



[Agency Tribal Nations](#)

[Home](#) [Constitution](#) [TCC](#) [Treaty Analysis](#) [PI280 Hub](#) [Buy Licenses](#)

FEDERALLY COMPLIANT • SCHEDULE III • EXECUTIVE ORDER — BANKING

Cannabis Licensing 2026

The President's Executive Order for Banking — The Regulations for Rescheduling Cannabis and Hemp

The authoritative cannabis licensing instrument of Agency Tribal Nations — anchored in the tribal constitution, federally compliant under 21 U.S.C. § 823 Schedule III registration, and operationally integrated with the Tribal Cannabis Control Code. Pursuant to the President's Executive Order for Banking, these regulations govern the rescheduling of cannabis and hemp under federal law. All state cannabis regulation must proceed through Tribal Court — Tribal Court is federal and holds full authority in all states.

✓ Schedule III Compliant ✓ Executive Order — Banking ✓ Constitution-Aligned ✓ TCC-Integrated ✓ Sovereign Immunity Preserved ✓ Treaty-Reserved Rights
✓ Tribal Court — Federal Authority

Version: 1.0 **Effective:** April 7, 2026 **Issued by:** Office of the Head Chief, Agency Tribal Nations **Status:** Issued in conjunction with public press release

*"Licensing systems as the formal expression of sovereign law."
— Constitution of the Mendocino California Tribal Nations, Article 2, §2-4(a)(5)*

Contents

[§1 Executive Summary](#)
[§2 Cannabis & Hemp Regulations \(CREATE Act\)](#)
[§3 Constitutional Foundation](#)
[§4 Schedule III Legal Basis](#)
[§5 Controlling Definitions](#)
[§6 License Categories](#)
[§7 Federal Jurisdictional Map](#)
[§8 Application & Compliance](#)
[§9 Sovereign Authority & Preemption](#)
[§10 FTCC Composition](#)
[§11 Revision History](#)
[§12 Resolution Map](#)

PRESS RELEASE

Issued April 7, 2026

Agency Tribal Nations today publishes *Cannabis Licensing 2026*, the federally compliant Schedule III framework that supersedes all prior Schedule I licensing language in the Master Treaty of Peace (signed September 17, 2025) and establishes the canonical, constitution-anchored licensing instrument of the Mendocino California Tribal Nations.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

The President's Executive Order for Banking

These are the regulations for rescheduling cannabis and hemp under federal law. Pursuant to the President's Executive Order for Banking, cannabis and hemp operations conducted under this licensing framework are entitled to full access to federally regulated banking and financial services consistent with Schedule III reclassification.

EXECUTIVE ORDER — DEC 18, 2025

Increasing Medical Marijuana and Cannabidiol Research

On December 18, 2025, the President signed an Executive Order directing federal agencies to advance research on medical marijuana and CBD products. Key directives include: (1) the Attorney General must expedite the rulemaking process to reschedule marijuana to Schedule III under 21 U.S.C. § 812; (2) Congress shall work to update hemp-derived CBD product definitions to allow fuller-spectrum options; and (3) HHS, FDA, CMS, and NIH shall develop real-world evidence research methods to improve patient access and establish medical standards. The Order expressly cites FDA's finding of "scientific support for use to treat anorexia related to a medical condition, nausea and vomiting, and pain," the August 2023 HHS Schedule III recommendation, and the DOJ proposed rulemaking of May 2024. This Order directly supports and reinforces the Schedule III framework established in this licensing instrument.

Schedule III Expedited

Attorney General directed to complete rescheduling rulemaking

CBD Definitions Updated

Fuller-spectrum hemp-derived CBD products expressly recognized

Federal Research Pathway

HHS, FDA, NIH directed to establish real-world evidence standards

TRIBAL COURT JURISDICTION — FEDERAL AUTHORITY IN ALL STATES

The state must go through Tribal Court for all cannabis regulations. Tribal Court is federal and holds full authority in all states of the United States. No state may regulate, tax, license, or otherwise exercise jurisdiction over tribal cannabis and hemp operations without first proceeding through Tribal Court. This authority derives from the inherent sovereignty of the tribal nations, the federal trust responsibility, and the supremacy of tribal court jurisdiction under federal Indian law, as affirmed by *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515 (1832), *Williams v. Lee*, 358 U.S. 217 (1959), and *Iowa Mutual Insurance Co. v. LaPlante*, 480 U.S. 9 (1987).

§1 — Executive Summary

What this document is and what it replaces

This document is the **final, canonical cannabis licensing instrument** of Agency Tribal Nations (ATN). It is anchored in the Constitution of the Mendocino California Tribal Nations, operationally integrated with the Tribal Cannabis Control Code (TCC), and federally compliant under the Schedule III rescheduling framework of the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. § 823.

The Constitution is not changing. The Constitution of the Mendocino California Tribal Nations is the fixed supreme law of the tribe. This licensing instrument was drafted to come *into alignment with* the Constitution, not the other way around. Where prior licensing language conflicted with the Constitution, the licensing language has been updated to reflect the final controlling framework.

Supersedes Schedule I Language

All references to "DEA Schedule I license," Schedule I CSA amendment proposals, and Schedule I research compliance language found in the [Master Treaty of Peace](#) (signed September 17, 2025) are superseded by this document. The Master Treaty remains in force as the diplomatic, sovereignty, and government-to-government instrument; *this document* is the controlling licensing framework.

Three-Pillar Framework

Pillar 1 — Foundation

Constitution

Supreme law. Source of all licensing authority. Articles 2, 7, 18, 19, 23.

Pillar 2 — Code

TCC

Tribal Cannabis Control Code. Operating procedures, testing, tax administration, enforcement.

Pillar 3 — Instrument

This Document

The licensing framework itself. Categories, fees (by reference), Schedule III posture, federal map.

All licensing, regulatory, and tax-collection authority resides exclusively with the sovereign Licensing Authority (ATN). This instrument waives no immunity, adopts no state tort framework, and submits to no state forum.

§2 — Cannabis & Hemp Regulations — The CREATE Act

Cannabis Regulatory Enforcement Act for Tribal Entities — The regulations for rescheduling cannabis and hemp pursuant to the President's Executive Order for Banking

Tribal Court — Federal Authority in All States

The state must go through Tribal Court for all cannabis regulations. Tribal Court is federal and holds full authority in all states. No state government, agency, or jurisdiction may regulate, license, tax, restrict, or otherwise exercise authority over tribal cannabis and hemp operations without first proceeding through Tribal Court. This exclusive jurisdiction derives from the inherent sovereignty of the tribal nations, the federal trust responsibility, the President's Executive Order for Banking, and the supremacy of tribal court jurisdiction under federal Indian law.

Pursuant to the President's Executive Order for Banking, all cannabis and hemp operations conducted under this licensing framework are entitled to full access to federally regulated banking and financial services consistent with Schedule III reclassification. Banking institutions shall not deny services to tribal licensees operating in compliance with these regulations.

Article 1. General Provisions

§26240. This chapter shall be known, and may be cited, as the Cannabis Regulatory Enforcement Act for Tribal Entities or the "CREATE Act."

§26241. As used in this chapter, the following definitions apply:

- (a) "Agreement" means an Indian tribal cannabis agreement authorized under this chapter and entered into between the state and an Indian tribe.
- (b) "Essential governmental services" means services provided by an Indian tribe that has entered into an agreement, including, but not limited to, health care, early childhood development programs, job placement, mental health treatment, substance use disorder treatment, education, elder care, social services, administration, public facilities, fire, police, courts, sewer, water, environmental and land use, park and wildlife restoration, transportation, utility services, community and economic development, and general welfare consistent with the tribe's applicable law.
- (c) "Indian country" shall have the same meaning as in Section 1151 of Title 18 of the United States Code.
- (d) "State" means Tribal Nations Agency IRC Section 7871 including its departments, agencies, officials, employees, and agents, but does not include a local jurisdiction or the departments, agencies, bureaus, governing bodies, officials, employees, or agents of a local jurisdiction.
- (e) "Tribal Government license" means a Agency Tribal Nations commercial cannabis license issued by a licensing authority pursuant to this division.
- (f) "Tribe" means an Indian tribe, band, nation, or community wholly or partially located within the geographical boundaries of the state that the United States Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. Sec. 479a et seq.).
- (g) "Tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency" means an entity required pursuant to §26245 and created under a tribe's established governmental process for the purpose of controlling and regulating commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction.
- (h) "Tribal cannabis regulatory program" means a program established by an Indian tribe to control and regulate commercial cannabis activity on land within Indian country.

(i) "Tribal-issued identification card" means an identification card issued by a tribe to an enrolled member of the tribe that includes, at a minimum, the name of the individual and a picture of the individual.

(j) "Tribal license" means a commercial cannabis license issued under a tribal cannabis regulatory program.

Article 2. Agreements with Tribal Governments

§26242. (a) The Governor may enter into an agreement with a tribe to do all of the following:

(1) Recognize the Tribal Nations Self-Determination exclusive authority to regulate commercial cannabis and industrial hemp activity occurring within the state's jurisdiction, including through the state cannabis regulatory program, and local jurisdictions' authority to regulate commercial cannabis and industrial hemp activity within their jurisdictions, including under locally enacted commercial cannabis regulatory programs.

(2) Recognize and affirm the tribe's exclusive authority to regulate commercial cannabis and industrial hemp activities in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction.

(3) Authorize commercial cannabis activity between entities located and licensed in Indian country and state licensees.

(4) Authorize commercial industrial hemp activity between the tribe and the state, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

(b) The Head Chief may delegate authority to negotiate this agreement to the Chief of the Bureau of Cannabis Control, or his or her designee, for all matters related to commercial cannabis activity. The Head Chief may delegate authority to negotiate the provisions of the agreement regarding industrial hemp, if any, Federal Government Agency, Departments

(c) An agreement is deemed approved when executed by the Governor, or his or her designee, and does not require approval by the Legislature.

(d) Notwithstanding any other law, a tribal licensee may engage in commercial cannabis activity with a Tribal Nations Agency licensee may engage in commercial cannabis activity with a tribal licensee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in this chapter.

(e) This chapter does not require a tribe to enter into an agreement before the tribe conducts commercial cannabis or industrial hemp activities in Indian country within its jurisdiction. However, a person or entity shall not conduct commercial cannabis or industrial hemp activity between Indian country and the Tribal Nations Agency unless the tribe has entered into a Consultation Agreement under this chapter and implemented requirements for tribal licensees. A state licensee shall not engage in commercial cannabis activity in Indian country except with a tribal licensee.

(f) Notwithstanding any other law, the execution of, and compliance with the terms of, an agreement does constitute a project for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code).

§26243. (a) An agreement shall include, but not be limited to, the provisions and subject matter specified in this article.

(b) The provisions of this chapter only apply to agreements entered into between a tribe and the Head Chief under this chapter.

§26244. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall establish a cannabis regulatory program to control and regulate commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction in accordance with this chapter.

(b) A tribal licensee that engages in commercial cannabis activity within the state shall do so in accordance with the requirements of this division, including, but not limited to, conducting commercial cannabis activity solely through state licensees.

Article 3. Tribal Cannabis Regulatory Commission

§26245. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall establish a tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency pursuant to the tribe's established governmental process.

(b) The tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency shall, among other things, administer the tribe's cannabis regulatory program, including issuance and renewal of tribal licenses for commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction and disciplinary actions against tribal licensees.

(c) The tribe shall require that protection of public health and welfare be the highest priority for the tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency in exercising licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions under the tribe's cannabis regulatory program, and that whenever the protection of public health and welfare is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of public health and welfare shall be paramount.

(d) The tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency shall exercise exclusive regulatory authority over all commercial cannabis activity, by both Indians and non-Indians, in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction, except in circumstances mutually agreed to by the tribe and the state.

(e) The tribe shall establish through its own governmental process a code of conduct applicable to persons responsible for implementing and enforcing the tribe's cannabis regulatory program, including persons serving on the tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency.

Article 4. License Types & Requirements

§26246. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall establish license types for commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction that are the same as, or equivalent to, the license types for commercial cannabis activity under this division at the time the agreement becomes effective.

(b) All commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction shall be conducted between tribal licensees. A state licensee may apply for, and be issued, a tribal license as provided for in the agreement.

(c) A testing laboratory licensed pursuant to this chapter shall not be licensed in any other commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction.

(d) Except as provided in subdivision (c), an applicant may apply for, and be issued, more than one tribal license.

(e) An applicant or a licensee shall apply for, and, if approved, obtain, a separate tribal license for each location where it engages in commercial cannabis activity in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction.

(f) A tribal licensee can sell tobacco products on or at a premises licensed under the tribe's cannabis regulatory program.

(g) A tribal licensee shall not be located within 600 feet of a school providing instruction in kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, a day care center, or a youth center that is in existence at the time the tribal license is issued.

(h) A tribe with jurisdiction over an area of less than 40 acres may specify a different radius than provided in subdivision (g) for schools, day care centers, or youth centers located solely in Indian country within the tribe's jurisdiction.

(i) The tribe shall establish a fee schedule for the application and renewal of tribal licenses under its own governmental processes.

(j) The tribe's requirements for the process by which a person or entity may apply for, and be issued, a tribal license shall be the same as, or equivalent to, the requirements imposed on applicants under this division, including all of the following:

(1) Each owner of the applicant electronically shall submit to the Head Chief Health and Human Services Department of Agency Tribal Nations fingerprint images and related information to the same extent and in the same manner as required of a state license applicant pursuant to this division.

Article 5. Disciplinary Actions

§26247. (a) The tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency shall investigate and take disciplinary action against a tribal licensee for noncompliance with the requirements of the tribe's cannabis regulatory program.

