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**Methods, Natural Amenities**

I gathered data on present-day federally recognized American Indian lands (reservations) from the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ “Indian Reservations in the Continental United States” map and index (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2015a). The map shows the locations of Federal Indian Reservations in the continental U.S. overlaid on top of state and county borders. The map index displays the reservation names. I used the map to identify the county/ies and state(s) associated with each reservation. I fact-checked counties associated with each reservation through additional internet research.

I gathered data on the identities of the tribes associated with each reservation by first identifying the federally recognized tribal names for each reservation from the Federal Register of Recognized Indian Entities, compiled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2015b). I also used internet research (e.g., reservation websites, tribe websites) to determine additional tribes which may have been relocated to each reservation and/or additional tribes not represented in the federal tribe name. This was especially necessary in instances where the federally recognized tribal name included a confederacy or group of disparate tribes (e.g., the federally recognized “Colorado River Indian Tribes” includes the Hopi, Mohave, Navajo, and Chemehuevi tribes; Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde includes the Chasta, Kalapuya, Molalla, and Rogue River tribes).

It is important to note that determining tribal names is difficult and subject to individual interpretation. The federally recognized tribe names may include separate bands or sub-groups, confederacies of distinct tribes, combinations of tribes, or tribes within a larger tribal grouping that are nevertheless culturally or linguistically distinct. I treated such instances consistently using the following approach. For distinct tribal bands, I used the most generalizable tribe name and did not distinguish between differing bands and sub-groups (e.g., “Ione Band of Miwok Indians” was reduced to “Miwok”). For tribal confederacies, I used web research to determine all tribes associated with the confederacy, and treated each tribe as a separate entry (e.g., “Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla” includes Cayuse, Umatilla, and Walla-Walla; “Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation” includes Pend d’Oreille in addition to Salish and Kootenai). For federally recognized tribal names that encompass multiple tribes, I treated each tribe as a separate entry (e.g., “Shoshone-Bannock Tribes” separated into “Shoshone” and “Bannock”). For tribes within a larger tribal grouping that are culturally or linguistically distinct, I usually deferred to the overarching tribal grouping, following my approach to tribal bands (e.g., “Oglala Sioux Tribe” was reduced to “Sioux”).

To determine historical American Indian lands, I gathered data from two sources: (1) Judicially established American Indian lands, and (2) Data compiled from land cession treaties made between American Indian tribes and the U.S. government from 1722-1883. Judicially established American Indian land areas were the results of cases presented before the Indian Claims Commission during 1946-1978. The Commission focused on cases filed prior to 1951 until its expiration in September 1978. The Commission settled land disputes between American Indians and the U.S. government, and established lands where an Indian tribe was able to prove its original tribal occupancy. I gathered data on these judicially established American Indian lands through use of the Indian Claims Commission map, which overlays these lands with state and county borders. The map index displays the names of American Indian tribes associated with each land area (Indian Claims Commission 1978). On occasion, these judicially established land areas were associated with two or more tribes. In these cases, I entered each tribe as a separate entry with associated state and county data. Additionally, the judicially established lands for California tribes were, for the most part, broadly listed under the name “Indians of California.” As such, in the corresponding data for present tribal lands associated with judicially established lands, I changed the tribe names for tribes from California to “Indians of California” for consistency and ease of comparative analysis, with the exceptions of California tribes listed specifically by name.

I also gathered data on historical tribal lands from the Indian Land Cessions data compiled by Charles C. Royce (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act 2015c). These data were organized in tabular data form, with columns representing the federally recognized tribe names (e.g., present tribal name) and associated present reservation, the original tribes listed in the primary source land cession treaties, the state, and each county ceded to the U.S. by the named tribe(s). Because the data included both the present federally recognized tribal name as well as the tribe(s) named in the original land cession treaty with the associated county-level data, I organized these data in two distinct ways. First, I organized the data guided by the tribe named in the land cession treaty. For the most part, the tribe name(s) listed in the original treaty were consistent with the corresponding present federally recognized tribal name. Under the few occasions when the tribe name(s) listed from the original land cession treaty was not clearly associated with the present tribe name(s) (e.g., “Bat-si”), I changed the name to that of the present tribe(s) associated with that particular entry (e.g., “Bat-si” was associated with the Berry Creek Rancheria of Maidu Indians, and so the entry was changed to “Maidu”). This method essentially linked the tribe(s) named in the land cession treaty/ies to the tribes associated with the present lands dataset for ease of comparative analysis.

My second approach used the present-day federally recognized tribe name to guide organization of the historical American Indians land data, rather than the tribe named in the treaty. In this approach, I linked the present-day, federally recognized tribe name listed in the Land Cessions dataset directly to the tribes listed in the present-day lands dataset. I used the same protocol to ensure that the tribe names were consistent across the two datasets. This approach did not use the tribe name listed in the original treaty, but rather used the federally recognized present tribe listed in the Land Cessions dataset and the historical lands associated with these entries as the primary unit for analysis.

Because I used multiple sources and methods to determine the American Indian historical lands to the county-level, I separated data collected from each source and method. As a result, there are three spreadsheets that list historical land data to the county level: (1) Historical lands and associated tribes determined by the judicially established American Indian land areas; (2) Historical lands and associated tribes based on land cession data and the associated tribe(s) named in the original treaty/ies; and (3) Historical lands and associated tribes based on land cession data and the associated present-day federally recognized tribe(s), without consideration or inclusion of the tribe named in the treaty. For each dataset, I included the American Indians present lands county-level data and only included tribes from the present lands dataset that were represented in the corresponding historical lands datasheet (e.g., judicially established lands; land cessions by treaty tribe; land cessions by present-day tribe).

**Methods, Content Analysis**

I compiled data on treaties made between American Indian tribes and the U.S. government from 1722-1883. These treaties include information on lands ceded from American Indian tribes to the U.S. government. I gathered full-text of these treaties from two sources: (1) the Oklahoma State Digital University Library (treaties made from 1770-1890), and (2) the University of Nebraska Libraries Electronic Text Center (additional treaties from 1722-1805). The treaty text available from these sources come from data compiled in the seven-volume *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* compilation, which was compiled and edited by Charles J. Kappler in 1904.
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