCHE COUNTRY

Mayhall (1962:193)
HOPI


Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line includes the use areas of the Tiwa, Tewa, Keres, and Zunis plus the northwest part of the state. Details are arbitrary. The TUA line goes straight south to the edge of the Taos traditional use area and along the eastern boundary, then goes southwest to the southeast corner of the San Cristobal Grant, then southwest to Granite Peak. From here, it follows the Zuni TUA line to the Arizona border. The TUA line is drawn to include the farthest east of the pueblo traditional use areas and the Galisteo Basin. The southern extent is defined by the Zuni traditional use area.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: The Hopi emerged from ancestral cultures in the San Juan Valley. They claim the old village sites were inhabited by their ancestors in the area beyond Navajo Mountain, south below the San Francisco Mountains, west to Grand Canyon, and east toward the Rio Grande (Courlander 1971:9-11).

Ellis (1974:140-141) identifies the approximate area occupied by the ancestors of the clans that now make up the Hopi Tribe as an area bounded roughly by the Colorado and San Juan rivers to the north, the Arizona-New Mexico state line on the east, the Zuni and Mogollon Rim to the south, and the San Francisco
Peaks to the west. However, the Hopis also include people from the Tewa, Tano, Tiwa, Keres, Jemez, and Zuni Pueblos, and the Hopi claim includes the later homes of the groups who joined the Hopi and the original homes of others who later became Hopi.

The area of aboriginal title claimed by the Hopi in the Indian Claims Commission [ICC] case (23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 291) is that bordered on the north and west by the San Juan and Colorado rivers, on the south by the Little Colorado and Zuni rivers, and on the east by the Merriwether line—extending from the confluence of the San Juan and Rio de Chelly on the north to the confluence of the Little Colorado and Zuni rivers on the south. None of the claim is in New Mexico.

The first group to come to the Hopi mesas came from Navajo Mountain. They were joined by migrants from a mountain range to the east (Mindeleff suggests they were from the Rio Grande, Ellis that they were from Mesa Verde), a third group came from the mountains of the east (Ellis 1974:110). The Asa people had lived in a village near Abiquiu—Ellis believes they were Keres chased out of the Chama Valley by Tewas. They moved south to Santo Domingo, some moving on to Laguna, some on to Acoma, Zuni, then to Hopi (1974:117).

According to Fewkes (1900:604), clans from New Mexico pueblos include the Bear Clan from the Rio Grande region and the Fokopi or Firewood people originally from Jemez country. The Asa clan formerly lived near Santa Fe and near Abiquiu moving to Santo Domingo, Laguna, Acoma, Zuni then Hopi (1900:610).

The Pueblo of Shungopavi's ICC petition includes a list of Hopi Boundary Markers and a map. One (number 10, Nah mee to ka [mouth of canyon]) may be on the New Mexico-Arizona border. The others are well within Arizona or in Utah.
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James states that the Sun, Moon, Stars, Sun’s Forehead, Eagle, Turkey, and two Hawk Clans all came from New Mexico pueblos. The Tansy Mustard Clan also originated in New Mexico, from near Santa Fe then Abiquiu (1974:27). Boundary markers of the Hopi Tusqua or land are the same as those in the ICC Shungopavi petition.

Tyler notes that in 1874, a Hopi told Ingersoll of the United States Geological Survey that Hopis inhabited this country as far west as the headwaters of the San Juan, north to the Rio Dolores, west to Utah, and south and southwest throughout Arizona and into New Mexico. They were chased south by savage strangers (1951:155-156).

Evaluation: The Hopi are unique in claiming both the land inhabited by their ancestors and the traditional use areas and ancestral lands of the relatives of individuals or clans who became Hopis. This produces a large traditional use area. Details of the TUA line are arbitrary.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

The Hanos came from Tsawarii on the Santa Cruz north of Santa Fe. Before that they lived at San Cristobal and San Lazaro moving to Santa Cruz between 1680 and 1692 (Eggen 1960:139).

Summary: The Hopi Tewa could also claim more of the Galisteo Basin than is indicated by the line.

Specific


Petitioner's Exhibit 69 (ICC Docket 196, National Archives) shows the locations of eagle shrines in Arizona and Utah. Exhibit 69A shows ruins, none are in New Mexico or Colorado. Exhibit 68 shows active eagle shrines according to clans or Mesa. None are in New Mexico or Colorado.
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ISLETA

1:100,000 maps: Acoma, Albuquerque, Belen

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Only Ellis (1979:351) gives information on the traditional use area. She states that Isleta Pueblo grew from an amalgamation of several related villages possibly extending into Tijeras Canyon (1979:351). She describes the southern Tiwa area as from Bernalillo to Los Lunas, west to the Rio Puerco, and east to the Manzano and Sandia mountains (1979:353). The TUA line is based on her description and details are arbitrary. Interstate 40 is used as a dividing line between the Isleta and Sandia traditional use areas.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: In the Indian Claims Commission [ICC] case, Isleta asked for compensation for two tracts of land they claimed had been taken through Spanish grants. These would extend the traditional use area boundaries slightly beyond the current reservation.

Evaluation: Ellis’s delineation of the southern Tiwa area (1979:353) may be fairly accurate; although she also maintains that some of the Rio Grande sites were Keresan (1956:15). The line drawn is an approximation based on her information.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ellis (1979:351) reports that refugees from villages in the foothills of the Manzanos (Chilili, Tajique, two small pueblos near Torreon, Tabira or Grand Quivira, Abo, and Tenabo) joined the Isletas in the 1600s because of Apache depredations. She also indicates (1979:353) that Isleta tradition tells of a
partial derivation from the south, which could mean those from the Manzano foothills or the Jornada Mogollons.

Montgomery-McGovern recorded an Isleta tradition that says their ancestors came down from the Sandia Mountains to inhabit their present pueblo (1932:64).

According to Parsons, the inhabitants of Quari, Tijique, and others east of the Rio Grande moved to Isleta in 1675 because of Apache attacks (1932:203). In 1880 some Lagunas migrated to Isleta (1932:205).

Summary: Based on Ellis (1979) and Parsons (1932), the Isletas might also claim an interest in the areas of the abandoned pueblos mentioned above, the Laguna traditional use area, and the area inhabited by the Jornada Mogollon.

Specific

Ellis reports that Isleta claims LA 489 as an ancestral site (1979:351).

Parsons states that Nahorai, the highest peak of the Manzano Mountains, has a raw material source for the red paint utilized by racers and ditch workers. Prayer feathers are deposited at a nearby spring (1932:320).
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Transcripts Antonio Abyeta, Dudley, Walter A. Rochow.
1:100,000 maps: Abiquiu, Los Alamos, Chaco Canyon, Chaco Mesa

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Sando (1982:64).

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Ellis (1956:5-6) gives a verbal description of the Jemez traditional use area that is similar to Sando's map (1982:64). The northern limits are a shrine on San Pedro Peak, the Baca location, and Yellow Mountain House on the southwest edge of Cuba. The western edge runs from the Hidden Water site, between Rainbow ruin and Petrified Foot Print ruin, down to LA 606 on the Rio Salado. The eastern-most site is LA 85 in Peralta Canyon.

Regan was told that the Jemez own the whole Jemez Valley. They scattered during the summer and returned to Jemez and San Antonio Hot Springs during winter (1917:27).

Evaluation: Because of the scale, the details of the TUA line may be off slightly. Ellis's account basically agrees with Sando and may be the source of his line.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ford and others (1972:25) say that many believe the Jemez lived in the upper San Juan and are descendants of those responsible for the Rosa, Sambrito, and Los Pinos phase sites. From there, they moved into the Gallina region, then into Jemez country.

Friedlander and Pinya note a shrine on the Sangre de Cristo Mountains and that some ceremonies are held on Lake Peak (1980:28).
In an ICC case, 250 Jemez claimed descent from Pecos and requested compensation for loss of the Pecos Grant (8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 200).

Sando claims that the ancestral Jemez lands are around Largo Canyon and in the Gallina Area. Later, they extended south to Yellow Mountain and Hidden Spring (both west of Cuba), west of La Ventana and Rainbow Springs, and into the Rio de las Vacas and Rio Cebolla (1982:9-10).

According to Schroeder (1979:435), Pecos Indians and their descendants visited two shrines north of the pueblo into the twentieth century.

**Summary:** The Jemez might claim an interest in the Pecos Grant area, the Navajo Reservoir area, and other areas with Rosa, Sambrito, and Los Pinos sites, and in the area of Gallina sites.

**Specific (on topo maps; @ approximate location)**

Douglas (1917:346, 357)

**World Center Shrine, Tsikomo Peak** [Douglas 1917:375] T 21N, R 5E

**La Sierra de la Bola Shrine** [Douglas 1917:376] T 19N, R 13E

Ellis (1956) considered the following as Jemez sites: Guilawena; just west of present Jemez, LAS 85, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 186, 187, 192, 248, 258, 303 (Pueblo Toreon), 373 (Red Rock Village), 386, 403, 479, 483, 484, 606 (Kwaivagu), Petrified Foot Ruin, Rainbow Ruin, and Cactus Ruin.

Friedlander and Pinyan (1980:28):

**Mount Pelado; peak has one of the most important shrines**

* T 18N, R 4E

Petitioner's Proposed Findings of Facts (1957:6-15) lists the following shrines jointly used by Zia, Jemez, and Santa Ana:

**La Ventana**

* T 19N, R 1W
Virgin Canyon
Barrankita Blanka
Alto Cruz
Fawn Spring
Mesa San Felipe
Stone Ford
Navajo Springs
Fork at Rios Bacas and Cebolla Creek
Big Black Hill
Vallecitos de los Indios
Grandma Cave
Sierra Paliza
Parrot Springs
Arroyo Hondo
Bear Springs
Sierra Quepa
Guaje Navajo
Mesa Santa Ana
Horned Peak
Coronado Ruin

These and others are also mentioned in the ICC transcript

Big Falls; east fork of the Jemez River
Redondo Peak
Hot Spring in San Antonio Creek

red top or big hill in Rio Vacas area
lake at head of Rio Vacas
ruin near Hiding Water, at Yellow Mountain; a Jemez ruin

? @ T 20N, R 2E

Los Torreones tank; red hill
Rainbow Spring @ T 18N, R 3W
Ojo Yewwne (Mare Springs)
Eagle Hunting shrine; north and east of Redondo Peak

@ T 19N, R 3-4E

Sando (1982):
Stone or Boulder Lake; place of origin * @ T 29N, R 1W - 1E
Pau-wa-s’ta-wa; Holy Ghost Spring; shrine @ T 17N, R 1W
Sae-yu-shun kio-kwa; Bird Peak; shrine @ T 17N, R 1E
Pe-pen-huni-kwa; Mountain’s End; shrine @ T 17N, R 1E
Da-’ash-te-kwa; Petrified Stone Place; shrine @ T 16N, R 1E
Pe-kwile-gi; Peñasco Spring; shrine @ T 15N, R 1E
Pe-paa-kwa; Sun Spring; west of San Ysidro @ T 15N, R 1E
Tsung-paa-gi; Sad Spring ? @ T 19N, R 1E
Wa-ha-bela-wa; Butterfly place @ T 18N, R 1E
below Tu-va-lwa
Soda Dam ? @ T 18N, R 3E
Daha-enu; Battleship Rock * @ T 18-19N, R 3E
Jemez Falls * @ T 18N, R 3E
Wa-ve-ma; Redondo Peak * @ T 19N, R 3-4E
Pa-shum-mu; Flower Mountain or Cichoma Peak; northeast corner boundary
marker * @ T 21N, R 5E
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Jemez villages

A-stio-le-kaw; San Diego Mesa
Amu-shun-kwa; Anthill place; Holiday Mesa
Wa-han-kwa; pumpkin place; overlooking Jemez Springs
Ko-le-wa-han-anu; small pumpkin; south of pumpkin place
Guisewa (LA 579) * T 18N, R 3E
Noni-shagi (LA 541); aspen growing place
Unshagi (LA 123); cedar growing place
Ho-kin-ti-le-ta; white hole place
Pa-to-kwa; turquoise moiety place

Regan (1917):
Red Rock; .5 miles north of Jemez; shrine * T 16N, R 2E
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Tsi-kumu. which means Obsidian Covered Mountain. In Towa its name is Pa-shun, meaning Flower Mountain.