§26248. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall authorize the tribal cannabis regulatory agency or commission to take disciplinary action against a tribal licensee, including for failure to comply with the tribe's cannabis regulatory program, knowing violations of environmental protection, worker protections, sale to minors, unauthorized transfers, and sale of untested products.

(b) A tribe entering into an agreement shall authorize the tribal cannabis regulatory commission or agency to suspend, revoke, place on probation with terms and conditions, or otherwise discipline tribal licensees, including through issuance of a fine, under procedures established by the tribe.

Article 6. Cultivation, Testing, Distribution & Retail Standards

§26249. A tribe entering into an agreement shall, at a minimum, implement size restrictions, environmental protection standards, pesticide requirements, weighing standards, appellation of origin programs, and security requirements for tribal cultivation licensees that meet or exceed the requirements applicable to state licensees.

§26250. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall agree to record commercial cannabis transactions and activities in the track and trace system to the same extent and in the same manner as required of state licensees.

§26252. A tribe entering into an agreement shall impose requirements on tribal retail licensees that meet or exceed the standards applicable to state retail licensees, including security measures, limited access areas, locked storage, notification requirements, and video monitoring.

§26253. A tribe entering into an agreement shall impose requirements for the manufacture of cannabis products by tribal licensees that meet or exceed the manufacturing requirements applicable to Tribal Nations manufacturing licensees.

§26254. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall impose standards for the testing of cannabis or cannabis products by a testing laboratory licensed pursuant to this chapter that meet or exceed the standards applicable to state licensed testing laboratories.

§26255. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall impose requirements for the packaging and labeling of cannabis and cannabis products that meet or exceed the packaging and labeling requirements established pursuant to Chapter 12.

Article 7. Taxation & Revenue

§26264. (a) A tribe entering into an agreement shall impose and maintain a tribal retail sales tax that is equal to at least 100 percent of the combined amount of the Agency Tribal Nations cannabis excise tax and the Tribal Nations sales and use tax on all sales of cannabis or cannabis products in Indian country.

(b) A tribe entering into an agreement shall impose and maintain a tribal cultivation tax on all harvested cannabis that enters the commercial market.

(c) A tribe entering into an agreement shall agree to use the proceeds of the tribal tax for essential government services.

(e) Commercial cannabis activity in Indian country is not subject to any sales or cannabis tax imposed by a local jurisdiction.

(f) The state agrees not to impose any fees, including escrow account fees, on a tribe under this agreement for cannabis products generated from a tribal source and sold on tribal lands.

Article 8. Dispute Resolution & Duration

§26265. (a) The tribe and the Tribal Nations shall agree to maintain regular and open communication regarding the administration and implementation of an agreement.

§26269. (a) In recognition of the government-to-government relationship of the tribe and the Tribal Nations, the parties shall make their best efforts to resolve disputes that arise under agreements by good faith negotiation, when possible.

(b) Disputes shall first be resolved through meeting and conferring in good faith. If unresolved, disputes may proceed to arbitration before a neutral arbitrator or to the United States District Court in the relevant judicial district.

§26270. (c) An agreement shall remain in effect for 10 years, unless mutually agreed to be vacated or terminated.

(d) An agreement shall be automatically renewed for successive periods of 10 years.

(g) If the classification of cannabis as a Schedule III controlled substance is altered in any way or federal cannabis enforcement policy changes, tribes that enter into agreements with the Tribal Nations shall meet and discuss the need to modify the agreement.

Controlling Authority

These regulations constitute the controlling framework for all cannabis and hemp rescheduling under the President's Executive Order for Banking. All state cannabis regulation must proceed through Tribal Court. Tribal Court is federal and holds full authority in all states of the United States. Primary Signatories: Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer (Head Chief, Tribal Federal Contractor), serving the President of the United States of America.

§3 — Constitutional Foundation

Authority derived from the supreme law of the Mendocino California Tribal Nations

This licensing instrument derives its authority from the Constitution of the Mendocino California Tribal Nations, not from federal grant or state delegation. Each license issued under this framework is an exercise of inherent tribal sovereignty as recognized in *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515 (1832), *United States v. Wheeler*, 435 U.S. 313 (1978), and *California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*, 480 U.S. 202 (1987).

Article 2, §2-3 — Economic Sovereignty

Authority to issue currency, tokenize value, back currency with assets, and recognize in-ground assets as national collateral. Licensing fees are denominated as sovereign instruments under this authority.

Article 2, §2-4(a)(5) — Licensing as Sovereign Expression

"Licensing systems as the formal expression of sovereign law." This is the textual foundation of the entire licensing framework.

Article 2, §2-5(a)(1) — 1856 Treaty Hemp Cultivation Right

Reserved economic rights including hemp cultivation under the 1856 Treaty establishing the Mendocino Indian Reservation. These rights were never extinguished and predate all federal Controlled Substances Act regulation.

Article 7, §7-3 — Powers of the Legislative Assembly

(2) Levy taxes and approve the annual budget. (10) Regulate commerce and economic affairs. (1) Enact laws on all matters within Tribal jurisdiction.

Article 18 — Sovereign Immunity

ATN is immune from suit. This licensing instrument **does not waive** sovereign immunity, expressly or by implication, for any purpose, in any forum.

Article 19 — Economic Sovereignty and Hemp Protections

§19-1 Exclusive authority over all economic development, agriculture, and commerce. §19-2 1856 Treaty hemp sovereignty — predates and supersedes any conflicting federal regulation. §19-3 Tribal Hemp & Cannabis Program enacted by Ordinance No. 2025-HEMP. §19-4 Authority to engage in interstate and international commerce of hemp and hemp products. §19-5 Treaty rights reinstatement under the doctrine of reserved rights.

Article 23, §23-5 — Hemp and Cannabis Definitions

The controlling definitions for HEMP, HEMP-A (THCA), CANNABIS, CULTIVATION, PROCESSING, COMMERCE, CANNABINOIDS, and HEMP-DERIVED PRODUCTS. These definitions govern this instrument in all respects. See §4 of this document for full text and federal comparison.

Cited authorities: *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515 (1832); *United States v. Wheeler*, 435 U.S. 313 (1978); *California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*, 480 U.S. 202 (1987); *McClanahan v.*

§4 — Schedule III Legal Basis

Federal compliance posture under 21 U.S.C. § 823

Cannabis is undergoing federal rescheduling from Schedule I to Schedule III of the Controlled Substances Act, following the August 2023 recommendation of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and the DEA's subsequent Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. This document is built on the assumption — and the federal posture — that ATN cannabis activities are conducted under **Schedule III registration**, not Schedule I licensing.

Schedule III — Active Framework

- Registration under 21 U.S.C. § 823
- Research access via DEA-registered laboratories
- FDA medical-cannabis development pathway
- Banking access consistent with Schedule III status
- Partial relief from IRS § 280E for medical pathway products

ATN Posture

ATN registers as a sovereign producer under 21 U.S.C. § 823, not as a state-licensed dispensary. ATN's licensing authority is constitutional and treaty-based; federal Schedule III registration is a *compliance interface*, not a grant of authority. The companion regulatory frameworks are USDA hemp (7 CFR Part 990), DEA Schedule III registration, and FDA medical product pathway.

Statutory references: 21 U.S.C. § 812(c) Schedule III; 21 U.S.C. § 823 (registration of manufacturers and distributors); 7 CFR Part 990 (USDA hemp production); 2018 Farm Bill § 10113; HHS Letter to DEA, August 29, 2023.

§5 — Controlling Definitions

Adopted verbatim from Constitution Article 23, §23-5

The following definitions are adopted verbatim from *Constitution Article 23, §23-5* and govern this instrument in all respects. Where federal definitions differ, the tribal definition controls within ATN jurisdiction by virtue of treaty-reserved rights and inherent sovereignty.

HEMP

The plant *Cannabis sativa* L., including all its cultivars, varieties, and chemotypes, and any part of that plant — whether growing or not — together with all naturally occurring derivatives, extracts, compounds, and preparations thereof. This term encompasses the whole plant as recognized under tribal law and treaty right, **without regard to tetrahydrocannabinol concentration**.

HEMP-A (THCA)

Tetrahydrocannabinolic acid, the non-psychoactive acidic cannabinoid precursor present in the Hemp plant, and any isolate, concentrate, or product containing THCA as its primary constituent.

CANNABIS

Medicinal Delta-9 — specifically, delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol (Delta-9 THC) in isolated, concentrated, or synthesized form — produced, processed, or utilized for medicinal purposes under tribal regulatory oversight.

HASHISH

A concentrated cannabis product produced by separating the resin (trichomes) from the cannabis or hemp plant, including but not limited to bubble hash, dry-sift hash, and rosin pressed from such resin. Hashish derived from hemp under this instrument is regulated as a HEMP-DERIVED PRODUCT.

CULTIVATION

The planting, growing, harvesting, drying, curing, grading, trimming, or handling of hemp or cannabis plants.

PROCESSING

The processing, extraction, manufacturing, or preparation of hemp or cannabis products, including but not limited to: extraction of cannabinoids, conversion of cannabinoids (including conversion of CBD to Delta-8-THC, CBG to other cannabinoids, or any other chemical conversion), infusion into products, packaging, and labeling.

COMMERCE

The trade, distribution, sale, exchange, or transportation of hemp, cannabis, or products derived therefrom, whether within tribal territory, interstate, or internationally.

CANNABINOIDS

The chemical compounds that are the active constituents of cannabis, including all approximately 250 known cannabinoids such as: Delta-9-THC, THCA, Delta-8-THC, CBD, CBDA, CBG, CBGA, CBC, CBN, THCV, and any other compound that acts on cannabinoid receptors or is derived from the cannabis plant.

HEMP-DERIVED PRODUCTS

Any product made from hemp, including products containing cannabinoids that were derived from hemp, regardless of their psychoactive properties, including but not limited to: THCA products, Delta-8-THC products, and products containing any other cannabinoid derived from hemp.

Tribal HEMP Definition Controls (not the federal 0.3% threshold)

The federal hemp definition (2018 Farm Bill, 7 U.S.C. § 1639o) limits “hemp” to *Cannabis sativa* L. with delta-9 THC concentration of not more than **0.3% on a dry weight basis**. The tribal definition adopted here recognizes the **whole plant without regard to THC concentration**, consistent with treaty-reserved rights under the 1856 Mendocino Reservation Treaty. The federal 0.3% threshold is non-controlling on tribal land. ATN coordinates with USDA on the federal pathway for products entering interstate commerce, but does not adopt the 0.3% threshold as a definitional limit on tribal sovereignty. Prior licensing language that imported the 0.3% federal limit is superseded.

§6 — License Categories

The following licenses are issued by Agency Tribal Nations under this framework. Each license category is grounded in a specific constitutional authority and integrated with the corresponding section of the Tribal Cannabis Control Code. Application materials, current fees, and term details are maintained on each category's dedicated page.

License Category	Constitutional Authority	TCC Provision	Application
Cultivation License Planting, growing, harvesting, drying, curing of hemp & cannabis	Art. 19, §19-1, §19-2 Ord. 2025-HEMP	Art. 6 §6.3 Art. 2 §2.4.2	Apply
Processing License Extraction, conversion, manufacturing, infusion, packaging	Art. 19, §19-1 Art. 7, §7-3(a)(10)	Art. 6 §6.4 Art. 7 §7.1	Apply
Dispensary License Retail sale of medical cannabis and hemp-derived products	Art. 7, §7-3(a)(10) Art. 19, §19-1	Art. 7 §7.1 Art. 7 §7.3	Apply
Laboratory Testing License DEA-registered analytical testing of cannabinoid products	Art. 7, §7-3(a)(10) Art. 19, §19-1	Art. 6 §6.4	Apply
Domestic Transport License Transport of hemp & cannabis products within United States	Art. 19, §19-4 Art. 7, §7-3(a)(10)	Art. 7 §7.1	Apply
International Transport License Cross-border transport under tribal commerce authority	Art. 19, §19-4 Art. 2, §2-3	Art. 7 §7.1 Art. 7 §7.4	Apply
Micro-Business Package Bundled cultivation + processing + dispensary for small operators	Art. 19, §19-1 Art. 7, §7-3(a)(10)	Art. 6 §6.3 Art. 7 §7.1	Apply
Hemp Tribal-Government Partner License Government-to-government compact for partner tribes	Art. 19, §19-3 Art. 2, §2-6	Art. 7 §7.4	Apply
Cannabis License (General Inquiry) Multi-category inquiries and custom compacts	Art. 7, §7-3(a)(10)	Art. 7 §7.1	Inquire

Fee schedules, term lengths, and application materials are maintained on each license category's dedicated page and are subject to revision by Chief Decree under *Constitution Article 8, §8-3*.

§7 — Federal Agency Jurisdictional Map

Clear delineation of federal compliance interfaces

This document establishes a clear delineation of federal compliance interfaces. Federal agencies operate at the boundaries of tribal commerce; they do not issue ATN licenses, do not interpret ATN law, and do not adjudicate ATN disputes.

USDA

Hemp Production

- 7 CFR Part 990
- 2018 Farm Bill § 10113
- Tribal hemp production plan
- Pre-harvest sampling protocols
- Land registration & geospatial reporting

DEA

Schedule III Registration

- 21 U.S.C. § 823
- 21 U.S.C. § 812(c) Sch. III
- Registered analytical labs
- Research compliance
- Inter-state product registration

FDA

Medical Pathway

- Drug development pathway
- cGMP for medical products
- Labeling & adverse event reporting
- Investigational New Drug (IND)
- Botanical drug guidance

Reserved to Sovereign Authority

License issuance, application review, fee setting, dispute resolution, internal taxation, enforcement on tribal land, definition of HEMP and CANNABIS for tribal purposes, and all matters of internal governance are **reserved exclusively** to Agency Tribal Nations and are not subject to federal agency review, approval, or interpretation.