Sando (1982:64)
JICARILLA APACHES


Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line is based on Hibben's line (the aboriginal use area or finer line) in Petitioner's Exhibit M from the Indian Claims Commission [ICC] case, as reproduced in Apache Indians XII after page 196. Exhibit M does not have section lines. The claim line (the heavy line on the map) is the result of negotiations and stipulations concerning overlaps with San Ildefonso, Santo Domingo, Santa Clara, Taos, and Nambe. Note that most of the Jicarilla Reservation falls outside the traditional use area and they will undoubtedly want to be consulted about that area.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Bender describes the Jicarilla range around 1850 as the mountainous country north into Colorado, to the Rio Grande beginning at the 37th parallel, and extending east into Texas (1974:25). In 1868, the western Jicarilla claimed the country between the Rio Grande and San Juan River, and with the Capote Utes, claimed a vast area west of the Rio Grande in New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, and Colorado including the Navajo River and San Juan River and its tributaries (1974:141).

Opler gives the western boundary as Tierra Amarilla and Chama, the northern as into Colorado, and extending east of the Canadian River. Their former territory surrounded all of the eastern pueblos (1971:310-311).
Tiller states the western boundary of Jicarilla native lands is the Sangre de Cristo Mountains, the northern is the Arkansas River, the eastern is the Big Cimarron River and Llano Estacado, and the southern range is the upper Pecos Valley and foothills of the Sangre Cristos (1976:2). Their home base was approximated by their four sacred rivers: the Arkansas, Rio Grande, Canadian, and Pecos (1976:3).

**Evaluation:** Exhibit M and the map with section lines (Gordon et al. 1974 after p. 182) differ in details suggesting that neither line is precise. Jicarilla camp sites and shrines occur throughout the area and support the claim for use of the area.

**Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:**

**General**

According to Bender, the Jicarillas regarded the Cimarron country as their home and held sacred medicine feasts and ceremonies for the dead there (1974:26). The Cimarron Valley was considered sacred, they used plants from the valley to make medicine, held feasts, and performed ceremonies for their dead in the valley (1974:143).

Dunham states that tradition places the Jicarilla center around Taos -- at the head of the Arkansas River below Royal Gorge, near Canyon City, Colorado (1963:29).

Sacred rivers that also served as boundaries include the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian (Nelson 1974:176). The Jicarilla origin myth places their emergence near Taos. According to myth, some Jicarillas believe that their first home was about 15 miles east of Taos. Others think it was in the San Juan Mountains of

According to Opler (1971:315), their sacred rivers include the Canadian, Arkansas, Rio Grande, Pecos, and sometimes the Chama River. Water from at least two sacred rivers was needed for some ceremonies. A place near Taos is considered the heart of the world. Friendly supernaturals dwell at Abiquiu Peak.

Specific Request for Findings of Fact, Hibben's list of sacred places (Hibben affidavit 1965:2) (* on topo maps, @ approximate location):

- Tucumcari Butte; sacred (Tucumcari Mountain) * T 11N, R 30-31E
- Rabbit Ear Mountain; shrine and landmark * T 27N, R 35E
- Sierra Grande; sacred stone for luck in hunting T 29N, R 29E
- Ojo Caliente; sacred hot springs @ T 24N, R 8E
- Ojo del Espiritu Santo; sacred hot springs @ T 16N, R 1W
- Sulphur Springs or Jemez Springs; sacred * T 18N, R 2E
- Huerfano Peak; sacred place and landmark * T 27N, R 9W
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ICC, Exhibit (Gordon et al. reproduced in Apache Indians VI after p. 182)
LAGUNA

1:100,000 maps: Acoma, Albuquerque, Belen, Grants

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Two sources are used to produce the TUA line. The first source is the verbal description of the boundary claimed in the Indian Claims Commission [ICC] Case (Petitioners, Pueblo of Laguna, Proposed Findings and Brief, pp. 7-8). The second is from Rands's Map 14 (reproduced in Pueblo Indians IV) where the line is erroneously labeled as the "Exterior Boundaries of Acoma Claim." The Acoma boundary is labeled "Laguna's Claim." The TUA line is a combination of the two, using the outer of the two lines.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Ellis (1974b:74-75) names eight Laguna boundary markers. The three that could be located on the topographic maps are reasonably close to both lines (on the north) or to Rands's line (on the south).

The line on Rands's Map 14 agrees with the description of the northern and western boundaries, and at least part of the eastern boundary given by Frank Paisano, an informant who was almost 99 years old when the hearings were held in 1953. The other landmarks and corners mentioned by Paisano could not be found on the topographic maps.

Evaluation: Both sets of lines are largely artificial--following section, township, range, or county lines. Only a small portion of the north, and most of the east boundaries utilize natural features such as the Rio Puerco and Salada Creek. This suggests recent estimates rather than actual traditional boundaries. The ICC west boundary is definitely artificial. It is the stipulated boundary between Acoma and Laguna.
Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ellis (1959:325) reports that the Lagunas were joined by settlers from Zia and Santa Ana.

In a later work, Ellis states that Laguna tradition has them coming from the north, probably from Mesa Verde after years of drought, then moving south as far as Alamo. One group continued southward and others retraced their steps northward (1974a:14). The Lagunas were in their present location in the 1400s after migrating from the north (1974a:43). Laguna sites extend from the Puerco on the east to Siama on the west, from the Agua Salado Valley on the north to Pakwenema on the south. The use area is outlined by shrines visited periodically (1974a:290).

The Lagunas claim that some of their people stopped in the Zia area and others went to the western area (Ellis 1974b:12). The Laguna route south from Mesa Verde was east of that of the Acomas--through San Ysidro and Zia (1974b:50).

In the late seventeenth century, refugees from Zia, Cochiti, Santo Domingo, Jemez, and Acoma moved to Laguna (Petitioner's Proposed Findings of Fact: 7).

Summary: Areas that might be of concern because Laguna absorbed populations from other pueblos include the traditional use areas of Zia, Santa Ana, Cochiti, Santo Domingo, Jemez, and Acoma.

Specific

In the past, the Laguna sacred mountains were Sandia Mountain to the east, Zuni Mountain to the west, Petaco Pinto to the south, and a peak north of Casa Salazar for the north. Today, closer mountains are used, one near Suwanne for the east and Mount Taylor for the west (Hewett and Dutton 1945:3).
Rands indicates that Laguna has six main shrines plus the Zuni Salt Lake. These include the top of Mount Taylor and Shote Koyte, a lower peak just north of Cebolleta, as the northern shrines; a hill in back of San Rafael as the western shrine; the top of Petouche and Cerro del Oro as the southern shrines; and Correo Snake Pit as the eastern shrine (1974:280).

Ellis (1974a:105-106): List of some shrines [locations are from Ellis's Exhibit 8 or the topo. maps; * indicates the feature is located on the topo. maps].

Ashanikotio (Wheat Mountain) - hill 1 mile north of Highway 66, halfway between Old and New Laguna * Wheat Mountain is T 10N, R 5W

Petoche - butte where one of the katchinas lives T 7N, R 6W

Shootikooti - 6 miles northwest of the Encinal in Cebolleta grant

Akotsziotio (Flower Mountain shrine) near Seama * T 10N, R 7W

Deep Cave - 3 miles northeast of Laguna T 10N, R 5W

Shooticama (shallow cave shrine) - .5 mile north of Laguna T 9-10N, R 5-6W

Hole where air comes out of the ground - 3 miles northeast of Laguna T 10N, R 5W

Tsitutiuwitsa - 7 miles southwest of Laguna

Matsuro's cave - east side of the mesa below the burned ruin of Shumusachtia

Tsitswuscomatsa (hiding water place) 2 miles northwest of Paguate

Tashkanakawaishu - spring near Sais-Wilson headquarters

Shrines close to Laguna

east side of the village
center of the plaza
Mukechakama
and two not described
Wakasuchtia - 4 miles southwest of Laguna and east of Shinatza

T 9N?, R 5 or 6W

Near Bell Rock - shrine for war captains

T 2-3N, R 9-10W

hill where pottery clay is obtained - two shrines - .5 mile northwest of
Laguna

T 9-10N, R 5W

shrine south of the one above - near railroad overpass T 9N?, R 5W
cave on sharp point of a mesa south of the railroad and south of Mesita
shrine northwest of Old Laguna
shrine south of Laguna on the south side of the highway
shrine west of Laguna where railroad bridge used to be
Cerro Oro

* T 5N, R 6W

Ojo Gallo

* T 10N, R 10W

Hills west of Marquez and on east side of Mount Taylor
Correo Snake Pit

T 8N, R 3W

High on Mount Taylor - war god shrine

T 12N, R 7W

Ellis (1974a:107-113) sites (ruins) with historical or mythological importance:

[LM-5] Punyana - first Laguna village

T 9N, R 5W

[LM-3] burned village, former home of the supernatural Matsuro

T 9N, R 5W. SW.

[also labeled LM-5] Old Laguna

[LM 14a] Shinatza # 1 - used for performance of secret ceremonials

T 9N, R 5-6W
[LM-8] Kawakaisha - defensive site said to be a place where old people, women, and children were placed during periods of danger  T 10N, R 5W

[LM-17] Sist (Old Mesita) - tradition says this is the first spot settled by Mesitas moving westward, probably when the conservatives left Laguna for Isleta  T 9N, R 4W

[LM-12] Punyeestye - occupied during the 1800s and was the site used for Katchina dances prior to the migration of Laguna conservatives  T 9N, R 6W
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LAGUNA SHRINES AND HOUSE SITES

ICC, Laguna Exhibit 8 (reproduced in Pueblo Indians II after p. 106)
LAND USE IN LAGUNA CLAIM AREA

LCC, Laguna Exhibit 87 (reproduced in Pueblo Indians V after p. 238)
LIPAN APACHES

1:100,000 maps: none

Traditional Use Area:

Sources: All of the sources reviewed indicate that the traditional use area of the Lipan Apaches did not reach New Mexico.

Mayhall gives a map of the Kiowa range showing the Lipan Apaches far into Texas, around San Antonio (1962:193).

Opler states that the Lipan occupied central and south Texas (1983:385).

The Proposal to Settle includes a version of Royce's (1899) Texas map where overlaps are identified. The Lipan Apache pending claim was well within Texas with an intervening claim by the Mescalero Apaches.