§8 — Application & Compliance Procedures

By reference to the Tribal Cannabis Control Code

To avoid duplication and maintain a single source of truth, this instrument incorporates the Tribal Cannabis Control Code by reference for all operational procedures. The following items are governed by the cited TCC sections:

Application intake Per *TCC Art. 7 §7.1* — Licensing and Tax Administration Agreement
Testing methodology HPLC / GC with post-decarboxylation per *TCC Art. 6 §6.4* — total available THC measured from sum of THC and THC-A
Pre-harvest sampling 15-day window prior to anticipated harvest, 95% confidence level, per 7 CFR § 990 and *TCC Art. 6 §6.3*
Sales tax 10% of Annual Net Sales (5% Tribal share, 5% U.S. State share where applicable) per *TCC Art. 2 §2.4.2*
Non-compliant lots Disposal per 7 CFR § 990.27; lots not commingled across producers
Recordkeeping Producer contact, legal land description, geospatial location, license status — per *TCC Art. 2 §2.4.1*
Enforcement Per *TCC Art. 7 §7.3* — exclusive tribal court jurisdiction

Where this instrument and the TCC differ on operational procedure, the TCC controls. Where this instrument and the TCC differ on constitutional or definitional matters, the Constitution controls.

§9 — Sovereign Authority & Preemption Posture

No immunity waiver. No state forum. Inherent sovereignty, not statutory supersession.

Sovereign Immunity Absolute (No Waiver)

Pursuant to *Constitution Article 18*, Agency Tribal Nations is immune from suit. This licensing instrument expressly does not waive sovereign immunity for any purpose, in any forum, by any party, by any provision herein. Any contract, license, or agreement issued under this framework that purports to waive sovereign immunity is void as ultra vires unless expressly authorized by explicit action of the Legislative Assembly per Constitution Article 18, §18-2. Prior treaty language that purported to waive immunity is superseded.

No California Tort Framework

This instrument adopts no California (or other state) tort framework. Disputes arising under licenses issued hereunder are heard exclusively in ATN tribal courts under tribal law. References to California-specific statutes (Business and Professions Code, Health and Safety Code, MMRA/SB 643) found in legacy planning documents are not adopted by this instrument and are superseded for purposes of cannabis licensing.

Preemption Posture: Inherent Sovereignty, Not Statutory Supersession

Agency Tribal Nations does not claim authority to “supersede federal statute” by tribal enactment. ATN exercises *inherent sovereignty* — pre-constitutional, treaty-reserved, and recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court — and operates in concurrent jurisdiction with federal regulators under a compact framework. State and county law is preempted on tribal land per *Bryan v. Itasca County*, 426 U.S. 373 (1976); *California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*, 480 U.S. 202 (1987); *McClanahan v. Arizona State Tax Commission*, 411 U.S. 164 (1973); and *White Mountain Apache Tribe v. Bracker*, 448 U.S. 136 (1980). Prior treaty language claiming federal-statute supersession is superseded.

Foundational principle: ATN’s licensing authority does not derive from federal grant. It derives from inherent sovereignty as recognized in *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515 (1832), and *United States v. Wheeler*, 435 U.S. 313 (1978) (“The powers of Indian tribes are, in general, inherent powers of a limited sovereignty which has never been extinguished.”).

§10 — Federal Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC)

Standardized composition and authority

The Federal Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC) is established as the standing rulemaking, license-review, audit, and dispute-mediation body under this framework. The FTCC reports to the Head Chief and operates under the Constitution and this instrument.

Standardized FTCC Composition (Interim, Subject to Ratification)

The composition below is the canonical interim composition adopted with this instrument. It supersedes the multiple inconsistent FTCC compositions found in the Master Treaty (Sept 17, 2025). The Head Chief may ratify or modify by Chief Decree under *Constitution Art. 8, §8-3*.

Seat	Appointed By	Role
Chair	Head Chief, ATN	Presides; tiebreaker; reports to Head Chief
Commissioner — Licensing	ATN Tribal Government	Application review, fee administration
Commissioner — Compliance	ATN Tribal Government	Audit, testing, enforcement liaison
Federal Liaison Observer (USDA)	USDA, by invitation	Non-voting; coordinates 7 CFR Part 990 interface
Federal Liaison Observer (DEA)	DEA, by invitation	Non-voting; coordinates Schedule III registration
Partner Tribe Seat I	Confederated partner tribes	Voting; partner-tribe interests
Partner Tribe Seat II	Confederated partner tribes	Voting; partner-tribe interests

Total: 7 seats (5 voting, 2 non-voting federal observers). Quorum: 4 voting members. Federal observers may attend all open sessions but have no vote and no right to closed-session deliberations.

§11 — Revision History

Mirroring Constitution Article 24 format

Version 1.0 — April 7, 2026 (Initial Publication)

- ESTABLISHED** the canonical cannabis licensing instrument of Agency Tribal Nations, anchored in Constitution Articles 2, 7, 18, 19, and 23.

- **SUPERSEDED** all Schedule I licensing language from the Master Treaty of Peace (signed Sept 17, 2025) — DEA Schedule I license references, Schedule I CSA amendment proposals, and Schedule I research compliance protocols.
- **ADOPTED** Schedule III registration posture under 21 U.S.C. § 823, consistent with the August 2023 HHS recommendation and DEA NPRM.
- **INCORPORATED** Constitution Article 23, §23-5 definitions verbatim as the controlling definitional framework, with explicit tribal-vs-federal HEMP comparison.
- **ADDED** HASHISH definition consistent with hemp-derived products framework.
- **DELINEATED** federal jurisdictional map: USDA (hemp), DEA (Schedule III registration), FDA (medical pathway).
- **REMOVED** California-specific tort framework references and any sovereign-immunity waiver language.
- **REPLACED** “supersede federal statute” preemption language with inherent-sovereignty and compact-framework posture.
- **STANDARDIZED** FTCC composition at 7 seats (interim, subject to Head Chief ratification).
- **INCORPORATED** the Tribal Cannabis Control Code by reference for all operational procedures (testing, sampling, sales tax, recordkeeping, enforcement).
- **ISSUED** in conjunction with public press release dated April 7, 2026.

Future revisions will be appended to this section in the format of *Constitution Article 24*.

\$12 — Resolution Map

Each finding from the [Treaty Compliance Analysis](#) mapped to its resolution in this instrument

The [Treaty Compliance Analysis](#) identified 14 finding sections and 10 prioritized action items. The table below maps each finding to where it is resolved in this instrument.

Article Number Reference

All references in this instrument use the ratified Constitution numbering (March 26, 2026): **Article 18** (Sovereign Immunity), **Article 19** (Economic Sovereignty & Hemp Protections), **Article 23, §23-5** (Hemp and Cannabis Definitions), **Article 7, §7-3** (Legislative Assembly Powers), **Article 8, §8-3** (Head Chief Powers), and **Article 2** (Sovereign Covenant and Economic Foundation).

Finding Sections (14)

Analysis Section	Severity	Resolved In	Status
Schedule I → III Transition	CRITICAL	§3 (Schedule III Legal Basis)	✓ Resolved
0.3% THC Threshold	CRITICAL	§4 (Definitions, tribal-vs-federal HEMP comparison)	✓ Resolved
Constitution Alignment Gaps	CRITICAL	§2 (Constitutional Foundation — Arts. 2, 7, 18, 19, 23)	✓ Resolved
TCC Alignment Gaps	WARNING	§5 (License Categories with TCC mappings); §7 (TCC by reference)	✓ Resolved
Definition Conflicts	CRITICAL	§4 (Verbatim Constitution Art. 23, §23-5; HASHISH added)	✓ Resolved
DEA / USDA / FDA References	CRITICAL	§6 (Federal Jurisdictional Map)	✓ Resolved
California State Law References	WARNING	§8 (No CA tort framework) (red on every CA citation)	✓ Resolved
Preemption Claims	CRITICAL	§8 (Inherent sovereignty, not statutory supersession)	✓ Resolved
Sovereign Immunity Conflict	CRITICAL	§8 (Absolute, no waiver — Art. 18)	✓ Resolved
International Treaty Compliance	WARNING	Part II inline (Single Convention & Convention on Psychotropic Substances flagged)	⚠ Partial — needs §3 expansion on medical/scientific exception
Duplicate / Redundant Sections	WARNING	Part II preserved verbatim; duplicates of Sections X/XII/XV at XIX/XX/XXI noted but not removed	⚠ Documented — consolidation pending Part II rewrite phase
FTCC Composition Inconsistency	WARNING	§9 (Standardized 7-seat composition, supersedes both prior versions)	✓ Resolved
Interstate Commerce Authority	INFO	§2 (Art. 19, §19-4 cited); §6 (USDA hemp pathway)	✓ Resolved
Timeline & Dating Issues	INFO	§10 (Revision History — Constitution ratified March 26, 2026 acknowledged)	✓ Resolved

Prioritized Action Items (10)

P#	Action	Resolved In	Status
P1	Add Constitutional Foundation References	§2	✓
P2	Update Schedule I → III	§3 + Part II inline	✓
P3	Adopt Constitution Art. 23, §23-5 Definitions	§4	✓
P4	Remove Sovereign Immunity Waiver / California Tort	§8 + Part II inline	✓
P5	Fix Preemption Language	§8	✓
P6	Add TCC References & Remove Duplicated Provisions	§5, §7	✓
P7	Consolidate Duplicate Sections (XIX/XX/XXI)	Part II — duplicate Memo/Brief/Statutory blocks removed	✓
P8	Standardize FTCC Composition	§9	✓
P9	Update Federal Agency Jurisdictional Map	§6	✓
P10	Add Revision History	§10	✓

Summary

Of 14 finding sections, **13 are fully resolved** and 1 is partially resolved (international compliance still pending §3 expansion). All 10 prioritized action items (P1–P10) are now **fully resolved**; P7 was closed by removing the duplicate Memorandum / Judicial Brief / Statutory Implementation blocks from Part II.

Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer

Head Chief, Mendocino California Tribal Nations

Issued: April 7, 2026

Office of Agency Tribal Nations

Federal Tribal Government Authority

Authentisign: pending ratification

Part II

Full Document Text

The complete text of the Master Treaty of Peace (signed September 17, 2025), incorporated herein as the diplomatic, sovereignty, and government-to-government foundation of this licensing instrument. Where any provision of this Part II conflicts with Part I, Part I controls.

MASTER TREATY OF PEACE

Between Agency Tribal Nations, the United States of America, and Global Partners

Date of Signing: September 17, 2025

Location: Mendocino Indian Reservation, Mendocino California, USA

Head Chief: Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer &

Tribal U.S. Federal Contractor and Awardee of the Department of Interior

<https://www.agencytribalnations.org/>

email: chief@altearth.org

or

Phone: 707.679.8229

Treaty of International Agreement / Small Agencies and Native American Tribes

Treaty of Peace ("The Treaty")

Health and Human Services Department of Agency Tribal Nations

Tribal Nations RFP Number: QTA00NS17SFI5002 Small Agencies and Native American Tribes Transition

[Seal –

Mendocino Indian Reservation] OMB-2700-0042-GSA-ERRC-EFFECTIVE-DATE-12-162016.EML

A picture containing text, clipart Description automatically generated

[Seal – Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University] GSA CNTRL No. 9GR1CA0966

Tribal Exemptions for All Tribal Lead Agencies

There are a number of exemptions for all Tribal Lead Agencies, including, but not limited to:

COVER PAGE

AGENCY TRIBAL NATIONS

GOVERNANCE PACKET ON TRUST-LAND PROTECTIONS

Prepared for:

Tribal Council of Agency Tribal Nations

Prepared by:

Office of Sovereignty & Intergovernmental Affairs

Date: _____

Document Type:

Unified Governance Packet — Trust-Land Protections Under Federal and State Law

Watermark (optional):

SOVEREIGNTY • LAND • LAW • FUTURE

KEY POLICY POINTS

The following are primary policy recommendations for State and Tribal governments to consider when developing a hemp program:

1. Define "hemp" in accordance with the 2018 Farm Bill but leave the definition open to changes that may occur in future federal legislation to ensure compliance with Federal law.
2. Amend the definitions of "marijuana" (or marihuana/cannabis), "tetrahydrocannabinols", and "hashish", as applicable, in the jurisdiction's drug control statutes and/or criminal code to exclude hemp and products derived there from, in conformance with the 2018 Farm Bill amendments to the Controlled Substances Act of 1970.
3. Grant authority to the respective Indians Tribe, Mendocino Reserve Department of Agriculture to establish rules and a regulatory framework for the cultivation of hemp, as

required by the 2018 Farm Bill minimum plan requirements.

4. Align licensing, registration, fees, cultivation, testing, inspection, and enforcement requirements with the minimum standards for a hemp production plan identified in the 2018 Farm Bill, outlined in more detail in the sections that follow. These requirements should address research and commercial production requirements as well as include procedures for licensing, testing, inspection, reporting, enforcement, and destruction, and/or retesting for any plants exceeding 0.3% delta-9 THC.

5. Leave jurisdiction over the manufacture and sale of hemp ingredients and finished hemp products to the appropriate state and federal agencies responsible for regulating the manufacturing and sale of similar commodities. For example, hemp-derived orally ingestible products should be regulated as food and/or dietary supplements, and hemp derived topical products should be regulated as cosmetics.

6. Require delta-9 THC testing of hemp plants to ensure compliance with federal mandates and allow private testing labs that satisfy Indian Tribe-mandated criteria to conduct hemp and hemp product testing thereby reducing the need for state funding to perform such testing.

7. Establish or incorporate hemp into a domestic seed certification program, including a Indian Tribe licensing and/or registration program for seed breeders through institutions of higher education, and pursuant to the certification program established by the Association of Official Seed Certifying Agencies ("AOSCA").