Richardson shows the 1820 location of the Lipans as well into Texas with the Mescaleros between them and the New Mexico boundary (1928:142).

Schroeder indicates that population shifts for the Lipan were south then west. All movement was in Texas (1974:569).
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MANSO

1:100,000 maps: El Paso, Las Cruces

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line is an estimate based on a map showing the area of Texas exploited by the Mansos, the projection of that line into New Mexico (Intervenors Rebuttal Exhibit, Docket 22C, Exhibit No. 3), and the descriptions in sources below. A similar version of the Texas map was photographed at the National Archives.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Forbes (1959:98) has a map that shows the Manso in southwestern New Mexico but it is very general. They have lived in the El Paso region since at least 1598 (1959:105).

Gerald (1974:117) notes that early sightings of the Mansos were in the vicinity of Doña Ana, New Mexico. Most settled near El Paso and intermarried with other groups. Some may have joined the Tigua community of Tortugas near Las Cruces (1974:123).

Intervenor's Proposed Findings of Fact and Brief (1973:18) states that the Mansos and Sumas were the indigenous inhabitants of the Mesilla Valley and the El Paso area. Beckett and Corbett (1992:3) also place some Mansos in the Mesilla Valley.

The ICC (36 Ind. Cl. Comm. 44) found that the Manso traditional lands were north of El Paso on both sides of the Rio Grande and the Mansos had been assimilated into the greater Mexican population by 1750.

Opler (1974:339) mentions a map that shows the Manso range was primarily in New Mexico with only a small part extending into Texas.
Evaluation: Since none of the maps show a New Mexico distribution, this line is an estimate. It is also possible there are no Manso descendants to consult. Their mention in the ICC case suggests the few that remain may be part of the Tortugas or Ysleta del Sur populations.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

No references to general or specific cultural properties were found.
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AREA EXPLOITED BY THE MAHNSO
DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
AND EARLIER

ICC, Intervenor's Rebuttal Exhibit 3 (National Archives, Docket 220)
MESCALERO APACHES


Traditional Use Area:

Source: The Indian Claims Commission Map, titled Mescalero Apaches, 1846-1880, reproduced in Apache Indians XII, after p. 362 is used to produce the TUA line.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: A map similar to the ICC map was located in Box 20 of Docket 22B at the National Archives. It shows a line that is similar to the TUA line and the government's recommended claim boundary. The government's claim does not extend as far as the Rio Grande to the west or to the state line to the east (pencil line on TUA maps). Its northern extent is between T 3 and 4N.

Basehart (1974:104-108) describes the aboriginal boundaries as the Rio Grande to the west, north to the Las Vegas area, east beyond the Pecos River, including the Llano Estacado, and south at least to the United States-Mexico border.

Bender (1974:274) indicates that the Mescalero range prior to the 1870s was between the Rio Grande and Pecos River in southern New Mexico. Their principal area was the Sierra Blanca, Sacramento, San Andres, and Organ Mountains. Some also lived in the Guadalupe Mountains and on the west side of the Rio Grande.
They occasionally traveled east of the Pecos River to join the Lipans in hunting bison. They also ranged into Jicarilla country to the north.

Mooney (1898, Plate 57) shows the Mescalero range in 1832 as extending to the Rio Grande, through the Llano Estacado into Texas, and north past Las Vegas.

Opler's recent map of the tribal territory in 1830 (1983:419b) gives the west boundary as the Rio Grande, the north as about 40 km south of Fort Sumner (which is about 70 km south of the boundary in the ICC case), and extending into Texas on the east and Mexico to the south.

Royce (1899:199, 923) shows the combined Jicarilla and Mescalero range as extending to the Rio Grande in the west and well into Texas in the east.

Evaluation: Basehart's (1974) maps for the Mescalero indicate they hunted and moved even farther north than the claim area. They also show little use, except for bison hunting, on the plains east of the Pecos River.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

As noted above, the Mescalero area of interest could extend as far north as Las Vegas (Basehart 1974; Mooney 1898).

Specific

Basehart's place names (1974:82-101) [map and text reference] (* on topo. maps; @ approximate location). Includes locations called sacred and those mentioned in myths or legends.

[24] dzildiyene or Salinas Peak (sacred mountain) * T 12S, R 4E
[31] tsedezai or rock pointed in a row (sacred place)
   @ T 23S, R 6E
[32] dzilhaldo?e (called to induce supernaturals to send heat)
nangodaszei or pointed sidewise; Capitan Peak (sacred mountain)  

* dzilkije or "just spotted with trees" (favored camp site of the mythical Foolish People)  

mbaibite?ozehaiyolkitc or "coyote cut out his calf" (refers to an incident in the cycle of coyote stories)  

eyanelezenetcezendil or "black animal let out" (refers to an event in mythology and thus sacred associations)  

ltisjeyegogele or "bow with a kink in it" (finest bow made here and origin myth recounts a successful hunt following the invention of this bow)  

nadahendeisaj?ejindil or "women are let out" (mythology; where women were released from the underground)  

tsenta?disja or "pile of heavy rocks" (rocks are now gone) (figures in Mescalero legends--could not be lifted)  

jo?olbihago?a or "canyon full of fir trees" (landmark associated with Mescalero legend)  

dzilkijende or "Foolish People" (camp site of mythical foolish people)  
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NAMBE

1:100,000 maps: Santa Fe

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Indian Claims Commission [ICC] unnumbered exhibit, reproduced in Pueblo Indians V, after p. 393 is used as the source of the TUA line. The Petitioner's and Defendant's lines are similar. The boundary farthest from the pueblo is used for producing the TUA line except in the two areas where the Nambe Reservation boundary is outside the area indicated in the ICC exhibit. Here, the reservation boundary is used as the TUA line.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Harrington states that his Map 22 mainly has Nambe place names; the area of Map 23 is claimed by the Nambes; Map 24, the area north of Nambe, has Nambe place names; and several Nambe ruins are found on Map 25 (1916:338, 358, 370, 377).

Evaluation: The TUA boundary is supported by Harrington's (1916) analysis. Many of the boundary markers are natural features.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

According to Ellis, the ancestors of the Tewa came from the San Juan region. Some probably came from Chaco Canyon, some from the Aztec district, some from Mesa Verde, and others from farther east on the San Juan (1974:14).

Parsons (1929:142) states that the Tewa origin myth has them emerging at Sand Lake.

Summary: Nambe could claim the Chaco Canyon, Aztec, and Mesa Verde areas as part of their traditional use area based on remote ancestry.

Specific [* on topo. maps; @ approximate location]
Ellis (1974) identifies the following as ancestral Nambe Pueblos: [Harrington's number]

[25-30] T'o B'Hi-Pang-GE; Old Nambe; 5 miles east; LA 254
   @ T 19-20E, R 10E

[22-40] KE-GUA-Yo; 3 miles SE of Nambe
   @ T 19N, R 11E

[22-41] A-Ga-Uo-No; 4 miles east of Nambe
   @ T 19N, R 11E

[22-42] KA-A-YU
   @ T 19N, R 11E

[25-23] Kate Ye Ouinge; LA 264
   @ T 20N, R 10E

[25-8] Cundayo on Rio Frijoles; LA 31
   @ T 20N, R 10E

[25-18] Pibiriong-Wikeji
   @ T 20N, R 10E

[25-36] POWA Kwaiye Ouinge
   @ T 19N, R 10E

LA 18; Sahkeyo; Yohe Kwaiye Ouinge

LA 17; Nambe Pueblo
   * T 19N, R 9E

Ellis (1962):

shrine on top of a flat-topped mesa 1.5 miles east of plaza
   @ T 19N, R 9E

Kea tchatne or Sands Lake; sacred and used in ceremonials

Yamayoge; major shrine

Okwinge Lakes; Katherine Lake; major shrine
   * T 19N, R 11E

Tamayoge; water shrine

Lake Peak, Sun Blue Lake; initiations and ceremonials
   * T 18N, R 11E

Friedlander and Pinyan (1980:21-23):

sacred mountains:

Santa Fe Baldy
   * T 19N, R 11E
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Lake Peak *T 18N, R 11E
Kate Okwinge or Lake Katherine; major shrine *T 19N, R 11E
Spirit Lake and Sun Blue Lake (below Lake Peak) T 18N, R 11E
Sandy Lake; major shrine

Harrington (1915):

[6-24] Ojo Caliente @T 24N, R 8E
[22-40] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 19N, R 11E
[22-41] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 19N, R 11E
[22-42] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 19N, R 11E
[23-9] track for ceremonial foot-racing @T 19N, R 9E
[23-30] first pueblo named Nambe @T 19N, R 9E
[23-36] adobe ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 19N, R 9E
[23-49] small piles of stone placed for religious purposes @T 19N, R 9E
[24-44] fire medicine hill; shrine on top @T 19N, R 9E
[25-8] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 20N, R 10E
[25-18] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 20N, R 10E
[25-23] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 20N, R 10E
[25-30] ruin of Nambe ancestors @T 19-20N, R 10E
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NAVAJO

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line is based on Indian Claims Commission [ICC] Map 8, reproduced in Navajo Indians III, pocket map.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: The Navajo Tribe’s Proposed Findings of Fact shows an even larger area of use and control based on locations recorded in historical documents (p. 157).

The ICC claim was for forty million acres. The ICC felt the aboriginal use area supported by archaeological and historical records was more like ten million acres (23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 281).

Brugge’s (1983:490) map of settlement areas in 1800 is similar to ICC Map 8 except that it excludes the Zuni, Acoma, and Laguna reservations.

Evaluation: The Navajo claim seems large. It includes all or parts of the Acoma, Laguna, Zuni, Jemez, Jicarilla, and Ute Reservations in New Mexico. They are likely to want to be consulted for the entire area indicated on ICC Map 8 and possibly an even larger area based on clan origins.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

107
The Navajo origin myth states that the Navajos originated in the Mesa Verde or La Plata area of Colorado or the Stinking Lake area of northern New Mexico (Ellis 1974b:91). Ellis believed that the first three parts of the origin legend were borrowed from the Pueblos. These parts resemble those of the Keresans and of Jemez (Jemez borrowed their myth from Keresan neighbors) (1974b:47). The Navajo tribe is largely composed of people from other groups who have been adopted as clans. These clans include two Yuman groups, one from north of the San Juan (possibly Shoshonean), three pueblo clans (one from near Jemez, one from a Rio Grande pueblo, and one in two bands, from near Santa Fe and probably Tanoan, and one that is probably Keresan), three Apache groups, and one Athapaskan group -- probably the original Navajos (1974b:123, 129-130).

Summary: Since the Navajos have pueblo clans, the Jemez and other pueblo traditional use areas may be additional areas of concern.