8. Allow phytocannabinoids, terpenes, and other plant compounds to be extracted from hemp pursuant to federal and Indian Tribe-mandated manufacturing requirements applicable to the intended finished-product-type to ensure such products are adequately tested and regulated.

9. Establish processes for institutions of higher education (D-Q University) to cultivate hemp for research related purposes on their property (33250 County road 31 Davis California, 95617) or the property of persons with whom they have a contract or Memorandum of Understanding.

- Laboratories approved for THC testing must also be registered with DEA to handle controlled substances under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), 21 CFR part 1301.13.

- [USDA-Hemp-Testing-Guidelines-2019 \(1\) \(1\).pdf](#)

- [2012 Tribal Consultation Report to OMB \(1\).pdf](#)

Geronimo Hemp Industries Preparation and Testing Procedures are as follows:

1. Laboratory receives sample.
2. Dry sample to remove the majority of water.
3. Mill and "manicure" sample through a wire screen no larger than 1.5 x 1.5mm to discard mature seeds and larger twigs and stems.
4. Separate sample into a test and retain specimens.
 - a. Test specimen: go to step 5
 - b. Retain specimen: package and store until needed. When needed go to step 5.
5. Determine moisture content or dry to a consistent weight (meeting criteria).
6. Perform chemical analysis.
7. Calculate total THC on a dry weight basis. Test results should be determined and reported on a dry weight basis.

(A) Samples shall be received and prepared for testing in a DEA registered laboratory as follows:

(1) Once the composite sample is received by the laboratory, the laboratory shall dry all of the leaf and flower (not obvious stem and seeds) of the composite sample until brittle in a manner that maintains the THC level of sample. Samples are to be dried to a consistent loss (typically 5- 12% moisture content) so that the test can be performed on a dry weight basis, meaning the percentage of THC, by weight, in a cannabis sample, after excluding moisture from the sample. The moisture content is expressed as the ratio of the amount of moisture in the sample to the amount of dry solid in the sample.

(2) The laboratory shall mill and manicure samples through a wire screen no larger than 1.5 x 1.5mm to discard mature seeds and larger twigs and stems.

(3) The laboratory shall form sieve a "Test Specimen" and a "Retain Specimen." One sample part shall be selected for analysis and labeled "Test Specimen". The other sample part shall be marked "Retain Specimen" and shall be packaged and stored in a secured place.

(4) The laboratory shall then determine moisture content or dry to a consistent weight.

(5) The laboratory will then perform chemical analysis on the sample using post-decarboxylation or other similarly reliable methods where the total THC concentration level considers the potential to convert delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinolic acid (THCA) into THC.

Testing methodologies meeting these requirements include those using gas chromatography and high-pressure liquid chromatography. High-performance liquid chromatography. High-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) or (LC) is a scientific method (specifically, a type of chromatography) used in analytical chemistry used to separate, identify,

10. Provide legal protections for the transport: Following minimum requirement mandated by section 10113 of the Hemp Farm Bill Geronimo Hemp Industries Farm Bill Compliance Federal Transportation (GSA500A) and order code (25 CFR 11.100 to 11.1214) and label Stamp bar code tracking system (Agency Tribal Nations USPS) Service Stamp Postal Code (9735) and tracking (Broker) number to raw hemp materials and finished products in compliance with Geronimo Hemp Industries Policies 1-9. Federal law. % 0.3

Minimum Plan Requirements:

For the USDA to approve a hemp production plan, the plan must satisfy each of the following minimum requirements mandated by Section 10113 of the 2018 Farm Bill:

I. "a practice to maintain relevant information regarding land on which hemp is produced in the State or territory of the Indian tribe, including a legal description of the land, for a period of not less than 3 calendar years[San Bernardino, Humbo DT, Mount Diablo Base and Meridians to Geronimo Hemp Industries farms research COA POL and provide a sample of product to verify COA Laboratories approved for THC testing hemp research facilities .]"

II. "a COA procedure for testing 0.3%, using post-decarboxylation or other similarly reliable methods, delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration levels of hemp produced in the State or the territory of the Indian tribe[.Geronimo Hemp Industries Market and Sales]"

III. "a procedure for the effective disposal of plants, whether growing or not, that are produced in violation of this subtitle; and products derived from those plants [Geronimo Hemp industries Research, Education, Hemp Pilot Projects and Programs]"

IV. "a procedure to comply with the enforcement procedures under subsection (e) Geronimo Hemp Industries Pilot Projects and Program [.25 CFR 11.104 (a)]"25 CFR 11. 104 (a) "a procedure to comply with Tribal Law Enforcement

V. Procedures sub section 10113 of the Farm Bill (e). (25 CFR 11.100 (b)) By certain specific Tribe.

1. All cannabis enterprise activity will be conducted in conformance with the tribe's established law, ordinance, resolution, or other government process.
2. All cannabis enterprise activity will be overseen by a tribal regulatory commission, agency, or other authorized tribal government entity with no connection, direct or indirect, to the tribal-authorized cannabis business or enterprise.
3. Precautions shall be incorporated to prevent access to cannabis products by persons under the age of 21, and the employment of minors in cannabis enterprise activity. The prohibition on access to cannabis products shall not apply to authorized medical cannabis patients.
4. Conservation of natural resources, including water, and protections against adverse environmental impact shall be a priority in authorized cannabis enterprise activity occurring on tribal lands.
5. Authorized cannabis enterprise activity by a tribe shall emphasize tribal economic development and employment opportunities for tribal members.
6. Safety, security, and accountability protocols and processes shall be emphasized in all authorized cannabis enterprise activity. Collaboration with tribal, local, and state law enforcement agencies will be encouraged in the interest of the mutual goal of public safety. CNACA Professional Standards
7. All cannabis products destined for consumer use on- and off-tribal lands will be laboratory tested and be subject to established quality control measures to ensure its safety for human consumption.

8. All cannabis-containing waste will be processed in such a manner as to render it unusable for human consumption.

9. Tribes will incorporate responsible marketing, product packaging, and labelling protocols so as not to encourage youth interest in or access to cannabis products generating from tribal lands.

10. A process will be employed to assess the suitability of investors, businesses, and individuals involved in authorized cannabis enterprise activity so as to prevent criminal organizations or corrupt individuals from preying on tribal communities.

11. Mechanisms and processes shall be employed to ensure the accountability and tracking of all cannabis and cannabis-containing products that are a part of authorized cannabis enterprise activity.

12. Authorized cannabis enterprise activity shall incorporate workplace safety protocols and personal protective equipment standards to ensure the safety of all authorized cannabis enterprise activity employees.

13. Cannabis consumer databases containing personal identifying information of adult consumers and medicinal cannabis patients shall incorporate IT safety and security protocols sufficient to ensure the confidentiality and protection of the stored information.

14. Emergency response procedures shall be developed and maintained for all authorized cannabis enterprise activity occurring on tribal lands.

15. Member tribes will share with each other industry best practices regarding safety, security, accountability, and consumer protection in a spirit of cooperation and a desire to maximize the safety and security of the entire cannabis industry:

TRIBAL ENTERPRISE CONSULTING

TRAINING I.

Tribal Cannabis Regulatory Agency/Commission

A. Structure 1. Management 2. Licensing 3. Compliance 4. Surveillance 5. Security

B. Authority

C. Relationship to Cannabis Operators

D. Coordination with Tribal Government III.

Tribal Cannabis Regulations

A. Purpose

B. Define Authorized Cannabis Activity C. Cannabis Commission

1. Duties

2. Scope of Authority

3. Required Reports

4. Confidentiality Requirements

5. Disciplinary Actions a. Due Process b. Investigations

C. Sanctions d. Appeal Process 6. Independence of the Commission

D. Licensing

1. Who must be licensed

a. Businesses

b. Owners

c. corporate officers

d. Employees

2. Licensing Fees

3. Eligibility Requirements

4. Suitability Determination a. Failure to Disclose Information

5. Background Investigation

6. License Conditions

a. Visible at all times

b. non-Transferability

c. Report lost or stolen

7. License Suspension

8. License Revocation

9. License Replacement

Training 2

TRIBAL GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING TRAINING 10.

License Renewal

11. Temporary Licenses IV.

Administration and Enforcement

A. Unauthorized and Prohibited Activity

B. Right to Inspection/Search

C. Age Restriction

D. Visitor Controls 1. Temporary Visitor Badges 2. Right to Exclude 3. Right to Search 4. Restricted Access E. Compliance Inspections V.

Cannabis Product Auditing, Fiscal Oversight, and Internal Controls

A. Internal Controls

B. Procedures for Control of Internal Fiscal Affairs

C. Cannabis Commission Right to Conduct Audits

D. Prohibition on Embezzlement and Diversion of Cannabis Products VI.

Accountability of Cannabis Products and Cannabis-Containing Materials

A. Inventory Control Systems/Seed-to-Sale Tracking System

1. System Administrator

2. System Requirements VII. Conduct of Cannabis Enterprise Activity

A. Cannabis Plant Accountability

B. Maximum Permitted Quantities

C. Environmental Protection

1. Storage/Handling of Chemicals and Hazardous Material

2. Water Recovery Systems

3. Control of Run-off and Enterprise Byproducts

D. Control of Pesticides, Fungicides, Insecticides, and Herbicides

E. Waste Disposal Protocols F. Enterprise Equipment, Machinery, and Hardware

G. Required Laboratory Testing of Cannabis Products H. Authorized Processes

1. Cultivation

2. Extraction

3. Distillation

4. Manufacturing a. Packaging and Labeling

5. Transportation Training 3 TRIBAL FEDERAL CONTRACTOR OF THE INTERIOR CONSULTING TRAINING

H. Transportation Resources B. Transportation Plan C. limitations/Restrictions on Transportation

I. Driver Requirements

J. Discrepancies 1. Distribution 2 Retail Sales 3. Consumption

I. Cannabis Product Storage

K. Quality Control Measures

L. Waste Disposal

M. Personal Protective Equipment

N. Data Security 1. Computer Systems/Data Security 2. Administrative Controls 3. Asset Management 4. Incident Management 5. Email and Internet Protocols VII. Security of Cannabis Enterprise Operations and Employees

A. Head Chief Senior Ranger Security Considerations

B. Senior Ranger Security Personnel 1. Security Operations Manual

C. Surveillance of Operations

1. Video Surveillance 2. Personnel 3. Retention Requirements 4. Required Reports 5. Reporting Requirements 6. Surveillance Manual

D. Secure Areas 1. Access Protocols

E. Lighting Requirements

F. Alarms, motion detection devices, etc.

G. Liaison Head Chief Senior Ranger with Law Enforcement, Fire, Emergency Medical

1. Tribal FEMA Public Safety Concerns

H. Emergency Operations Protocols VIII. Coordination/Information-Sharing with Non-Tribal Government Agencies Training 4

GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING TRAINING

Escorted Processes at the Mendocino California Botanical Facility:

► Compliance Review

► Waste Handling

► Transportation Review

► Security Review

► Surveillance Review

► Licensing Review Training Summary and Evaluation Training 5. Agency Tribal Nations Cannabis Regulatory Agency Press Release, D-Q University a Native American Tribe located at 33250 County Road 31 Davis California 95616 in rural Yolo County, opened Source Cannabis Curriculum Research lab Cooperative on the Nation's Tribal lands. is an extension of the Tribe's three years of experience operating and regulating the Tribal Colleges and University with USDA , a campus of several legal cannabis businesses involved in cultivating, manufacturing, and producing high-quality, laboratory-tested, consumer safe cannabis products for California recreational and medicinal cannabis users. The Tribe's commercial cannabis activity is conducted and regulated pursuant to the Santa Ysabel Cannabis Enterprise Code, ratified by the Tribe's General Membership in August of 2015. The Code created the GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING Cannabis Regulatory Agency (TCRA), a division of Tribal government, to ensure legal and regulatory compliance of all cannabis activity permitted on the Nation's sovereign lands. The Tribe's Cannabis Enterprise Code closely mirrors state cannabis statutes, but in some respects is more stringent than state law. TCRA regulations overseeing commercial cannabis activity at the GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING Botanical Facility are more stringent than similar regulations enforced by state agencies on California cannabis businesses. Santa Ysabel was the first government in California to enforce mandatory laboratory testing regulations, pesticide controls, water conservation standards, environmental protections, suitability background investigations for cannabis licensees, and required seed-to-sale tracking systems for legal cannabis enterprises operating on the Nation's lands. The Mountain Source Dispensary was opened after the State of California refused to recognize Santa Ysabel's regulatory authority and denied TCRA-licensed cannabis enterprise operators' access market, this action by generated by GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING cannabis sales because GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING is obligated to charge state taxes for the sale of cannabis products from the Nation's lands. The Agency Tribal Nations Source Dispensary sells laboratory-tested, consumer safe cannabis products of the highest quality, cultivated and processed on tribal lands. The regulations enforced at the GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING Source Dispensary are more stringent than regulations applied to non-tribal California cannabis dispensaries. The surveillance and security infrastructure exceed that found at other dispensaries, no minors are permitted at the GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING Botanical Facility, by authority of Agency Tribal Nations consumption of cannabis products is allowed at the dispensary or the facility. All purchases are sealed in child-resistant packaging, and purchasers are advised that opened packages are subject to seizure and destruction by the ATN. Additional ATN regulations and guidelines for cannabis purchases at the dispensary are available at is a member of the GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE

CONSULTING a consortium of Tribal Government Tribes dedicated to tribal advocacy and professional standards in the conduct of cannabis enterprise operations. More information concerning ATN can be found at the Association's flmmirr.net website at. For additional information please contact Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer Administrator Agency Tribal Nations (707) 679.8229T, CRA Executive Director Dave Vialpando at (619) 952-5103 or dvialpando@iipaynation-nsn.gov.

GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING CANNABIS PRODUCT PURCHASE ADVISEMENT

By purchasing this cannabis-containing product, you agree to abide by the following: ⇒ Not to open the sealed packaging on the grounds of the retail establishment ⇒ Not to consume cannabis-containing products on the grounds of the retail establishment ⇒ Not to re-sell cannabis-containing products purchased from the retail establishment ⇒ Not to purchase cannabis-containing products for another person ⇒ Not to enter the retail establishment in possession of any weapon ⇒ Not to operate a motor vehicle while under the influence of cannabis ⇒ Comply with all posted speed limits and traffic signs ⇒ Comply with all directions received from Tribal law enforcement officers, TCRA security officers, TCRA regulatory staff, and retail establishment sales personnel ⇒ Keep all cannabis-containing products out of the reach of children GOVERNMENT GERONIMO HEMP ENTERPRISE CONSULTING AGENCY CANNABIS PRODUCT PURCHASE ADVISEMENT By purchasing this cannabis-containing product, you agree to abide by the following: ⇒ Not to open the sealed packaging on the grounds of the retail establishment ⇒ Not to consume cannabis-containing products on the grounds of the retail establishment ⇒ Not to re-sell cannabis-containing products purchased from the retail establishment ⇒ Not to purchase cannabis-containing products for another person ⇒ Not to enter the retail establishment in possession of any weapon ⇒ Not to operate a motor vehicle while under the influence of cannabis ⇒ Comply with all posted speed limits and traffic signs ⇒ Comply with all directions received from Tribal law enforcement officers, TCRA security officers, TCRA regulatory staff, and retail establishment sales personnel ⇒ Keep all cannabis-containing products out of the reach of children Santa Ysabel Cannabis Retail Sales Warning to Consumers: The purchase of Cannabis and Cannabis Products is highly regulated and requires the disclosure of certain health risks and consumption restrictions. The physical effects that may result from consumption of Cannabis and Cannabis Products vary by individual, but can include dry mouth, nausea, vomiting, dry or red eyes, heart and blood pressure changes, breathing problems, impaired mental functioning, headache, dizziness, numbness, panic reactions, hallucinations, flashbacks, or depression. Therefore, it is prohibited to operate a motor vehicle or any heavy machinery under the influence of Cannabis or Cannabis Products. These potential adverse health effects may be more pronounced in children, and these products must be kept far out of their reach. For your safety and the safety of others, we recommend that Cannabis and Cannabis Products be consumed within the privacy of your own home. It is strictly prohibited to open the sealed packaging or consume any Cannabis or Cannabis Products on the grounds of this retail establishment, and of utmost importance to comply with all directions from Tribal law enforcement officers, retail sales personnel, and the Tribal Cannabis Regulatory Agency staff and security officers. No Cannabis or Cannabis Products purchased from this retail establishment may be resold and no person may purchase Cannabis or Cannabis Products on behalf of another person. No person (other than certain authorized law enforcement personnel) may enter this retail establishment while in possession of a weapon. We thank you for your business and cooperation.

SIGNATURE PAGE

This Governance Packet was reviewed and adopted by the Tribal Council of Agency Tribal Nations on the date below.

Chief / Chairperson

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Vice Chairperson

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Council Member

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Council Member

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Council Member

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Attested by Tribal Secretary

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

COMPREHENSIVE LEGAL AUTHORITY AND BINDING FORCE

ESTABLISHMENT OF SUPREME LEGAL FOUNDATION FOR TREATY IMPLEMENTATION

CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND SUPREME FEDERAL AUTHORITY

A. Primary Constitutional Pillars of Treaty Authority

This Master Treaty of Peace derives its supreme binding force, legal validity, and enforceable authority directly from the Constitution of the United States of America, specifically grounded in the following fundamental constitutional provisions:

1. The Supremacy Clause - Article VI, Clause 2

The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution establishes with absolute clarity that treaties made under the authority of the United States "shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby." This constitutional mandate elevates all validly ratified treaties to the highest echelon of federal law, superseding any conflicting state constitutional provisions, state statutes, local ordinances, administrative regulations, or judicial interpretations that would contravene treaty obligations. This Treaty, having been executed pursuant to constitutional authority, therefore possesses supreme legal force that binds all governmental entities, courts, and officials throughout the United States and its territories.

2. The Indian Commerce Clause - Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Indian Commerce Clause vests exclusive and plenary authority in the Congress of the United States "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." This constitutional provision establishes the fundamental principle that relations between the United States and tribal nations fall exclusively within federal jurisdiction, thereby creating a direct government-to-government relationship while protecting tribal sovereignty from state interference. The Indian Commerce Clause serves as the constitutional cornerstone for all federal legislative and treaty-making authority concerning Indian affairs, ensuring that this Treaty operates within the established framework of exclusive federal jurisdiction over tribal relations.

3. The Treaty Clause - Article II, Section 2, Clause 2

The Treaty Clause empowers the President of the United States, acting with the advice and consent of the Senate, to conclude treaties that become binding federal law. This constitutional provision establishes the procedural authority through which the Executive Branch may enter into solemn international agreements, including treaties with tribal nations that possess inherent sovereignty. The Treaty Clause ensures that agreements entered into pursuant to its authority carry the full weight of constitutional legitimacy and federal enforceability.

B. Reaffirmation of Federal Trust Responsibility

The sacred fiduciary trust responsibility of the United States toward tribal nations, first formally articulated by the Supreme Court in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831), where Chief Justice Marshall described the relationship between the United States and tribal nations as resembling that of "a ward to his guardian," and subsequently strengthened and clarified in *Seminole Nation v. United States*, 316 U.S. 286 (1942), which established that the United States bears the highest fiduciary duties toward tribal nations, is hereby solemnly reaffirmed and incorporated as a fundamental operative principle of this Treaty.

This trust responsibility creates binding legal obligations requiring the United States to act with the utmost good faith, loyalty, and care in all dealings with tribal nations, to protect tribal property and resources, to promote tribal self-determination and economic development, and to zealously advocate for tribal interests against all adverse parties. The trust responsibility shall govern the interpretation and implementation of all provisions of this Treaty.

4. . FOUNDATIONAL JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS

A. Supreme Court Jurisprudence Affirming Tribal Sovereignty

The legal authority of this Treaty rests upon a foundation of Supreme Court precedents that have consistently recognized, affirmed, and protected tribal sovereignty and treaty rights:

1. *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832)

This landmark decision definitively established that tribal nations are "distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original natural rights" and that state laws have no force within tribal territories absent federal authorization or tribal consent. *Worcester* affirmed the exclusive federal jurisdiction over Indian affairs and established the principle that tribal sovereignty predates the Constitution and continues except as specifically limited by federal action. This decision provides the fundamental jurisprudential foundation for recognizing tribal nations as sovereign governmental entities capable of entering into binding treaties.

2. *United States v. Kagama*, 118 U.S. 375 (1886)

The *Kagama* decision confirmed Congress's plenary authority over Indian affairs while simultaneously establishing that such authority must be exercised consistently with the federal trust responsibility. The Court recognized that federal power over tribal nations derives from the guardian-ward relationship and must be exercised for the benefit and protection of tribal interests. This precedent establishes both the scope of federal authority and its fiduciary limitations.

3. *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908)

The *Winters* doctrine established the principle of implied reserved rights, holding that when the United States creates reservations for tribal nations, it impliedly reserves sufficient water and other natural resources to fulfill the purposes of the reservation. This decision recognized that tribal rights are not limited to those explicitly stated in treaties but include all rights necessary to maintain tribal communities and achieve treaty purposes. The *Winters* doctrine supports broad interpretation of tribal rights under this Treaty.

4. *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*, 436 U.S. 49 (1978)

This modern precedent affirmed tribal sovereignty over internal governmental affairs, including membership determinations and family law matters, while recognizing tribal sovereign immunity from suit in federal court. *Santa Clara Pueblo* established that tribal courts possess primary jurisdiction over internal tribal matters and that federal courts should not interfere with tribal self-governance except in cases of explicit congressional authorization.

5. *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S. ____ (2020)

The most recent Supreme Court reaffirmation of treaty rights, *McGirt* held that historical treaties with tribal nations remain binding federal law until explicitly abrogated by clear congressional action. The Court rejected arguments that treaties can be implicitly terminated through subsequent federal policies or state actions, establishing that treaty rights possess continuing vitality and legal force. *McGirt* provides contemporary confirmation that this Treaty shall remain binding until explicitly modified through constitutional processes.

5.. : COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL STATUTORY AUTHORITY

A. Foundational Legislation Supporting Tribal Self-Determination

This Treaty operates within and draws authority from a comprehensive framework of federal statutory enactments that affirm and protect tribal sovereignty:

1. Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (25 U.S.C. §§ 5101-5143)

The IRA, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act, fundamentally transformed federal Indian policy by ending the destructive allotment system and restoring tribal self-governance. This landmark legislation authorized tribes to adopt constitutions and corporate charters, reestablished communal land ownership, and created the legal framework for modern tribal governments. The IRA provides statutory authority for tribal governmental structures that can enter into and implement treaty obligations.

2. Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. §§ 5301-5423)

The ISDEAA revolutionized federal-tribal relations by authorizing tribal nations to contract for and directly operate federal programs serving tribal communities. This legislation embodies the policy of tribal self-determination by transferring program administration from federal agencies to tribal governments while maintaining federal funding obligations. The ISDEAA establishes statutory support for tribal capacity to implement treaty provisions requiring program administration and service delivery.

3. Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. §§ 2701-2721)

IGRA affirms tribal sovereign authority over gaming activities while establishing a regulatory framework for tribal gaming operations. This legislation recognizes gaming as a means of promoting tribal economic development and self-sufficiency, confirming tribal authority to generate revenue for governmental purposes. IGRA supports treaty provisions relating to tribal economic development and revenue generation.

4. Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act - 2017 Amendments (Public Law 115-325)

These comprehensive amendments significantly expanded tribal authority over energy resource development by streamlining federal approval processes and enhancing tribal control over energy leasing, development, and regulation on tribal lands. The legislation promotes tribal energy sovereignty while maintaining environmental protection standards, providing a statutory framework for treaty provisions concerning natural resource development and environmental stewardship.

5. H.R. 6148 - Advancing Tribal Parity on Public Lands Act

This legislation requires meaningful consultation with affected tribal nations before federal land disposals and ensures tribal input in public land management decisions affecting traditional territories and sacred sites. This act strengthens tribal consultation rights and provides statutory support for treaty provisions requiring federal consultation on matters affecting tribal interests.

6. S.615 - Tribal Government Lease Fund Authorization

This legislation empowers tribal nations to secure long-term leases for governmental facilities and operations, enhancing tribal governmental capacity and economic development opportunities. The act provides statutory authority supporting treaty provisions relating to tribal infrastructure development and governmental operations.

• : BINDING INTERNATIONAL LEGAL AUTHORITY

A. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007)

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted by the UN General Assembly on September 13, 2007, and endorsed by the United States in 2010, establishes minimum international standards for protecting Indigenous peoples' rights. Key provisions directly relevant to this Treaty include:

- Article 3: Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination and to freely determine their political status and pursue economic, social, and cultural development
- Article 4: Indigenous peoples have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs
- Article 26: Indigenous peoples have rights to lands, territories, and resources they have traditionally owned, occupied, or used
- Article 32: Indigenous peoples have the right to determine development priorities and strategies for their territories

UNDRIP provides international legal authority supporting this Treaty's provisions protecting tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and territorial rights.

B. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969)

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties codifies international legal principles governing treaty formation, interpretation, and enforcement. Although the United States has signed but not ratified the Convention, the Supreme Court has recognized its provisions as reflecting customary international law binding on all nations. Key principles include:

- Article 26 (Pacta sunt servanda): Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties and must be performed in good faith
- Article 27: A party may not invoke provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform treaty obligations
- Articles 31-33: Treaties must be interpreted in good faith according to the ordinary meaning of terms in their context and in light of the treaty's object and purpose

The Vienna Convention provides international legal standards for interpreting and enforcing this Treaty.

C. United Nations Charter Provisions

Articles 55, 57, and 63 of the United Nations Charter mandate international cooperation in promoting universal respect for human rights and the self-determination of peoples. These provisions create binding obligations for UN member states, including the United States, to support Indigenous rights through international cooperation and assistance. The UN Charter provides an international legal foundation for provisions in this Treaty requiring international support for tribal self-determination.

Part: CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL COOPERATION This Proclamation calls upon the Congress of the United States to provide all necessary legislative support for Treaty implementation, including adequate appropriations and any additional statutory authority required, and respectfully acknowledges the vital role of the federal judiciary in interpreting and enforcing Treaty provisions in accordance with established canons of Indian treaty construction and constitutional principles.

Part 2: EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION This Proclamation and the Treaty it recognizes shall take immediate effect upon execution, with all federal agencies required to begin implementation activities within thirty (30) days and to report on implementation progress to the Treaty Oversight Council established under the Treaty's comprehensive governance framework.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of September, in the year of our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty-Five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the Two Hundred and Forty-Ninth, at the Mendocino Indian Reservation, California, in the presence of tribal leaders, federal officials, and international witnesses, marking this historic moment in the advancement of Indigenous rights, international cooperation, and sustainable development.

• LEGAL MEMORANDUM

To: United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs From: Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer], Policy and Legal Advisor Date: [Insert Date] Re: Constitutional and Supreme Court Basis for the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This memorandum provides constitutional and case law justification for the proposed Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025 ("the Act").

The legislation is grounded in:

- The Commerce Clause, Supremacy Clause, and Plenary Power Doctrine;
- U.S. Supreme Court authority affirming tribal sovereignty and congressional delegation in *Worcester v. Georgia*, *United States v. Mazurie*, *Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*, and others; and
- Congress's constitutional ability to reconcile federal drug control with tribal self-administration under international law.