Specific [ ] = ICC Map 8 and Van Valkenburgh 1974b reference number; * location is on topo. maps

[2] Burford or Stinking Lake
[2a] Taos
[4] Navajo Trail
[5] Salt Point
[6] Mesa Quartado
[7] Huernano Mountain
[8] Escrito Spring
[9] Wide Belt or Sisnateel
[10] Wijiji

* T 28N, R 1E
* T 26N, R 13E
T 28N, R 5W
T 28N, R 7W
T 28N, R 8W
T 28N, R 9W
* T 27N, R 9W
* T 23N, R 7W
* T 22N, R 6W
T 21N, R 10W
Mesa Fajada
Pueblo Pentado
Kin Ya A
Red Mountain
Cabezon Peak
Pajarito Peak
Cerro Caliso or Big Bead Mesa
Old Crater
Mount Taylor
San Mateo Lava Flow
Ojo de Gallo
Cerro Berra
The Geyser
San Mateo Peak
Mogollon Baldy
Hosta Butte
Star Mountain
Navajo Church Rock
Twin Buttes
Ga'ngi'dail
Salt Lake
Mesa Santa Rita
Chimney Rock
Salt Creek
Aztec Ruin

* T 21N, R 10W
* T 20N, R 8W
T 17N, R 12W
T 18N, R 3W
* T 16N, R 3W
* T 17N, R 1E
T 15N, R 4W
T 14N, R 10W
* T 12N, R 7W
T 10N, R 9W
* T 10N, R 10W
T 8N, R 2W
T 7N, R 3W
* T 8S, R 6W
* T 12S, R 17W
* T 16N, R 13W
?? T 15N, R 3W
* T 16N, R 17W
* T 15N, R 19W
T 4N, R 15W
* T 3N, R 18-19W
* T 5N, R 18W
* T 31N, R 16W
* T 31-32N, R 17W
* T 30N, R 11W
[59] Mesa Mountains T 32N, R 9W
[60] River Junction * T 30-31N, R 7W
[61] San Rafael Canyon T 29N, R 7W
[62] Big Water T 30N, R 5W
[65] Shiprock Pinnacle * T 29N, R 19W
[74] Red Lake Volcanic Plugs T 19N, R 21W
[76] Chuska Peak * T 19N, R 19W

Goodman (1982: Map 44) gives a map with sacred places marked but not identified.

Hester (1962:85) lists the following as sacred mountains: Pelado Peak for the east, Mount Taylor (* T 12N, R 7W) for the south, San Francisco Mountain as the west, the La Plata Mountains for the north, and Huerfano Mesa (* T 27N, R 9W) as the center. Other sacred geographical points in New Mexico include: Hog Back Mountain (* T 30N, R 16W and T 27-29N, R 16W), Blue House above Farmington, and Red Mesa near Farmington.

References Reviewed:

Bailey, Garrick, and Roberta Glenn Bailey

Brugge, David M.

Correl, J. Lee
1972 Report Showing Traditional Navajo Use and Occupancy of Lands in the 1882 Executive Order Reservation. Research Section of the Navajo Tribe, Window Rock.


110
Ellis, Florence H.  


Fanale, Rosallie Angelina  

Goodman, James M.  

Harrington, John P.  

Hester, James J.  
1962 *Early Navajo Migrations and Acculturation in the Southwest*. Museum of New Mexico Papers in Anthropology, No. 6, Santa Fe.  

Jenkins, Myra Ellen, and Ward Alan Minge  

Kluckhohn, Clyde and Dorothea Leighton  

O'Bryan, Aileen  

Reeve, Frank D.  


Schroeder, Albert H.  

111
Sutton, Imre

Van Valkenburgh, Richard F.

Van Valkenburgh, Richard F. (edited by Clyde Kluckhohn)

Court Cases and Materials:


Materials at the National Archives Docket 229 (30 boxes).
PAWNEE

1:100,000 maps: none

Traditional Use Area:

Sources: Blaine (1980) depicts the Pawnee distribution around 1800 as almost entirely within Kansas and Nebraska and barely reaching into northern Oklahoma and northeastern Colorado.

Heape places Pawnee living areas in Kansas and Nebraska but the hunting-raiding area extends into New Mexico in the vicinity of the Canadian River (1982:62). This area could be considered part of their traditional use area; although another map (1982:63) showing the same area places the Kiowa in that vicinity.

Hyde notes that the Pawnees may have stole horses and mules in New Mexico. His map of Pawnee land between 1300 and 1725 shows the closest Pawnee villages well into Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas (1974:10-11, 157).

The Indian Claims Commission case concerned land in Nebraska and Kansas.

Schroeder, working for the government and trying to prove the Jicarillas did not have exclusive use of northwestern New Mexico, maps the documented sightings of Pawnees and other Plains groups from 1694 through 1852. He shows the Pawnee located in Nebraska between 1694 and 1720. By the late 1700s raids, visits, or camps were recorded at Las Vegas, Mora, Taos, and along the Cimarron (1974:457).

While the Pawnees were definitely in New Mexico, their main territory was in the Plains. It seems unlikely that their raiding and trading would have established a traditional use area within the state.
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Heape (1982:62)
PICURIS

1:100,000 maps: Taos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: No source gives a traditional use area beyond the current Picuris reservation. The reservation is marked as the TUA.

Evaluation: Picuris probably had a larger traditional use area than today's reservation. Spanish settlers have infringed on land and water rights since the early 1700s (Schroeder 1974:16-17). Brown tells of protests when the commons east of the pueblo grant was given to a non-Indian settler (1973:45).

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Brown was told that some of Picuris ancestors had lived at Pot Creek (T 24N, R 13E), possibly with ancestors of the Taos Indians (1973:1).

Schroeder (1974:15-16) mentions the following shrines: a sacred rock with a sun painting in the middle of the Rio Pueblo (it was blasted away by a lumber company), a shrine on the mounded remains of an old house at the pueblo, and La Jicarita Peak (T 21N, R 13E).

A San Juan Indian told Harrington that the principal shrine of the Picuris was located on top of Jicarita Mountain (1916:194, 339).

Summary: A traditional use area may extend at least as far as Jicarita Peak.
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POJOAQUE

1:100,000 maps: Los Alamos, Santa Fe

Traditional Use Area:

Source: No source discusses boundaries. The current Pojoaque Reservation represents the TUA.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Harrington (1916:336) could not find a Pojoaque Indian at Pojoaque. Lambert (1979:326) states that much of the population was lost or absorbed by other pueblos. Those who resettled in the early 1930s were a mix of Tewas, Tiwas, and Spanish.

Evaluation: The traditional use area could easily be larger than the reservation and could include the areas of other Tewa and Tiwa pueblos.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Except for general Tewa traditional properties, none were found that refer specifically to Pojoaque.

Summary: The Pojoaques could claim additional traditional cultural properties based on remote origins or relationship to other Tewa and Tiwa groups.

Specific

Ellis (1979:4) considered LA 61 a Pojoaque ruin.
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SANDIA

1:100,000 maps: Albuquerque

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Ellis (1979:353) describes the southern Tiwa range as the area from Bernalillo to Los Lunas, west to the Rio Puerco, and east to the Manzano and Sandia mountains. The TUA line is based on this description and her comment that Isleta villages possibly extended into Tijeras Canyon. Interstate 40 is used as an arbitrary divider between the Sandia and Isleta traditional use areas.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Sandia Pueblo residents fled to the Hopi region after the Pueblo Revolt (Brayer 1939:67). Returning to resettle in 1748, their western boundary became the Rio Grande because Spanish ranchers now owned the land west of the river. The eastern boundary was the main ridge of the Sandia Mountains (1939:68-69).

Simons describes the Sandia territory (probably modern) as from the foothills of the Sandias to the east, Bernalillo to the north, the Rio Grande to the West, and Alameda to the south. She claims that their spiritual and physical boundaries lie within this area (1969:23).

Evaluation: Ellis’s (1979:353) description of the southern Tiwa range may be fairly accurate. The TUA line is an approximation based on her information. Sandia’s claim of shrines on the West Mesa (Parker 1993) and in the Sandia Mountains (Brant 1979:347; Simons 1969:28) tend to support such an area.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Brant states that sacred shrines are located in the Sandia Mountains (1979:347).
Dozier says that the Spanish restored 441 Tiwas to their pueblos of Pajarito, Alameda, and Sandia. This implies the Pajarito and Alameda could be considered ancestral Sandia sites (1970:87). Schroeder also identifies the residents of Puaray and Alameda as Tiwas (1972:58).

Parker notes that the Sandias consider the area of Petroglyph National Monument sacred (1993:4).

Simons also reports sacred areas in the Sandias (1969:28) and that the water from the Rio Grande is still considered sacred (1969:39).

Specific

Douglas (1917:357-358) identifies the La Sierra de la Bola Shrine (T 19N, R 3E) as one visited by residents of Sandia Pueblo.
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SAN FELIPE

1:100,000 maps: Albuquerque, Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line includes the current San Felipe lands, the joint use area with Santo Domingo, and the Angostura Grant.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: San Felipe has a long history of land conflicts with Santa Ana and Santo Domingo. The Santa Ana people have grazed, planted, and even sold land along the Rio Grande claimed by San Felipe (Brayer 1939:78-79). The Angostura Grant, located between San Felipe and Santa Ana, was sold and eventually lost through adverse possession (1939:83-86).

Evaluation: The San Felipe traditional use area could easily be larger. There is little information about this pueblo and they did not file objections to claims by Santa Ana, Santo Domingo, Zia, or Cochiti pueblos before the Indian Claims Commission.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Strong shows the Keresans living around Chaco Canyon and extending north to Aztec and Mesa Verde. The Cochitis and San Felipes lived together at various villages in the Rio Grande Valley. The last joint village was Kuapa (which he locates at five miles north of Cochiti in Cochiti Canyon). After the split, the San Felipes built a pueblo at Cubero (1979:392).

According to their origin myth, the San Felipes lived at El Rito de los Frijoles with the Cochitis and Santo Domingos. They moved south, stopping at Kuapa (which White locates 12 miles northwest of Cochiti) where they lived with the Cochitis. They split with the Cochitis and moved to a pueblo (the first San
Felipe or Katishtya) west of the Rio Grande at Cubero, then moved and built a new pueblo at the foot of Mesa Tamita (La Mesita) when the first Katishtya was washed away (White 1934:7).

Summary: The San Felipes could also claim an interest in the Chaco Canyon to Aztec area or El Rito de los Frijoles based on remote ancestry. Their traditional use area probably extends beyond the area marked.

Specific

Harrington attributes a ruin built between 1683 and 1693 and located on the high blackish mesa west of San Felipe and north of Santa Ana to the San Felipes (1916:497-498).
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SAN ILDEFONSO

1:100,000 maps: Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:


Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Joe Aguilar (ICC Testimony 1975:12-15) described the San Ildefonso boundaries as Santa Clara reservation to the north; the Pojoaque and Tesuque reservations on the east; Cochiti reservation on the south; and Baca Location No. 1 and Valle Grande/Jemez Mountains on the west.

Ellis describes the west boundary as the high peaks and mesas of the Pajarito Plateau (1979:9).

According to Harrington, San Ildefonso claims all of the land depicted on his Maps 17, 19, and 20; Map 18, east of the Rio Grande; and at least part of Map 16 (1916:263-322). The southern boundary of Map 17 was identified as the approximate boundary between the land claimed by the San Ildefonos as the home of their ancestors and that claimed by the Cochitis as home of their ancestors (1916:278).

Evaluation: The ICC claim line may be fairly accurate. However, it does skirt other pueblo land and a part of the Santa Fe National Forest in a way that suggests the description was influenced by the ICC litigation. Placement of the TUA line is somewhat arbitrary in places, for example, when the description is:
along a ridge north of Chupadero Canyon or the ridge immediately north of the Rio de los Frijoles. The topographic maps do not have this kind of detail.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

**General**

Ford and others find the Tewa origins unclear. They may have been in the Upper San Juan and moved south down the Rio Chama and Rio Puerco about A.D. 1000, some occupying the Galisteo Basin and east side of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains. Alternatively, the Tewa could have developed from the Tiwa in the Middle Rio Grande about A.D. 900 (1972:31-32).

According to Hewett and Dutton, the Tewas consider the Ojo Caliente region to be the cradleland of their people (1945:40).

Whitman describes the migration of the San Ildefonsos as beginning in the north, some say Mesa Verde, moving south and occupying the villages of Potsuwi, Sankewi, and Otowi and finally moving to the Rio Grande after sources of water gradually failed. They moved to the top of Black Mesa after the Pueblo Revolt (1947:3-4). Edelman (1979:312) basically agrees.

**Summary:** The San Ildefonsos could also claim the Upper San Juan, Chama, Galisteo Basin, Middle Rio Grande, and Ojo Caliente areas based on remote ancestry.

**Specific** (* on the topo. maps; @ approximate location)

**Douglas (1917):**

- World-center shrine
  - T 21N, R 5E
- La Sierra de la Bola shrine
  - T 19N, R 3E
- nine shrines on Tonyo, sacred mesa of the San Ildefonsos
  - T 18N, R 8E
three shrines on Okuo Tuwanyo or La Lomita Alta T 19N, R 8E
Ovoahwi Peak shrine T 19N, R 8E

Friedlander and Pinyan (1980):

Tewa sacred peaks:

Conjilon
Tsikomo; Chicoma Mountain
Sandia Crest
Truchas Peak

Harrington (1916): [ ] Harrington’s map number

[6-24] Ojo Caliente T 24N, R 8E
[15-17] lake of the north; Kosa ceremonies T 20N, R 8E
[16-37] lake of the west; sacred water ceremony @ T 19N, R 7-8E
[16-105] Potsuwi’i ruin; ancestors lived here @ T 19N, R 7E
[16-114] another Potsuwi’i @ T 19N, R 7E
[17-34] Tshirege; ancestors lived here @ T 19N, R 6E
[18-4] alter or shrine @ T 20N, R 8E
[18-7] stone; figures in mythology @ T 20N, R 8E
[18-19] Black Mesa; figures in mythology * T 20N, R 8E
[18-23] alter on Black Mesa T 20N, R 8E
[18-30] "giants oven" southeast end of Black Mesa T 20N, R 8E
[19-29] shrine hill of San Ildefonso @ T 19N, R 8E
[19-39] lake of the east; spring @ T 19N, R 8E
[19-118] cave; home of the Black Mesa giant @ T 19N, R 8E
[19-123] lake of the south @ T 19N, R 7E
Hewett and Dutton (1945:34-40):

world mountains:
- Keping; San Antonio Peak * T 30N, R 9E
- Tsikumuping; Cerro Pelado * T 12N, R 5E
- 'Okuping; Sandia Mountain * T 12N, R 5E
- Kuseping; Lake Peak * T 18N, R 11E

Wayima'oku; shrine on a small roundish hill .75 miles from the village T 19N, R 8E

sacred lakes or springs:
- north lake; just north of the mouth of Santa Cruz Creek T 20N, R 8E
- east lake; spring south of Pojoaque creek @ T 19N, R 8E
- south lake; at Otowi T 19N, R 8E
- west lake; left of the San Ildefonzo-Otowi-Espinola road
  Ojo Caliente @ T 24N, R 8E

Schifter (ICC Testimony 1975:5) states that the area of the Roman Vigil Grant is a sacred area.

Abel Sanchez (ICC Testimony 1975:42) says that Capulin Canyon is a sacred area.
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SAN JUAN

1:100,000 maps: Abiquiu, Taos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Harrington (1916) indicates the San Juan traditional use area extended beyond the current reservation. The TUA line is extrapolated from his maps when these go beyond the reservation boundary (Maps 9, 10, and 12).

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Harrington indicates that the San Juans claim the areas of Map 9, Map 10, Map 11, Map 12, and Map 13 (1916:197, 205, 208, 219, 223).

Evaluation: Harrington's maps are not to scale. As a result, the portions of the TUA line that are based on these maps are subject to some error. The traditional use area could easily be larger than indicated.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ortiz notes that many Tewa elders have detailed knowledge of the region north and northwest of San Juan, especially in the Chama Valley. He believes it is because they once occupied that area (1969:148-149).

Summary: The San Juans could also claim the area north and northwest of their reservation, especially the Chama Valley, and even more remote areas, such as Mesa Verde, based on ancestral occupation.

Specific [* on topo. maps; @ approximate location]

Douglas (1917:355, 358):

World-center shrine  T 21N, R 5E
Sierra de la Bola shrine  T 19N, R 3E

Sun Blue Lake initiations and ceremonials

Harrington (1916): [map number]

[6-24] Ojo Caliente @ T 24N, R 8E
[9-14] sacred spot; mythology @ T 21N, R 10E
[9-43] Pio-ge; ancient San Juan village @ T 22N, R 9E
[10-26] ancestral San Juan site @ T 21N, R 8E
[12-27] principal ceremonial hill of San Juan @ T 21N, R 9E
[12-28] shrine on hill @ T 21N, R 9E
[12-30] shrine on hill @ T 21N, R 9E
[13-27] San Gabriel @ T 21N, R 8E

Ortiz (1969):

Posi owinge, Tewa ancestral village near Ojo Caliente

@ T 24N, R 8E

sacred mountains:

Conjilon Peak * T 27N, R 5E
San Antonio Peak (some say important but not sacred)
  * T 30N, R 9E
Tsikomo; Chicoma Mountain * T 21N, R 5E
Sandia Crest * T 24N, R 8E
Truchas Peak * T 20N, R 12E

sacred flat-topped hills:

Tema Yoh; above La Madera @ T 25N, R 8E
Toma Yoh; a few miles southwest
Tun Yoh; between San Ildefonso and Santa Clara
Tsi Mayoh; east of San Juan
principal shrines:

Than Powa; northern edge of village * T 21N, R 8E
Awe Kwiyoh; single stone at western edge * T 21N, R 8E
Nu Enu; single stone south of village * T 21N, R 8E
Ti Tan He i; shrine of the east; 1 mile east of village * T 21N, R 8E

others around each village
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SANTA ANA

1:100,000 maps: Albuquerque, Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Ellis's (1956) identification of Santa Ana use areas and sites is the basis of the TUA line. The TUA line was drawn to include the areas indicated as use areas and sites.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: No source discusses boundaries for Santa Ana.

Evaluation: Ellis based her identification of sites as Santa Ana on ceramics and legends (1956:15). The TUA lines are fairly arbitrary because there are no details in the literature.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ellis (1956:3) claims that the Santa Anas moved south with the Zias. They went farther south toward Acoma then back to the Rio Grande and northward to the Corrales-Ranchitos area where they were joined by a group from Paako. The Corrales group of Santa Anas lived in that area into the nineteenth century and had several pueblos including one at Puaray and several in Corrales. She also maintains that some Santa Anas came from the Galisteo Basin and split into two groups, one going to live with the Zias (1956:9). She attributes the Angostura Mill site, the Coffman site, and the Seven Day Adventist Academy site to the Santa Anas. The Angostura Mill residents moved to the east slope of the Sandias, possibly to Paako between 1300 and 1425, and were joined by a group from the Galisteo Basin (1956:9). Based on ceramics, Ellis believed that the Coffman site, the Gonzales site (LA 288), LA 1844, and the Seven Day Adventist Academy
site or Puaray II (LA 728) are Santa Ana sites. The Black site, west of Alameda, and the Whipple site, south of Alameda are also thought to be Santa Ana. Bandelier identified Paako as Tano. Spanish explorers in 1626 called it Tiwa (Harrington 1916:508).

Summary: Ellis's (1956) report suggests that Santa Ana could also claim part of the Galisteo Basin and Paako as part of their traditional use area. They could also claim the Chaco Canyon/Mesa Verde area based on remote ancestry.

Specific (* on topo maps; @ approximate location)
Hewett and Dutton 1945:36 name the six sacred mountains for Santa Ana:

kawestima
tspina
taotyuma
kchana
koatyuma
stiyeichana

Logan (1993:1)
Petroglyph National Monument

Petitioner's Proposed Findings of Facts (1957:6-15) lists the following shrines jointly used by Zia, Jemez, and Santa Ana:

La Ventana * T 19N, R 1W
Virgin Canyon
Barrankita Blanka
Alto Cruz
Fawn Spring
Mesa San Felipe * T 19N, R 4W
Stone Ford
Navajo Springs
Fork at Rios Bacas and Cebolla Creek
Big Black Hill
Vallecitos de los Indios
Grandma Cave
Sierra Paliza
Parrot Springs
Arroyo Hondo
Bear Springs
Sierra Quepa
Guaje Navajo
Mesa Santa Ana
Horned Peak
Coronado Ruin

* T 17N, R 1E
* T 18N, R 3E
* T 18N, R 1E
* T 18-15N, R 3-4E
* T 13N, R 4E

These and others are also mentioned in the ICC transcript

Big Falls; east fork of the Jemez River
Redondo Peak
Hot Spring in San Antonio Creek
red top or big hill in Rio Vacas area
lake at head of Rio Vacas
ruin near Hiding Water, at Yellow Mountain; a Jemez ruin

? @ T 20N, R 2E

Los Torreones tank; red hill
Rainbow Spring

@ T 18N, R 3W
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Ojo Yewwne (Mare Springs)
Eagle Hunting shrine; north and east of Redondo Peak

@ T 17N, R 1E

Peckham (1977) locates but does not name a number of shrines on Santa Ana land.

These are located:

- T 13N, R 4E, Secs. 4 (LA 2409), 5 (petroglyphs)
- T 14N, R 3E, Secs. 23, 24
- T 14N, R 4E, Secs. 31, 32

Public Law 95-498 lists the following shrines and religious sites:

- Santiyaku 'Ke Kura; Santiago's Corral
- Santiyaku Ka'we; Santiago's Home
- Santiyaka 'Kaisru; Santiago's Field
- 'Tsitsi Sruii; Water Snake Head
- Tuyuuma; Snake Head Shrine/Canjilon Hill
- Shayeka Kauwatsesrura; Hunter Shrine
- 'Kuyau 'Kapesru; Old Lady Sita Shrine
- Huchaniitse; White House Shrine
- Dyadyu Tsinautani; Bobcat Point
- 'Kasreri 'Kumiyeisrura; Clown Point
- Chapiyu 'Ka 'kuyanisru; Chapiyu's Trail
- Shawiti 'tsuyu; Parrot Point
- Hane 'Kai; Sacred Clown Society Shrine
- Yuarkuma; Corn Cob Shrine

White (1942:23):

- Old Tamaya or Santa Ana; on the Mesa de Santa Ana
site on Mesa del Cangelon may be the prehistoric home of the Santa Anas
(citing Bandelier)
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SANTA CLARA

1:100,000 maps: Abiquiu, Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The Indian Claims Commission [ICC] Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, claimed aboriginal area (photographed at the National Archives, Docket 356) is the basis for the TUA line.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Baklini (1968: Map 2) provides a map that has projected land claim boundaries similar to the ICC Exhibit 1 map except for the south. Her projected boundaries, mainly based on historical records, includes important landmarks.