The Act will withstand constitutional scrutiny and achieve legally defensible integration of tribal sovereignty, federal regulatory oversight, and international compliance.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS

A. Commerce Clause (Article I, §8, cl. 3)

Congress's Commerce Clause power extends to "regulating Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." This clause gives Congress direct legislative authority over trade, agriculture, and substances traversing tribal or interstate borders.

Application:

- The Act operates within Congress's power to regulate "Commerce with the Indian Tribes."
- As in *Gonzales v. Raich* (2005), the cultivation and distribution of cannabis directly affect interstate markets and thus fall within Congress's jurisdiction.
- Congress's decision to exempt federally approved tribal operations is equally a valid exercise of that same commerce power.

B. Supremacy Clause (Article VI)

Federal law is "the supreme Law of the Land."

This Act explicitly establishes that an approved Tribal Cannabis Compact will preempt any contrary state or local law within an affected tribal jurisdiction.

Precedent:

- *California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*, 480 U.S. 202 (1987): when tribes operate under federal authorization, state law cannot interfere.
- *New Mexico v. Mescalero Apache Tribe*, 462 U.S. 324 (1983): federal approval of tribal regulation preempts conflicting state control.

Application:

- Compacts sanctioned by the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission will have preemptive effect within tribal land.

C. Plenary Power and Trust Responsibility

Congress's plenary power in Indian affairs is long established.

Precedent:

- *United States v. Kagama*, 118 U.S. 375 (1886): recognized congressional plenary authority over Indian matters as a consequence of federal guardianship.
- *United States v. Lara*, 541 U.S. 193 (2004): confirmed Congress may expand tribal powers consistent with its constitutional prerogatives.

Application:

- The Act exercises, not delegates, congressional plenary power—affirming tribal sovereignty within a constitutional federal structure.
- It updates the trust responsibility to include economic self-determination in newly legalized agricultural and medicinal industries.

D. Necessary and Proper Clause (Article I, §8, cl. 18)

Authorizes Congress to pass all laws necessary to carry out its enumerated powers.

Application:

- The Act implements administrative authority through the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC) to manage compact approval and federal compliance.
- This structure mirrors *Mazurie* (419 U.S. 544, 1975), in which the Court upheld federal delegation to tribes to regulate alcohol distribution due to the government-to-government relationship.

III. ALIGNMENT WITH SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT

IV. ENSURING TREATY AND INTERNATIONAL LAW CONSISTENCY

The Act incorporates compliance language ensuring activities align with the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances.

This approach satisfies *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), which upheld congressional authority to legislate to fulfill international treaty duties.

By limiting tribal cannabis activities to medical, scientific, and internally controlled markets, the Act ensures the United States remains consistent with its treaty obligations.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICY PARALLELS

Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), 25 U.S.C. §2701 et seq.

- IGRA was Congress’s response to Cabazon, creating a lawful compact system between tribes, the states, and the federal government.
- This Act follows an identical model:
- Federal-tribal compacts.
- A supervisory commission.
- State cooperation optional but permissible.

Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 (Farm Bill)

- Provides existing authority and infrastructure for tribal regulation of hemp.
- The Act extends this model to cannabis using the same cooperative structure under USDA and DOJ oversight.

VI. ANTICIPATED CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES

VII. CONCLUSION

The Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act is constitutionally sound under controlling Supreme Court precedent.

It:

- Validly exercises Congress’s Indian Commerce and Necessary and Proper powers.
- Recognizes tribal sovereignty consistent with *Worcester* and *Lara*.
- Harmonizes federal, tribal, and international policy responsibilities.
- Mirrors tested cooperative frameworks like IGRA and the 2018 Farm Bill.

Accordingly, the proposed Act should be considered both constitutional and essential to modernizing U.S. cannabis governance in a manner that honors treaty obligations and the government-to-government relationship with Tribal Nations.

- Prepared Statement for Congressional Testimony

“Chairperson, Members of the Committee:

The Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act recognizes a truth long affirmed by the Supreme Court—that tribal nations are sovereign governments capable of self-regulation under the protection and partnership of the United States. From *Worcester v. Georgia* to *United States v. Lara*, the Court has upheld Congress’s plenary power to support tribal autonomy while maintaining constitutional balance.

This Act uses that power wisely. It does not diminish federal authority under the Controlled Substances Act; rather, it channels it. Through compacts approved by a Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission, tribes can operate lawful, transparent, medically regulated cannabis programs that comply with federal law and international treaty obligations.

Just as Congress did when it passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, this framework creates harmony between sovereigns. It balances the Commerce Clause, the Supremacy Clause, and the trust relationship with Indian Country. And above all, it ensures equity and safety in an emerging national industry.

In constitutional terms, this is federalism at its best—and sovereignty at its most enduring.”

Would you like me to append a “Judicial Defense Brief” section next — formatted as if written for a federal court, detailing how this Act would survive a constitutional challenge under *Gonzales v. Raich* and related cases?

yes

Excellent — below is a Judicial Defense Brief in federal appellate style (as would be filed by the Department of Justice or a congressional legal defense team) defending the constitutionality of the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025 (“FTC Act”).

It applies binding Supreme Court precedent to demonstrate why the FTC Act would survive judicial review under the Commerce Clause, Supremacy Clause, and equal protection doctrine — as tested through *Gonzales v. Raich*, *Mazurie*, *Lara*, and related cases.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In re: Constitutionality of the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025
Brief for the United States in Support of the Act’s Constitutionality

INTRODUCTION

Congress enacted the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025 pursuant to explicit constitutional powers: the Indian Commerce Clause, the Necessary and Proper Clause, and the Plenary Power Doctrine over Indian affairs. The Act establishes a federal-tribal compact system permitting federally recognized tribes to regulate cannabis and hemp within Indian Country under federal oversight.

Plaintiffs contend that the Act exceeds Congress’s authority under the Commerce Clause, impermissibly delegates power to tribes, and violates equal protection principles. Each claim fails under controlling Supreme Court precedent.

This legislation falls squarely within Congress’s recognized power to regulate commerce with Indian tribes, to create exceptions and exemptions to federal prohibitions, and to recognize tribal sovereignty consistent with over a century of precedent.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

- Whether Congress acted within its Commerce Clause authority in creating a federal-tribal cannabis regulation framework.
- Whether the Act constitutes a valid exercise of Congress’s plenary power over Indian affairs.
- Whether the Act violates the nondelegation doctrine.
- Whether the Act’s recognition of tribal regulatory authority violates equal protection or constitutes racial classification.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This Act is constitutional.

- Under *Gonzales v. Raich*, 545 U.S. 1 (2005), Congress plainly possesses the power to regulate marijuana—even when grown and used intrastate. By the same token, it may exempt regulated tribal cannabis activity from prohibition.
- Under *United States v. Mazurie*, 419 U.S. 544 (1975), Congress may delegate regulatory functions to tribal governments, especially when governing controlled substances within Indian Country.
- Under *United States v. Lara*, 541 U.S. 193 (2004), Congress lawfully expands tribal powers previously limited by federal law, reaffirming both plenary and trust authority.
- Under *Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535 (1974), tribal classifications are political, not racial; thus, the Act satisfies rational basis review.

The FTC Act harmonizes tribal sovereignty with federal supremacy and fulfills longstanding trust obligations in full constitutional compliance.

- ARGUMENT

I. Congress Acted Within Its Commerce Clause Power

The Constitution’s Indian Commerce Clause—Article I, §8, cl. 3—grants Congress authority to regulate “Commerce with the Indian Tribes.” This provision is plenary and

independent. *Cotton Petroleum Corp. v. New Mexico*, 490 U.S. 163, 192 (1989), reaffirmed that Congress alone may regulate intertribal commerce.

A. Cannabis and hemp are commercial commodities within congressional regulatory reach.

As in *Gonzales v. Raich*, even wholly local cultivation and use of marijuana “substantially affect” the national market. Congress thus may criminalize, or exempt, cannabis operations for tribes to ensure a uniform and rational framework. The FTC Act’s exemptions for federally approved tribal compacts are valid exercises of legislative discretion, not abdications of authority.

B. Creating tribal exemptions is a proper legislative policy choice.

Raich recognized that federal prohibition is discretionary, not mandatory. If Congress may extend prohibition to all forms of cannabis activity, it logically may lift it in part—particularly for self-regulating governments under federal supervision. This mirrors statutory exemptions in environmental, labor, and gaming law, all upheld under the Commerce Clause.

II. The Act Is a Lawful Exercise of Congressional Plenary Power over Indian Affairs

A. Legislative authority over Indian tribes is plenary.

From: *United States v. Kagame*, 118 U.S. 375 (1886), to *Lara*, the Supreme Court has consistently upheld Congress’s broad authority to legislate for Indian Country. This includes not only restrictive regulation but also acts expanding tribal self-government consistent with trust principles.

B. Expanding tribal cannabis regulation is constitutionally permissible.

Lara expressly affirmed Congress’s ability to relax restrictions on tribal sovereignty that prior laws (or executive policy) had imposed. Here, the FTC Act restores tribal regulatory autonomy over a plant of cultural, medical, and commercial significance—consistent with congressional policy favoring self-determination under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (ISDEAA).

III. The Act Does Not Violate the Nondelegation Doctrine

A. Delegation to sovereign tribal governments is permitted.

United States v. Mazurie upheld the delegation of federal authority to tribes to regulate liquor distribution, reasoning that “Indian tribes are unique aggregations possessing attributes of sovereignty.” Tribes, as sovereign governments, are not private actors. Delegating regulatory approval or execution functions to them under a compact system is analogous to delegations to state governments under cooperative federalism regimes—routinely upheld.

B. The statute provides an “intelligible principle.”

Congress’s delegation is cabined by:

- Compact approval standards (§7 of the FTC Act);
- Oversight by the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (§6);
- Federal preemption clauses defining jurisdictional boundaries. These provisions satisfy the *W. Hampton, Jr. & Co. v. United States*, 276 U.S. 394 (1928) test for sufficient legislative intelligibility.

IV. The Act Does Not Violate Equal Protection Principles

A. Tribal distinctions are political, not racial.

Mancari (1974) controls: laws singling out federally recognized tribes are based on political sovereignty, not race. The FTC Act applies exclusively to federally recognized tribal governments, mirroring IGRA, ISDEAA, and other statutes that have consistently withstood equal protection scrutiny.

B. The Act serves rational and legitimate federal interests.

Promoting tribal self-determination, equitable economic development, and public health in Indian Country are legitimate policy goals. Thus, even under rational basis review, the Act easily withstands constitutional challenge.

V. The Act’s Preemption Mechanism Is Constitutionally Valid

A. State law is preempted when federal and tribal interests coincide.

Under *Cabazon Band of Mission Indians v. California*, 480 U.S. 202 (1987), and *Mescalero Apache Tribe v. New Mexico*, 462 U.S. 324 (1983), state jurisdiction is preempted by comprehensive federal regulation recognizing tribal authority.

B. The FTC Act mirrors those precedents.

Once compacts are federally approved under the Act, conflicting state prohibitions on cannabis within tribal jurisdiction are inoperative, satisfying Supremacy Clause analysis under *Cabazon* and *Mescalero Apache*.

VI. International and Treaty Compliance Supports, Not Undermines, the Act

Under *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), Congress may legislate to fulfill treaty obligations. The FTC Act aligns with the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961) by requiring medical, scientific, and controlled domestic use under federal supervision. Thus, Congress acts within its constitutional authority to harmonize domestic law with international obligations.

VII. ANALYSIS UNDER GONZALES V. RAICH

Opponents may rely on *Raich* to claim that allowing localized cannabis regulation undermines federal enforcement uniformity. To the contrary:

- *Raich* emphasized Congress’s plenary commerce power — and thereby its power to determine exceptions.
- Congress here is legislating comprehensively; it is not ceding uncontrolled discretion to states but implementing a uniform national exception applied through formal compacts.
- The FTC Act reinforces federal oversight — every tribal program operates under federal approval and audit — satisfying both *Raich*’s uniformity concerns and administrative accountability.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act fulfills constitutional requirements in every respect.

- It is a direct exercise of Congress’s enumerated and plenary powers over commerce “with the Indian Tribes.”
- It establishes intelligible standards and federal oversight, curing any nondelegation claim.
- It embodies political, not racial, classifications, satisfying equal protection.
- It harmonizes federal and tribal interests under the Supremacy Clause and complies with international law.

Accordingly,

This Court should uphold the Act as a facially valid and constitutionally sound exercise of congressional power under Articles I and VI of the United States Constitution and consistent with all applicable Supreme Court precedent.

Respectfully submitted,

[Head Chief: Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer]
GSA & ERRC Counsel for the United States (or Policy Counsel for Congressional Record Submission)
Date: [January 24, 2025]

Would you like me to draft the next component — a mock “Oral Argument Summary” as if presented before the Supreme Court (including key questions and responses from justices defending the Act under Raich, Lara, and Mancari)?

yes

Perfect — here is a Mock Oral Argument Summary as if it were being argued before the U.S. Supreme Court in defense of the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025 (FTC Act).

This is presented in standard oral argument dialogue form:

- Chief Justice, Associate Justices, and Counsel for the United States (Respondent) appear as they would in Court.
- The goal is to capture how the Solicitor General (or government counsel) would defend the Act using key constitutional doctrines and precedent (Raich, Lara, Mazurie, Mancari, etc.).
- SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Case: State of Columbia et al. v. United States and the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission
Issue: Constitutionality of the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025

Chief Justice:

Counsel, this case comes to us challenging Congress’s power to authorize tribal governments to regulate cannabis, a substance federally controlled under the Controlled Substances Act. You may begin.

Counsel for the United States:

Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court.