According to Harrington, the Santa Claras claim the areas shown in his Maps 14 and 15; north to Ranchitos, south to Mesilla, and east to Santa Clara Pueblo (1916:231, 249). This corresponds fairly well to the ICC claim area.

The testimony of several Santa Clara elders (ICC Testimony, National Archives, Docket 356) has verbal descriptions supporting the boundaries and use of the area marked in Exhibit 1.

Evaluation: The TUA line should be fairly reliable since all three sources were in basic agreement. Two sources have the eastern boundary extending into the San Juan grant to just below Ranchito.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Aron and Hill relate the following history of Santa Clara. After emergence from a lake in southern Colorado, they migrated south, stopping at Ojo Caliente then passing through Pecos Pueblo. They returned to the Rio Grande Valley and built their homes. Their ancestors lived at Puye and Shufinne (1979:296).
Summary: The Santa Claras could claim land farther north or a route to Pecos Pueblo based on remote ancestry. The literature does not indicate additional areas of interest.

Specific (* on topo. maps; @ approximate location)

Baklini (1968:94):

Tschicoma Mountain; shrine and ancestral center of worship

* T 21N, R 5E

Douglas (1971b):

World-center shrine T 21N, R 5E
Sierra de la Bola shrine T 19N, R 3E

Harrington (1916): [] Harrington's map number

[6-24] Ojo Caliente; the most sacred place of the Tewa @ T 24N, R 8E
[14-46] Puye; ancestors lived there * T 20N, R 7E
[14-116] first site of Santa Clara T 20N, R 8E
[15-17] where the Kosa society holds ceremonies T 20N, R 8E
[15-21] former Santa Clara pueblo T 20N, R 8E
[15-22] former Santa Clara pueblo T 20N, R 8E

Hewett and Dutton (1945:34-40):

world mountains:

Keping; San Antonio peak * T 30N, R 9E
Tsikumuping; Cerro Pelado * T 18N, R 4E
'Okuping; Sandia Mountain * T 12N, R 5E
Kuseping; Lake Peak * T 18N, R 11E
lake where Kosa society holds ceremonies ? T 20N, R 8E
region around Ojo Caliente

Ojo Caliente

ICC testimony of Cleto Tafoya (July 20, 1953:17,22):

Black Mountain; 15-18 miles north of the pueblo

Coyopo Spring to the east

Puye ruins; respected and are sacred
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SANTO DOMINGO

1:100,000 maps: Albuquerque, Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line is a rough approximation based on the verbal descriptions of Tracts A through C and part of D in the Indian Claims Commission case [ICC] (30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 262-265), the current reservation boundaries, the enlarged southeast turquoise mine claim area based on a generalized map (42 Ind. Cl. Comm. 325), and the area between the turquoise mine claim and the reservation.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: In the ICC case (30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 244, 249), Santo Domingo claimed they shared aboriginal title to the land granted to San Felipe by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902.

Evaluation: The verbal description of the Santo Domingo aboriginal land is hard to follow and has many land marks that do not appear on maps (for example, Turquoise Trading Post). The resulting TUA line is so unnatural as to be suspect. The connecting line is completely arbitrary.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas: General

The Santo Domingos told Bandelier they once lived at a small pueblo at Potrero Quemada, 1.5 miles east of Wallace on Arroyo de Galisteo (White 1935:12). Tanos from Galisteo Pueblo lived at Santo Domingo between 1782 and 1794, left, and returned to Santo Domingo permanently at a later date (1935:17). There are a number of sacred springs and shrines in the vicinity of Santo Domingo (1935:167).
Ellis states that the Cerrillos Hills turquoise mines and area around them have special religious significance (n.d.:i). The Old Turquoise Mine or pit on Mount Chalchihuitl was the most important mine and a shrine (n.d.:23). The Keresans claim to have inhabited the Galisteo Basin before moving to the Middle Rio Grande (n.d.:6). Schroeder (1976:34) agrees that the residents of San Marcos Pueblo were Keresan.

**Summary:** Santo Domingo is likely to claim a larger part of the Galisteo Basin based on an ancestral Keresan occupation. They may also claim an interest in the Chaco Canyon to Mesa Verde region and the El Rito de los Frijoles area based on ancestral occupation of those areas.

**Specific**

Douglas (1917:357) claims the La Sierra de la Bola Shrine (T 19N, R 3E) was used by the Santo Domingos in the early 1900s.
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SUMA

1:100,000 maps: none

Traditional Use Area:

Sources: Forbes (1959:98) map shows the Sumas south of the New Mexico border.

Gerald indicates that the Suma occupied both sides of the Rio Grande valley up to Paso del Norte. They raided outside their territory but there is no mention of raids into New Mexico (1974:70-71). Gerald’s map (1974:86) of the area utilized by the Suma Indians shows their range as well within Texas.

Intervenor’s Proposed Findings of Fact and Brief (1973:18) states that the Mansos and Sumas were the indigenous inhabitants of the Mesilla Valley and the El Paso area.

The ICC (35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 44) found that the Sumas were originally located south of El Paso and the tribe is now extinct.

A map photographed at the National Archives, Indian Claims Commission Docket 22C Intervenor’s Exhibit, shows the Suma range as below and east of that of Ysleta.

Evaluation: Only one source indicates the Sumas may have extended into New Mexico. It seems more likely they were south of the border.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

No references to traditional cultural properties were found.
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TAOS

1:100,000 maps: Taos, Wheeler Peak

Traditional Use Area:

Source: Indian Claims Commission [ICC] Defendants Exhibit 101; reproduced in Pueblo Indians I (1974 after p. 345) is the source of the TUA line.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Ellis's ICC report mentions a map put together by Taos elders to locate boundaries of their aboriginal use area. The map was to have numbers indicating places (1974:112-113). This map is not reproduced in her report and was not found at the National Archives. A sketch map, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, that indicates some of the features and boundaries similar to those on Exhibit 101 was photographed at the National Archives. It differs slightly, especially to the south where the boundary is a few miles south of Rio Chiquita rather than along it.

Evaluation: The area seems small but a number of elders testified that this was their area of native use as handed down from their fathers and grandfathers (Ellis 1974:112). The boundaries incorporate creeks, rivers, and natural features and it may be fairly accurate.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ellis (1974:35) states that one account of the Taos peoples' origins says they came from the north, wandered south, and built a pueblo at Ojo Caliente, then moved south to the Black Mountains before moving north to a pueblo south of Taos Valley, and finally to the present site.

Parsons identifies a ruin 8 miles south of Taos, near Ranchos de Taos, as the one described in the emergence myth and occupied by the Taos people before
they settled at Taos. It was partially excavated in 1920 by Jeançon who called it Llano (1935:5).

Summary: The Taos residents could claim the area south of the TUA line based on their belief that they have ancestral homes at Ojo Caliente and the Black Mountains.

Specific

Douglas (1917:355) indicates that his World Center Shrine (T 21N, R 5E) was used by Taos.

Ellis (1974:120-131, 142-143) lists and describes the following shrines and ceremonial spots: (* on topo maps; @ approximate location)

[1] sun stone shrine
[2] Rio Grande Spring; curing
[6] irrigation ditch; legend says it was marked out by supernaturals; runs from near the opening of the mouth of Hondo Canyon to the flat above the river some miles down
[7] Tiny Hawk Peak; herbs for ceremonies
[8] a peak on Arroyo Seco and sacred springs nearby
[9] Williams Peak and associated sacred springs
[10] Bear Lake; sacred lake * T 27N, R 14E
[12] Star Lake; ceremonies
"Next Lake"; shrine
Willow Creek; sacred source of the Rio de Taos
Dear Lake, near La Junta Canyon; shrines
Living Crow; hill with hunting shrines
Apache or Seasons Springs
Salty ground where deer come to lick salt; sacred areas
Dry Wood; sacred springs
Buffalo Grass; shrine
Taos Peak or Pueblo Peak; shrine; Taos Peak * T 27N, R 15E
Pueblo Peak * T 25N, R 14E
"First Picking"; sacred springs
Lake of Night Springs; south edge of Taos town; sacred water
Eagle Nest Lake area; go to get eagle plumes for ceremonial use
mound; distant point where racers go as part of religious rituals
Black Lake
Osha Pass; sacred springs
Black Lake Peak; identifies the southeast corner of Taos land
ruin; home of the Water People's clan
Pot Creek ruin; home of the Feather People clan
Ponce de Leon Hot Springs; sacred spring
Knife Mountain; sacred springs
gorge of the Rio Grande; religious rites
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TESUQUE

1:100,000 maps: Los Alamos, Santa Fe

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The only source that specifically mentioned boundaries was M. Vigil during the Nambe Indian Claims Commission [ICC] hearings (1954:26). He stated that Tesuque lands were bounded on the north by the Nambe Reservation starting at Mayo-ping, go from Lake Peak down to Keh-qui-yeh, then to Aspen Peak, and south of the Rio del Medio Valley. Southern and eastern boundaries are extrapolated to correspond with the Tesuque Reservation and extending south from Lake Peak. This description is the basis for the TUA line.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: None were found.

Evaluation: Tesuque’s traditional use area could easily be larger than indicated.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Stanley states the Tesuques claim to have lived in caves in the canyons in the east before building the first pueblo (1963:19).

Summary: The Tesuques could claim areas such as Rio de los Frijoles and the Chaco Canyon/Aztec/Mesa Verde area based on remote ancestry.

Specific [* on topo. maps; @ approximate location]

Ellis (1962:74):

Sands Lake: sacred; used in ceremonials

Ellis (1979):

LA 835; Chacoan type site in the Tesuque Valley; religious center or home metropolis
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Poshu; a collection of small sites on the eastern edge of the valley: LA 69, 176, 752, etc.


Sun Blue Lake; initiations and ceremonies @ T 18N, R 11E

Harrington (1916:385):

[26-21 to 24] sites of Tesuque ancestors are higher up in the Tesuque Valley @ T 18N, R 9 E

[26-14] sacred hill of Tesuques @ T 18N, R 9E

Hewett and Dutton (1945):

sacred hill south of the pueblo; shrine on summit

Ojo Caliente @ T 24N, R 8E

Parsons (1929:244):

two shrines on a hill south and southeast of town

M. Vigil (1975:24):

Lake Peak; shrine on south side * T 18N, R 11E

Wadia (1957:168):

shrine on a hill west of the village @ T 18N, R 9E
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TORTUGAS

1:100,000 maps: Las Cruces

Traditional Use Area:

Source: No maps indicate an area of occupation or concern. Since any line would be entirely arbitrary, no TUA line was drawn.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Dutton (1983:19) identifies the Tortugas as Tiwas.

Houser indicates that Tortugas may be a daughter colony of Ysleta del Sur and was founded by a composite of Tigua, Piro, and Manso Indians from the El Paso region (1970:30, 1979:337). Beckett and Corbett (1992:7) agree.

Hurt says that Tortugas consider themselves Tiwa but they also include Mansos, Piros, and Tanos (1952:104).

According to Oppenheimer, the village of Tortugas consists of an amalgam of Tiwa-Piro, Spanish American, Anglo-American, and Mexican Indian cultural elements. The village was originally settled primarily by Tiwas (1974:219). Some informants say the original inhabitants of Tortugas came from Ysleta del Sur, some were Piros from Senecu, and there were a few Mansos (1974:240).

Schroeder states that the Piros who lived at Tortugas were from the southern pueblos (1979:237). The Tompiros joined their Piro relatives living along the Rio Grande (1979:241).

Evaluation: This community may be so assimilated that there is no interest in the surrounding area or the traditional use area of their ancestors.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

No information was found on traditional cultural properties. It is possible that the Tortugas residents will be interested in the traditional use
areas of their ancestors. This would include the traditional use areas of the southern Tiwa pueblos and Ysleta del Sur, and the area inhabited by the Piros and Tompiros.
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Traditional Use Area:

Source: The few maps that show a range for the Utes are very general. The TUA line is plotted from one of these general maps (Pettit 1982:4). It is more conservative than those based on Delaney’s (1974, Map 2) map (for example, O’Rourke 1980:48), but includes a larger area than Callaway and others (1986:337).

Verbal descriptions of the ranges for the bands suggest that the Weeminuche or Ute Mountain Utes should be consulted for the area west of the Continental Divide. The Capote and Muache or Southern Utes should be consulted for the area from about Farmington east.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Almost every account has a different spelling for the Ute bands. The spellings have been standardized in this section.

Callaway and others place the Muache band of Utes east of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains as far south as Santa Fe. The Capote band ranged from east of the Continental Divide to near the Animas River and from south of the Conejos River to an area east of the Rio Grande to the west side of the Sangre de Cristos, including the area that is now Chama and Tierra Amarilla. The Weeminuche band was west of the Continental Divide from the Dolores River into
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Utah. Their southern boundary extended to the San Juan River Valley in northwestern New Mexico (1986:339).

Delaney (1974:52-53) describes the ranges from Spanish contact to 1868. The Weeminuches occupied the area between Tierra Amarilla to the Animas and Colorado rivers. Bands cultivated land along the La Plata River and hunted the San Juan headwaters. The Muache band ranged from the San Luis Valley to the east side of the Sangre de Cristos Mountains north of Taos. Capotes lived in the area north from Abiquiu to the Novae river with Tierra Amarilla the central location for most of the band.

Ellis gives the original range of the Weeminuche band as west of the Continental Divide and down to Navajo country on the south. The Capotes were east of the Weeminuches, east of the Continental Divide in the region around the Sangre de Cristo and San Juan ranges during the summer and moving north to as far south as the Chama Valley in the winter. The Muache band occupied the territory from the Sangre de Cristo and Colebra ranges on the west to Raton and Trinidad on the east (1974:439).

Hughes places the Capote band in the San Luis Valley and upper Rio Grande, the Muache band along the Sangre de Cristos into New Mexico, and the Weeminuche band in the San Juan drainage (1977:27).

Schroeder states that Durango, Colorado was the dividing line between the Capotes and Weeminuches (1965:69). His maps, based on historic records, place the Utes as far south as Jemez between 1694 and 1725 (1974:451) and at Las Vegas between the late 1700s and 1846 and again between 1846 and 1852 (1974:455, 457).

The Ute Mountains Utes are the Weeminuches who lived in the San Juan drainage of Colorado for about 200 years (Wood 1980:10). They refused to take
allotments in southern Colorado and moved to the western edge of the reservation set aside for them and the Capotes and Muache Utes, establishing a camp that eventually became their reservation (1980:17). The Southern Ute Reservation is the home of the Muache and Capote bands (Delaney 1974:71).

**Evaluation:** The TUA line is an estimate. Pettit’s map has no scale and exact placement of topographical features may not be reliable. The TUA line is based on the relative position of the range with respect to the confluence of the Rio Grande and Chama River and location of Abiquiu and the Oklahoma panhandle. It may be off considerably.

The Utes undoubtedly occupied and hunted at least as far south as the eastern two-thirds of the area marked. Evidence of use south of the San Juan Valley in the western section is far less clear. The Utes made no claims for land in New Mexico to the Indian Claims Commission and the literature suggests that most of their traditional culture has been lost (see Wood 1980).

**Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:**

No references to specific or general traditional cultural properties were found in the literature reviewed.
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*Southern Ute Tribe or Band of Indians v. The United States of America.* 17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 28 (1966).

Materials at the National Archives, Dockets 327 and 328.
This four-state map indicates the original lands occupied by the Ute People

Pettit (1982:4)
Hunting grounds and extent of occupation

Occupation at the time of American acquisition in 1848

O’Rourke (1980:48)
WESTERN/TONTO APACHES

1:100,000 maps: none

Traditional Use Area:

Sources: The sources reviewed indicate that the Western or Tonto Apaches do not claim a traditional use area within New Mexico.

Basso considers the Western Apaches as those who lived in Arizona during historic times, except for the Chiricahua, Warm Springs, and Apache Mansos (1983:463).

Bender places the Tontos around the Verde and Salt rivers (1974:25).

Buskirk indicates that the Western Apache range does not extend into New Mexico (1986:18).

Goodwin (1969:2-4) divides the Western Apaches into the White Mountain Band, Cibecue group, the San Carlos group, the Southern Tonto group, and the Northern Tonto group. His group and band map indicates their territory was entirely within Arizona, although they did range outside their boundaries on raids.

Schroeder indicates the Tonto/Western Apache range was within Arizona (1974:120).
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YSLETA DEL SUR

1:100,000 maps: Las Cruces

Traditional Use Area:

Source: A map photographed at the National Archives, Indian Claims Commission [ICC], Docket 22C, Intervenor's Exhibit, shows the residents of Ysleta del Sur and the other relocated pueblo groups living in the El Paso area as ranging into New Mexico. The TUA line is an estimate based on the ICC map.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: Bowden's map of El Rancho de Ysleta indicates they extended into New Mexico (1974:134).

In their chronology, Diamond and others, Inc. note that Sandia and Isleta were joined by increments from Taos, Acoma, the Piro pueblos, the Salinas area, and the Jornado area (n.d.:2). Tompiros from the pueblos of Jumanes, Abo, and Tabira went to El Paso. Residents of the Tigua mountain pueblos of Chilili, Tajique, and Quarai also went to Isleta (n.d.:12).

Gerald states that the Tiguas, who now occupy Ysleta del Sur, were Christianized Indians that include Piros from Sevellita, Alamillo, Socorro, and Senecas and Tiguas from Isleta. His map of hunting camps and residences are all in Texas (1974:25).

Houser claims the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur recognize a kindred relationship with Isleta pueblo. Other residents of Ysleta say that, according to legend, some were migrants from California or Gran Quivira who were displaced and welcomed into the Ysleta community (1970:27, 1979:336). Their origin myth has them living at Hueco Tanks for many years until they ventured west and discovered the Rio Grande and moved (1970:28).
Intervenor's Findings of Fact and Brief (p. 14) states that the Piros are no longer a surviving tribe. The survivors are now members of the Tigua tribes of Ysleta.

The ICC map of Texas shows the residents of Ysleta and other Pueblo communities as ranging slightly into New Mexico.


Evaluation: The relocated Pueblo groups appear to have ranged up into New Mexico to hunt and gather. The TUA line is an estimate.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

No specific traditional cultural properties were mentioned in the material reviewed. It is possible that the Ysletas will be concerned with the traditional use areas of their ancestors and close relatives, particularly Isleta Pueblo and the Piro pueblos. As the above sources indicate, they might also be concerned with the areas inhabited by the Tompiros, Taos, and Acoma.
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ZIA

1:100,000 maps: Albuquerque, Chaco Mesa, Grants, Los Alamos

Traditional Use Area:

Source: The TUA line represents the Indian Claims Commission area claimed as joint use by the Zia, Santa Anas, and Jemez (Defendant's Exhibit), plus an area of the Zia reservation that extends outside the claim area on the east side.

Supporting/Confirming and Alternative Sources: none.

Evaluation: Ellis's maps (photos taken of maps at the National Archives) show Zia sites and use areas thinly scattered throughout the claim area, providing some support for the TUA line.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/ Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Ellis says that, according to legend, the Zias and Jemez came from the north together along the high ridges of the southern Jemez Mountains. Zia moved south to its current area (1956:2-3).

Hoebel states that the Zia ancestors lived in the Chaco Canyon area (based on ceramics) and expanded northward into the Mesa Verde area. Pueblo Bonito and Mesa Verde are claimed as ancestral homes. Six sites in the Jemez Valley and dating to the thirteenth century are probably associated with Zia (1979:407-408).

Regan was told by the Jemez that villages from the confluence of the Salado and Jemez rivers were Zia Pueblos, as were the villages on Red Mesa or Mesa Colorado 3 miles west of Jemez village (1917:25).

Summary: The Zia could claim an interest in the Chaco Canyon/Mesa Verde areas as ancestral homelands.
Specific

Douglas (1917:358):

La Sierra de la Bola Shrine [Douglas 1917:376] T 19N, R 3E

Ellis (1974:8-12, 56, 57)

LA 303, Pueblo Toreon or Pueblo Gente Pardo – first Zia village

Espirit Santo Spring @ T 16N, R 1W

Okiah I; large Zia site marks west edge of Zia territory

T 17N, R 1W

Other sites listed as Zia sites include LA 135, 138, 189, 192, 298, 308, 322, 392, 393, 399, 410, 1997 (A.D. 1250-1350); Sand Hill Zia, Zia Pueblo, LA 102, 241, 374, 377, 384, 392, 924, and the Kitchena Pueblos (after A.D. 1350).

the area around Mount Pelado @ T 18N, R 4E

an Albuquerque West Mesa Volcano

Shrine in the Sandia Mountains

Logan (1993:1)

Petroglyph National Monument

Petitioner's Proposed Findings of Facts (pp. 6-15) lists the following shrines jointly used by Zia, Jemez, and Santa Ana:

La Ventana * T 19N, R 1W

Virgin Canyon

Barrankita Blanka

Alto Cruz

Fawn Spring

Mesa San Felipe * T 19N, R 4W
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone Ford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo Springs</td>
<td>* T 17N, R 1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fork at Rios Bacas and Cebolla Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Black Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallecitos de Los Indios</td>
<td>* T 18N, E 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandma Cave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Paliza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Hondo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Springs</td>
<td>* T 18N, R 1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Quepa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaje Navajo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Santa Ana</td>
<td>* T 14-15N, R 3-4E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horned Peak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado Ruin</td>
<td>* T 13N, R 4E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are mentioned in the ICC transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Falls; east fork of the Jemez River</td>
<td>* T 18N, R 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Peak</td>
<td>* T 19N, R 4E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Spring in San Antonio Creek</td>
<td>* T 20N, R 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red top or big hill in Rio Vacas area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake at head of Rio Vacas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruin near Hiding Water, at Yellow Mountain; a Jemez ruin</td>
<td>? @ T 20N, R 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Torreones tank; red hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Spring</td>
<td>@ T 18N, R 3W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ojo Yewne (Mare Springs)
Eagle Hunting shrine; north and east of Redondo Peak
@ T 19N, R 3-4E

Stevenson (1894:67)
Koasaia; early Zia village 2.5 miles north of present pueblo
@ T 15N, R 2E

White (1962:315)
Lions of Potrero de las Vacas
T 18N, R 6E
sacred spots along Koshairi ritual raceway:
Koasaiya; old pueblo ruins 1.75 miles west of Zia
@ T 15N, R 2E

Cpaiyak Ko-t
Gya wi Ko-t
others are unnamed
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Forest land approx. 230,000 A.
Pueblo Grants

LEGEND
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PUBLIC DOMAIN

1CC, Defendant's Exhibit (National Archives, Docket 137)
ZUNI


Traditional Use Area:

Source: The United States Claims Court (12 Cl.Ct. 610) accepted the Zuni Tribe's description of its use area. The New Mexico portion is described as: "east to Willow Mountain in the State of New Mexico; thence northeast to Granite Mountain near the town of Magdalena, New Mexico; thence northwest to Cebollita Peak; thence in a northerly direction around the western fringe of the Malpais (lava flow) to Grants, New Mexico; thence northeast to Mt. Taylor, thence northwest to Hosta Buttes; thence northwesterly to Mexican Springs, thence westerly to Ganado, Arizona." The court's description was used for the northern portion of TUA line because Map 21, Area of Zuni Sovereignty, 1846 (Ferguson and Hart 1985) lacks landmarks along the northern boundary line. The two agree except for the northern line. The court's northern boundary is farther north. Ferguson and Hart's Map 21 line is the basis of the TUA line except for the north boundary.