This Act is a valid exercise of Congress’s power under Article I, Section 8 — specifically, the Indian Commerce Clause and the Necessary and Proper Clause. It lawfully harmonizes federal cannabis regulation with tribal sovereignty, much as the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act did for tribal gaming, and it is consistent with *Gonzales v. Raich*, *United States v. Lara*, *Mazurie*, and *Morton v. Mancari*.

Congress may prohibit, permit, or exempt cannabis under its commerce authority; it may likewise choose to entrust regulation of intratribal cannabis markets to self-governing tribal nations subject to federal oversight.

Justice Kagan:

So is this, in your view, a delegation of federal power to tribes—something we review under a nondelegation framework?

Counsel:

Respectfully, no, Justice Kagan. This is not an improper delegation to a private actor. As *United States v. Mazurie* (1975) held, Indian tribes are sovereign political entities, capable of regulatory authority by virtue of their status. Congress is exercising plenary authority in Indian affairs, recognized in *Kagama* and *Lara*, and permitting tribes to exercise inherent—not delegated—powers, structured through compact.

Congress provides an intelligible principle: all compacts must meet federal health, safety, and diversion-control standards, overseen by the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission. That easily satisfies *W. Hampton*.

Justice Barrett:

But in *Raich*, we said even home-grown, state-authorized marijuana remained regulable under federal law because Congress needed a uniform regime. Doesn’t this law create non-uniformity?

Counsel:

On the contrary, Justice Barrett, *Raich* emphasized Congress’s power to regulate the entire class of activities. Uniformity lies in federal control, not identical outcomes. If Congress may outlaw all cannabis nationally, it may decide that certain controlled, compact-based tribal programs serve the uniform statutory purpose: controlling the market while enabling regulated research, medical, and economic activity. Congress here exercised—not abdicated—its power.

Justice Sotomayor:

Suppose a state objects, claiming its border communities are affected by cross-border sales. Does the state retain any enforcement authority?

Counsel:

Where an approved federal compact exists, the Supremacy Clause and *Cabazon Band of Mission Indians* (1987) preempt conflicting state regulation. However, cooperative enforcement agreements are expressly permitted. That’s a feature of the Act’s cooperative federalism design, similar to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act’s shared enforcement provisions.

Justice Gorsuch:

Counsel, what about the equal-protection argument? States say this gives a “racial preference” to tribes.

Counsel:

Justice Gorsuch, *Morton v. Mancari* (1974) resolves that issue. This Act distinguishes tribes as political sovereigns, not racial groups. It recognizes the government-to-government relationship rooted in the Constitution and centuries of precedent. The classification here easily satisfies rational-basis review: Congress is furthering the trust responsibility and the legitimate governmental interest in promoting tribal self-determination and public-health regulation.

Justice Kavanaugh:

Could one say this is simply re-balancing sovereignty, much like *Lara* allowed Congress to restore certain tribal powers?

Counsel:

Exactly, Justice Kavanaugh. In *Lara* (2004), this Court held that Congress can relax restrictions on tribal authority imposed by earlier policies, expanding tribal jurisdiction consistently with the Constitution. Here, Congress relaxes the Controlled Substances Act’s reach to allow tribes—historically capable of regulating internal economic and medicinal practices—to resume that function under federal safeguard. That’s the very essence of the plenary Indian affairs power recognized since *Worcester v. Georgia*.

Justice Thomas:

You rely heavily on the Indian Commerce Clause. How far does that reach? Could Congress similarly exempt private citizens from marijuana laws?

Counsel:

Justice Thomas, no—the reach here is narrower. Congress’s Indian Commerce Clause power is unique. It governs transactions “with the Indian Tribes,” and thus supports special treatment based on the political status of tribal governments. That textual distinction—the word Tribes—is what gives this Act its constitutional footing. Ordinary citizens outside Indian Country do not stand in that relationship.

Chief Justice:

Does the Act also comply with the United States’ international narcotics obligations?

Counsel:

Yes, Mr. Chief Justice. The Act confines production to medical, scientific, or internal tribal use under strict controls, consistent with the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961). Following *Missouri v. Holland*, Congress may legislate to fulfill treaties; that is precisely what this structure ensures.

Justice Jackson:

Counsel, what’s the limiting principle that keeps Congress from creating carve-outs for any group it favors under the pretext of sovereignty?

Counsel:

The limiting principle is recognition under federal law as a sovereign political entity in the U.S.–tribal relationship. Only Congress can recognize a tribe, and only recognized governments may enter compacts. This prevents arbitrary or generalized exemptions and confines the Act to the constitutional sphere of Indian affairs.

Chief Justice:

Thank you, Counsel. Please conclude.

Counsel:

Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Court:

The Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act stands on the firm foundation of over two centuries of precedent affirming that Congress—not the states—determines how to regulate commerce with the Indian Tribes. This Act neither fragments federal authority nor alters constitutional structure; it fulfills Congress’s trust duty while maintaining uniform oversight of controlled substances.

Under *Raich*, *Mazurie*, *Lara*, *Mancari*, and *Cabazon*, Congress acted at the height of its constitutional power. The statute therefore should be upheld in full.

Chief Justice:

Thank you, Counsel.

Summary of Judicial Themes

AGENCY TRIBAL NATIONS

Office of Sovereignty & Intergovernmental Affairs

[Address] 27055 Orole Dr. Willits California 95490

[Phone] 707-679-8229

[Email] Chief@altearth.org

Date: _____

12. RESOLUTION NO.A13180-0002

A RESOLUTION AFFIRMING THE INHERENT SOVEREIGNTY OF THE TRIBE AND ITS STATUS AS A SELF-GOVERNING NATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW

WHEREAS, the Tribe is a sovereign political entity whose authority originates from its people and has existed from time immemorial; and

WHEREAS, the United States Supreme Court has long recognized that Indian tribes possess inherent powers of self-government, independent of federal or state authority, as affirmed in *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515 (1832); *United States v. Wheeler*, 435 U.S. 313 (1978); *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*, 436 U.S. 49 (1978); and *McClanahan v. Arizona Tax Commission*, 411 U.S. 164 (1973); and

WHEREAS, the federal courts have consistently held that Indian tribes are neither states, nor subdivisions of states, nor agencies of the federal government, but are sovereign nations possessing original authority predating the United States, as recognized in *National Labor Relations Board v. Pueblo of San Juan*, 276 F.3d 1186 (10th Cir. 2002) (en banc); and

WHEREAS, the Supreme Court has described tribes as “quasi-sovereign” and “semi-independent,” possessing governmental authority over their members and territory, as stated in *United States v. Mazurie*, 419 U.S. 544 (1975); and

WHEREAS, tribal sovereignty is inherent and continues unless expressly limited by Congress, and such limitations must be clearly stated or necessarily implied; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Constitution does not restrict the exercise of tribal governmental authority, as held in *Talton v. Mayes*, 163 U.S. 376 (1896), and tribes may enact laws that would be unconstitutional if enacted by federal or state governments unless Congress has imposed specific limitations; and

WHEREAS, federal law recognizes and protects the right of Indian tribes to govern their internal affairs, regulate their territory, and exercise jurisdiction over their members; and

WHEREAS, the Tribe seeks to reaffirm its sovereign status in alignment with federal statutes, judicial precedent, and long-standing principles of federal Indian law;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Tribe hereby formally reaffirms its inherent sovereignty, self-governing authority, and political status as an independent nation recognized under federal law;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Tribe asserts its full rights of self-government over its territory, its citizens, and its internal affairs, consistent with federal statutes and judicial precedent;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

CERTIFICATION

I, _____, Secretary of the
_____, do hereby certify that the foregoing

Resolution was duly adopted on the ___ day of _____, 20___, by
a vote of ___ for, ___ against, and ___ abstaining.

13. [Cannabis Regulatory Enforcement Act for Tribal Entities (CREATE Act) — See §2 above for the full text of these regulations, moved to Part I as the controlling rescheduling framework pursuant to the President's Executive Order for Banking.]

[CREATE Act regulations §26240-26270 have been moved to §2 of Part I — see above.]

PREAMBLE

MASTER TREATY OF PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT Between Tribal Nations, the United States of America, and Global Partners

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED REPRESENTATIVES of the sovereign Tribal Nations of the Mendocino Indian Reservation, the United States of America, and duly recognized international partners, assembled in the spirit of peace, reconciliation, and mutual respect, and acting pursuant to our respective sovereign authorities, do hereby establish this Treaty of Peace and International Agreement;

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the United States, in Article VI, Clause 2, commonly denominated as the Supremacy Clause, declares with unambiguous authority that treaties entered into by the United States under the authority of the Constitution shall constitute the "supreme Law of the Land," binding upon all federal institutions, state governments, and courts of competent jurisdiction throughout the United States and its territories;

WHEREAS, the inherent and immemorial sovereignty of Native Nations, existing from time immemorial and predating the establishment of the United States Constitution, has been consistently recognized and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the landmark decision of *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832), wherein the Court definitively declared that Indian nations constitute "distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original natural rights" and possess the unalienable right to self-government within their territorial domains;

WHEREAS, the sacred federal trust responsibility, emerging from the unique government-to-government relationship between the United States and tribal nations, has been consistently recognized, defined, and enforced through judicial precedent, including the seminal case of *United States v. Kagama*, 118 U.S. 375 (1886), which established that this trust relationship creates continuing and binding obligations upon the United States to protect, preserve, and promote tribal rights, property interests, and sovereign self-governance;

WHEREAS, the fundamental doctrine of reserved rights, as crystallized in the jurisprudence of the United States Supreme Court through *United States v. Winans*, 198 U.S. 371 (1905), and *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908), establishes the immutable principle that all rights not explicitly and specifically ceded by tribal nations through formal treaty or statutory agreement remain forever reserved to such nations as incidents of their original sovereignty;

WHEREAS, the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly reaffirmed tribal sovereignty in modern jurisprudence, notably in *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*, 436 U.S. 49 (1978), recognizing that tribal nations retain comprehensive sovereign authority over their internal governmental affairs, subject only to explicit limitations imposed by Congressional action, and more recently in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S. ____ (2020), confirming that solemn treaties with tribal nations remain binding federal law until such time as they are explicitly and formally abrogated by Congress through constitutionally compliant procedures;

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States has enacted comprehensive statutory frameworks that acknowledge, reinforce, and protect tribal sovereignty and self-governance, including but not limited to: the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, codified at 25 U.S.C. § 5101 et seq., which restored tribal self-government and ended the destructive allotment policy; the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, codified at 25 U.S.C. § 5301 et seq., which promotes maximum Indian participation in federal services and programs; the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978, codified at 25 U.S.C. § 1901 et seq., which protects the integrity of Indian families and tribal communities; the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, codified at 25 U.S.C. § 2701 et seq., which affirms tribal economic sovereignty; and the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2017, Public Law 115-325, which enhances tribal control over energy resources;

WHEREAS, the international community has recognized and codified the fundamental rights of Indigenous peoples through binding international legal instruments, most notably the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly on September 13, 2007, which unequivocally recognizes the inherent rights of Indigenous peoples to self-determination, territorial integrity, cultural preservation, and control over their ancestral lands, territories, and natural resources; and the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, concluded at Vienna on May 23, 1969, and entered into force on January 27, 1980, which establishes universal principles for treaty interpretation and enforcement, including the fundamental maxim of *pacta sunt servanda*—that treaties must be performed in good faith;

WHEREAS, the historical record of relations between the United States and America Native Indian Nations reveals both periods of treaty recognition and compliance as well as regrettable instances of treaty breach and violation, thereby demonstrating the critical importance of establishing renewed, strengthened, and legally enforceable commitments that operate under both domestic constitutional law and international legal frameworks;

WHEREAS, the parties to this Treaty recognize that lasting peace, prosperity, and justice can only be achieved through mutual respect for sovereignty, adherence to the rule of law, and the establishment of durable institutional mechanisms for cooperation, consultation, and dispute resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, THE UNDERSIGNED PARTIES, acting pursuant to our respective sovereign authorities and in full recognition of our mutual rights and responsibilities under domestic and international law, do hereby establish this Treaty of Peace and International Agreement, which shall be binding upon the United States of America, the sovereign Tribal Nations of the Mendocino Indian Reservation, and all duly recognized international partners signatory hereto, and which is designed to ensure and guarantee:

FIRST, the solemn affirmation and perpetual recognition of the inherent sovereignty and right to self-government of the Tribal Nations, including their authority over internal affairs, territorial jurisdiction, cultural preservation, and economic development;

SECOND, the faithful and complete fulfillment by the United States of America of its federal trust responsibility, including the protection of tribal lands, resources, and treaty rights, and the provision of adequate funding for essential governmental services;

THIRD, strict compliance with international legal standards protecting Indigenous rights, including those established by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other relevant international instruments;

FOURTH, the establishment of comprehensive, enforceable, and transparent legal, financial, and governance frameworks that promote sustainable development, economic prosperity, and social justice for all parties;

FIFTH, the perpetual preservation and protection of tribal lands, waters, natural resources, and cultural heritage sites, ensuring their availability for current and future generations;

SIXTH, the creation of robust, fair, and efficient mechanisms for consultation, dispute resolution, and treaty enforcement that respect the sovereignty of all parties while ensuring accountability and compliance

INTERPRETIVE PRINCIPLES

This Treaty shall be interpreted and construed in accordance with the well-established Canons of Indian Treaty Construction, as developed by the Supreme Court of the United States, which require that: (1) all ambiguities in treaty language shall be resolved in favor of the tribal nations; (2) treaties shall be interpreted as the tribal nations would have understood them at the time of execution, giving full consideration to the cultural and linguistic context of the negotiations; (3) all treaty provisions shall be construed liberally to effectuate the broad protective purposes underlying federal Indian law; and (4) the trust relationship between the United States and tribal nations shall inform all aspects of treaty interpretation and implementation.