Supporting/Confirming or Alternative Sources: Crampton states that Zuni country covers parts of four states. The east boundary is the Continental Divide from the Zuni Mountains south to the Mangus and Gallo mountains (1977:3-4).

Evaluation: The Zuni Atlas (Ferguson and Hart 1985) indicates that the boundaries should extend beyond or around the landmarks. As a result of this and
the scale of Map 21, the TUA boundaries are only approximate. Because of this and problems of scale, the lines on the maps may be off by a few miles.

The Zunis have settled on this as their area of sovereignty. Judging from the maps in the Zuni Atlas, the boundaries represent the maximum extent defined by their hunting and plant-collecting areas.

Potential Traditional Cultural Properties/Additional Traditional Use Areas:

General

Crampton states that the Zunis are the amalgam of Mogollons and Anasazis (1977:11).

According to Cushing (1896:342-343), Legend says that the Zuni are descendants of two or more peoples. One branch extended to the north, was intrusive from the west or southwest (lower Rio Colorado), and ranged on the plain north of the arid mountainous region of Utah and Colorado. They were probably ancestors of the other Pueblos and some Shoshoneans. The other group was south and west of the Rio Puerco and the Colorado Chiquito, reaching as far down as Mexico. Ancestors were probably descendants of the cliffdwellers of the Mancos, San Juan, and other canyons of Utah, Colorado, and northern New Mexico.

Summary: These sources indicate the Zunis could claim an even larger area of interest, especially to the north and south.

Specific

Crampton (1977:7-8):

Towayalane or Corn Mountain - sacred and central to Zuni mythology

T 9-10N, R 18-19W

Zuni Salt Lake - in Zuni mythology and pilgrimages to perform rites and to gather domestics and ceremonial salt

T 3 N, R 18-19W
prehistoric towns (1977:12):

Halona on the Zuni River
Matsakya (Stevenson 1904:46) on a knoll less than 2 miles east of present Zuni
Kyakima at the base of Towayalane
Kechipbowa
Hawakuh

Ferguson and Hart 1985:23 and Map 8 - all of the spots visited during their search for the middle place remain sacred to the Zuni people ([ ] map reference, @ approximate location):

Heshoda Yalla
Halona:Itiwana (Zuni)
Heshodan Imk'oshkwia [172]

Heshoda Yalt'a - on top of El Morro [39]  T 9N, R 14W
Bi'k'yay'a - east end of Zuni Mountains [43]  T 10N, R 10E
Dewankwin K'yaba:chu Yalanne is Mount Taylor [24]  T 12N, R 7W
Chi:biya Yalanne in the Sandia Mountains [2]  @ T 11N, R 5W

Ferguson and Hart 1985: 51, 125-134 and Map 18, religious use areas [Map 18 number]:

[1] Shiba:bulima; Stone Lions Shrine  T 17N, R 6E
[2] Chi:biya Yalanne; shrine and place of origin in the Sandia Mountains  @ T 11N, R 5W
[3] Lemmulle; Ice Caves; religious area  T 9N, R 12W
[4] Naluwala:wa; shrine T 9N, R 11-12W
[6] Kwili Yala: A:chi; war god shrine @ T 11N, R 20W
[7] Lhak/alhonatah-na; war god shrine @ T 11N, R 19W
[9] Dwankwin Onan Baniyna'a; war god shrine Zuni Reservation
[14] Do:k'yan'a;a; sacred spring Zuni Reservation
[15] Ma'k'yaya @ T 3N, R 19W
[16] Ahayu:t an Yalanne @ T 3N, R 18W
[17] Chimik'yan'ka dey'a
[20] Heshoda Bitsulliya; Chaco Canyon T 21N, R 10-11W
[24] Dewankwin K'yaba:chu Yalanne; Mount Taylor T 12N, R 7W
[25] K' yak' yali an Yalanne; Eagle Peak T 7S, R 17W
[26] Sa'do:w Yalanne @ T 1S, R 18-19W
[27] Piliayallawe; Willow Mountain T 11S, R 18W
[28] Dona Yala:we @ T 1-2S, R 10-11W
[31] He:mushina Yala:we; in Jemez Mountains @ T 18N, R 1E
[35a] Nobonni Dahna'a; religious use area @ T 9N, R 19W
[36] Udeya: Yalanne; shrine, use area @ T 9N, R 12W
[37] Wimanbowa Yalanne; religious area @ T 10N, R 14W
[39] Heshoda Yalt'a; religious offerings here T 9N, R 14W
[40] A'ts'in'a; Inscription Rock; shrine T 9N, R 14W
[41] Ts'u'yala'a; Cerillos Hills; shrine @ T 15N, R 8E
[43] Bi'k'yaya'a; San Rafael; sacred spring T 10N, R 10W
[48] K'ya:k'yalna' K'ya:kwayinna; Jemez Mountains, curing area @ T 18N, R 2E
[53] Lu:k'yan'a; sacred spring Zuni Reservation
[54] Uhana'a; sacred spring  
[55] A'labattsi'a; sacred spring  
[56] Wikk'yal'a; offerings made here  
[57] Yala Lana; offerings made here  
[58] Kyaki:ma; ruin; offerings  
[60] Sha'lak'ona:wa; sacred spring  
[66] Idwa K'yan'a; ritual campsite  
[68] K'ya:ts'i' K'yan'a; sacred spring  
[69] Bo'sho'wa; religious area  
[71] Ishan'an Dek'yapbow'a; use area  
[72] Mats'a:kya; ruin  
[73] Idiwa Dahn'a; place on trail from Blackrock to the Zuni Salt Lake  

Zuni Reservation

[83] Idi'wananne; center place, end of Zuni migration  
[86] Chishe:na:/A'l'akkwe'a; Apache Creek; shrine T 5S, R 17W  
[88] /amequelleyawa; near Manuelito, ancestral site T 14N, R 20W  
[90] Ahayu:t A:chiya' Delashhin'a; south of Gallup; war god shrine  

T 14-15N, R 18W

[92] Kiwaikuluk/a; Jemez Mountains, prayer place  
[93] Dahna K'ohanna; near San Isidro  
[94] Ts'iya'a:wa; Jemez Mountains, prayer offerings  
[95] K'yawikhya; Laguna Pueblo  
[98] A'su'wa; place in myths  
[99] U'k'yahayan El'a; place in myths  
[101] /iyani:k/a:waisha; on Rio Grande, visited by elders  

T 17N, R 6E
Yash: tik/u: tu; on Rio Grande, visited by elders @ T 17N, R 6E
Mi/ashu:k/awa/ka; on Rio Grande, religious area @ T 16N, R 6E
K'ya:ts'i' K'yan'a; sacred spring Zuni Reservation
Amidola: Debow Ul'a; assoc. with scalp ceremonies T 10N, R 18W
Debo'kw in Im'a; religious use area Zuni Reservation
Sho' Dek'yapbow'a; assoc. with War Chiefs Zuni Reservation
Hebadin'a; shrine Zuni Reservation
Kyane:lu Yala:we; near Shiprock T 29-30N, R 17-18W
Deshukt Dina:wa; assoc. with Hunting Society T 6N, R 14W
Deshukt Lan Im'a; associated with the Hunting Society ?
K'yana'wa; Blackrock Lake T 10N, R 18W
Hak'win A'deyalt'a; on trail to Zuni Salt Lake T 9N, R 18W
Dona A;De'ana:wa; on trail to Zuni Salt Lake T 9-10N, R 19W
Deshamik'ya Im'a; on trail to Zuni Salt Lake, offerings made Zuni Reservation
Kyama:kya; home of Kanakwo, near Atarque T 6N, R 18W
Habana: A'l'akkwe'a; ancestral site T 11N, R 16-17W
Nadatdekiwi:wa; ritual hunting area T 12N, R 17-18W
Delak Akwe'a; area of ritual deer traps T 8-9N, R 16-17W
K'yawa:na Lana'a; Rio Grande, place in migration @ T 15N, R 5E
Tsilhinn/yalh/a; Rio Grande, place in migration ?
Dopbolliya: K'yan'a; Taos Blue Lake, migration T 27N, R 14E
Komkwayikya dey'a; sacred area Zuni Reservation
A'ts'ina:wa, sacred spring Zuni Reservation
A'labatts'i'a; prayer site Zuni Reservation
[149] Bi:shu'tay'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[150] K'yan Ul'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[151] K'ya:dechi'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[152] A:yaya'kya; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[153] Idelakukya dey'a; place named in prayer  Zuni Reservation
[154] Sumk'yan'a; place named in prayer  Zuni Reservation
[155] Wilatsu'u:kw An K'yan'a; place named in prayer  Zuni Reservation
[156] Hebadin'a; place named in prayer  Zuni Reservation
[175] Hawikku; ancestral site  T 8N, R 20W
[176] Halona:wa; ancestral site under Zuni village T 10N, R 19W
[178] Dolokhana'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[179] Onan Delakwi'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[180] Opbon Biya'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[181] Banidan Im'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[182] Anela:wa Im'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[183] Sum A'ishokda'a; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[184] A:k'ohna' Dina:wa; sacred spring  Zuni Reservation
[190] Sha:kaya; area used by Hunting Society  @ T 1N, R 9W
[217] /awak/on:yellan/a; spring between Luna and Reserve  
T 6-7S, R 19-20W
[233] Shundek'yay'a; use area  T 9N, R 18W

Mountains held especially sacred to the Zuni include the Sandia Mountains, Mount Taylor, the northeast end of the Zuni Mountains, the Mogollon, Gallo, and Tularosa Mountains. Each waterway is of religious importance. The entire Zuni
River is held sacred and is the pathway for pilgrimages. Religious offerings are made at Zuni Salt Lake, Zuni Plateau, the Rito Quemado area, Broken Pottery Mountain, and Eagle Peak to the south; shrines in the Zuni Mountains, Agua Fria, El Morro, Mount Taylor to the east; Zuni Buttes, Bear Springs, Jacob's Well, Houck, and Chaco Canyon to the north (Ferguson and Hart 1985:51).

Stevenson (1904:407) states that the stone lions on top of a mountain 10 miles from Cochiti are the home of their culture hero and of the beast gods and are considered sacred.
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CORE AREA OF ZUNI SETTLEMENT IN HISTORIC PERIOD

Ferguson and Hart (1985:Map 12)
Ferguson and Hart (1985:Map 18)