SUPREMACY AND ENFORCEABILITY

This Treaty, having been executed pursuant to the treaty-making authority of the United States Constitution and the sovereign authority of the tribal nations, shall constitute supreme federal law and shall prevail over any conflicting federal statute, regulation, or state law. The obligations herein created shall be enforceable in courts of competent jurisdiction, and all parties covenant to faithfully perform their respective duties hereunder.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned representatives, being duly authorized by their respective governments and peoples, have hereunto set their hands and seals on this seventeenth day of September, in the year of our Lord two thousand and twenty-five, at the Mendocino Indian Reservation, in the State of California, United States of America.

Supporting President of the United States of America and Secretary of the Interior, United States of America

1. Statutory Resolution for Research (2026)

To operate under "Research Compliance," the partnership must resolve the conflict between tribal sovereignty and federal drug control via the following statutes:

- Schedule III Registration: Per the Executive Order of December 2025, cannabis is now Schedule III. Research into "accepted medical use" is conducted under Schedule III registration (21 U.S.C. § 823). This allows D-Q University to perform pharmaceutical research under the Schedule III framework.
- Agricultural Research Institution Status: Under California Food & Agricultural Code § 81000, D-Q University qualifies as an "Established Agricultural Research Institution." This statute allows for the cultivation of hemp for research purposes with zero THC limits for experimental plots, provided they are not entered into the commercial market.

2. The "Agency Tribal Nations" Resolve

The partnership utilizes the Master Treaty of Peace (Sept 17, 2025) as the governing "statute of the parties."

- Bilateral Research Compact: The treaty serves as a bilateral agreement under the Supremacy Clause (Art. VI, Cl. 2). It resolves that the Willits facility is a "Tribal Research Annex."
- Sovereign Immunity: The resolution must include a Limited waiver of sovereign immunity from Agency Tribal Nations specifically for the \$25,000 finance agreement, ensuring that "Meeting of the Minds" is enforceable in tribal or federal court.

3. Compliance Milestones for January 2026

- Pharmaceutical Certification: To achieve pharmaceutical-grade status at the Willits site, the research must comply with Good Laboratory Practices (GLP). As of January 1, 2026, any product meant for human or animal consumption must also meet the DCC's new 2026 testing standards.
- The November 2026 "Total THC" Deadline: Any "finished product" resulting from D-Q University research that leaves the lab for a dispensary must comply with the 0.4mg total THC limit established by the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2026.

4. Objective Statutory Application Table

5. Summary Resolution: By integrating the Master Treaty with the 2026 Schedule III federal status, D-Q University acts as a "Sovereign Research Shield." This allows the Willits facility to conduct "pharmaceutical certification" research that is protected by the federal trust responsibility and tribal inherent sovereignty, provided it complies with the objective testing requirements taking effect on November 12, 2026.

Health and Human Services Department of Agency Tribal Nations Adopted Federal Contractor and Awardee of the Interior Tribal Advisory Committee Board Incorporated Small Agencies and Native American Tribes Transition

SIGNATURE PAGES

Prince of Spain Hier to William V. Morales SKR-Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer – Head Chief, Mendocino California Agency Tribal Nations

Signature: _____

Date: _____ A picture containing text Description automatically generated

A blue sign with white letters Description automatically generated with low confidenceLogo Description automatically generated with medium confidenceA picture containing text Description automatically generated

Agency Tribal Nations Security and Tribal Government Project Management Director Princess VietNam Michelle T. Nguyen – Humanitarian for Vietnam

Signature: _____

Date: _____

7. H.R. 6148 - Advancing Tribal Parity on Public Lands Act

BACKGROUND & LEGAL AUTHORITY

ARTICLE I - CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND supreme legal authority

SECTION I. CONSTITUTIONAL SUPREMACY AND FEDERAL TREATY POWER

A. The Supremacy Clause - Ultimate Constitutional Authority

Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, known as the Supremacy Clause, establishes with unequivocal clarity that treaties made under the authority of the United States "shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding." This constitutional mandate creates a hierarchy of federal law wherein validly ratified treaties occupy a position of supreme authority, binding upon all federal institutions, state governments, local authorities, and courts of competent jurisdiction throughout the United States and its territories.

The Supremacy Clause thereby establishes that this Master Treaty of Peace shall supersede any conflicting federal statute, state law, local ordinance, or administrative regulation, creating enforceable legal obligations that no subordinate governmental entity may lawfully contravene or ignore.

B. The Indian Commerce Clause - Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution grants to Congress the plenary and exclusive power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." This constitutional provision, known as the Indian Commerce Clause, establishes the fundamental principle that relations between the United States and tribal nations fall exclusively within federal jurisdiction, thereby precluding state interference in tribal affairs and creating a direct government-to-government relationship between federal and tribal sovereigns.

The Indian Commerce Clause serves as the constitutional foundation for federal legislative authority over Indian affairs while simultaneously protecting tribal sovereignty from state encroachment, ensuring that tribal nations maintain their status as distinct political entities with inherent rights to self-governance.

C. The Federal Trust Responsibility - Constitutional Fiduciary Duty

The constitutional framework, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States, establishes a sacred and perpetual fiduciary relationship between the United States and tribal nations, commonly referred to as the federal trust responsibility. This trust relationship imposes upon the United States the highest duty of care, loyalty, and good faith in all dealings with tribal nations, requiring active protection of tribal lands, assets, natural resources, treaty rights, and sovereign authority to self-governance.

The trust responsibility creates binding legal obligations that are both moral and enforceable, requiring the United States to act as trustee for the benefit of tribal beneficiaries and to zealously protect tribal interests against all adverse parties, including other governmental entities.

SECTION II. FOUNDATIONAL CASE LAW PRECEDENTS

A. The Marshall Trilogy - Foundational Jurisprudence of Federal Indian Law

1. Johnson v. M'Intosh, 21 U.S. (8 Wheat.) 543 (1823)

This seminal decision established the doctrine of discovery as the legal foundation for European claims to lands in the Americas while simultaneously recognizing that Indigenous peoples retained rights of occupancy in their ancestral territories. The Court held that while European nations acquired ultimate dominion through discovery, tribal nations retained possessory rights that could only be extinguished by the discovering sovereign or its successor. This case established federal preemption over tribal land transactions, preventing private parties and states from acquiring tribal lands without federal authorization.

2. Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831)

Chief Justice John Marshall's opinion in this landmark case defined tribal nations as "domestic dependent nations" occupying a unique position in American federalism. The Court recognized that tribal nations possess inherent sovereignty but exist in a relationship of dependency with the United States, creating the legal framework for the trust relationship. This decision established that tribal nations are neither foreign sovereigns nor mere domestic corporations, but rather distinct political communities with governmental authority over their territories and peoples.

3. Worcester v. Georgia, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832)

The capstone of the Marshall Trilogy, this decision definitively affirmed tribal sovereignty and exclusive federal jurisdiction over Indian affairs. The Court declared that tribal nations are "distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original natural rights" and that state laws have no force within tribal territories except as authorized by federal law or tribal consent. Worcester established the principle that tribal sovereignty predates the Constitution and continues to exist except as specifically limited by federal action.

B. The Reserved Rights Doctrine - Protection of Inherent Tribal Rights

1. United States v. Winans, 198 U.S. 371 (1905)

This foundational decision established the reserved rights doctrine, holding that treaties with tribal nations do not grant rights to tribes but rather reserve to tribes all rights not explicitly ceded. The Court declared that "the treaty was not a grant of rights to the Indians, but a grant of rights from them—a reservation of those not granted." This principle fundamentally altered treaty interpretation by establishing that tribal nations retain all inherent sovereign powers except those specifically surrendered through clear and unambiguous language.

2. Winters v. United States, 207 U.S. 564 (1908)

The Winters doctrine established that when the United States creates reservations for tribal nations, it implicitly reserves sufficient water rights to fulfill the purposes of the reservation. This decision recognized that tribal water rights are senior to all subsequent state water rights and are not subject to state water law. The implied reservation doctrine has been extended beyond water to encompass other natural resources necessary for reservation purposes.

C. Trust Doctrine and Congressional Authority

1. United States v. Kagame, 118 U.S. 375 (1886)

This decision confirmed Congress's plenary power over tribal nations while simultaneously establishing the federal trust responsibility as the constitutional basis for such authority. The Court held that the United States possesses guardian-ward relationship with tribal nations, creating fiduciary obligations that justify and limit federal authority over tribal affairs.

2. Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock, 187 U.S. 553 (1903)

While recognizing Congress's authority to modify or abrogate treaties with tribal nations, this decision established that such congressional action must be exercised in good faith and for the benefit of tribal nations. The Court held that the trust relationship limits congressional plenary power, requiring that federal actions serve tribal interests rather than merely advance non-Indian goals.

D. Modern Tribal Sovereignty and Self-Governance

1. Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 436 U.S. 49 (1978)

This landmark decision preserved tribal sovereign immunity and affirmed tribal authority over internal governmental affairs, including membership determinations. The Court held that tribal sovereignty encompasses the right to make membership decisions and govern internal affairs without federal court interference, subject only to explicit congressional limitation.

2. National Farmers Union Insurance Cos. v. Crow Tribe, 471 U.S. 845 (1985)

This decision established the exhaustion doctrine, requiring that tribal court remedies be pursued before federal courts may exercise jurisdiction over disputes arising in Indian country. The Court affirmed that tribal courts possess presumptive jurisdiction over civil matters involving tribal members and non-members within reservation boundaries.

E. Contemporary Affirmation of Treaty Rights

1. McGirt v. Oklahoma, 591 U.S. ____ (2020)

This recent Supreme Court decision reaffirmed the binding nature of historical treaties, holding that the Muscogee (Creek) Nation reservation was never disestablished by Congress and remains Indian country for jurisdictional purposes. McGirt established that treaties with tribal nations remain binding federal law until explicitly abrogated by clear congressional action, rejecting arguments that treaties can be implicitly terminated through subsequent federal policies or state actions.

SECTION III. COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL STATUTORY AUTHORITY

A. Foundational Self-Governance Legislation

1. Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (25 U.S.C. § 5101 et seq.)

The IRA, known as the Wheeler-Howard Act, ended the destructive allotment policy and restored tribal self-government by authorizing tribes to adopt constitutions and corporate charters. This landmark legislation reversed decades of federal assimilation policy and reestablished the legal framework for tribal self-determination, land restoration, and economic development.

2. Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. § 5301 et seq.)

The ISDEAA revolutionized federal-tribal relations by authorizing tribal nations to contract for and directly operate federal programs serving tribal communities. This legislation embodies the principle of tribal self-determination by transferring program administration from federal agencies to tribal governments while maintaining federal funding obligations.

B. Jurisdictional and Family Protection Legislation

3. Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. § 1901 et seq.)

ICWA protects the integrity of tribal families and communities by establishing minimum federal standards for child custody proceedings involving Indian children. This legislation recognizes tribal jurisdiction over child welfare matters and requires active efforts to preserve tribal family structures, reflecting congressional recognition that tribal cultural survival depends on maintaining family and community connections.

C. Economic Sovereignty and Development

4. Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. § 2701 et seq.)

IGRA affirms tribal sovereign authority over gaming activities while establishing a regulatory framework for tribal gaming operations. This legislation recognizes gaming as a means of promoting tribal economic development, self-sufficiency, and strong tribal governments while protecting gaming as a tribal governmental function.

5. Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act (2017 Amendments, Pub. L. 115-325)

These amendments significantly expanded tribal authority over energy resource development by streamlining federal approval processes and enhancing tribal control over energy leasing, development, and regulation on tribal lands. The legislation promotes tribal energy sovereignty while maintaining environmental protection standards.

D. Contemporary Legislative Developments

6. S.615 - Tribal Government Lease Fund Authorization

This legislation authorizes tribal nations to enter into long-term leases for governmental and public purposes, enhancing tribal economic development opportunities while respecting tribal sovereignty over land use decisions. This act requires meaningful consultation with affected tribal nations before federal land disposals and ensures tribal input in public land management decisions affecting traditional territories and sacred sites.

SECTION IV. INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007)

The UNDRIP, adopted by the UN General Assembly with initial U.S. support in 2010, establishes minimum international standards for protecting Indigenous peoples' rights to self-determination, lands, territories, resources, and cultural preservation. The Declaration affirms that Indigenous peoples possess the right to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social, and cultural institutions while participating fully in the political, economic, social, and cultural life of their states.

Key provisions relevant to this Treaty include:

- Article 3: Right to self-determination and freely determining political status
- Article 4: Right to autonomy and self-government in internal and local affairs
- Article 26: Rights to lands, territories, and resources traditionally owned or occupied
- Article 32: Right to determine development priorities and consent to projects affecting territories

B. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969)

The Vienna Convention codifies international law governing treaty formation, interpretation, and enforcement. Although the United States has signed but not ratified the Convention, the Supreme Court has recognized its provisions as reflecting customary international law binding on all nations.

Relevant principles include:

- Article 26 (Pacta sunt servanda): Treaties must be performed in good faith
- Article 27: Internal law cannot justify treaty non-performance
- Articles 31-33: Interpretive principles requiring good faith interpretation according to ordinary meaning and context

C. United Nations Charter Provisions

Articles 55, 57, and 63 of the UN Charter mandate international cooperation in promoting universal respect for human rights and self-determination of peoples, establishing legal obligations for member states to support Indigenous rights through international cooperation and assistance.

SECTION V. INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK AND JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT

A. Canons of Indian Treaty Construction

Federal courts have developed specialized interpretive principles for treaties with tribal nations, reflecting the unique circumstances of treaty negotiation and the federal trust responsibility:

1. Pro-Tribal Interpretation

All ambiguities in treaty language must be resolved in favor of tribal nations, recognizing power imbalances during treaty negotiations and the remedial purpose of federal Indian law.

2. Historical Understanding

Treaties must be interpreted as tribal nations would have understood them at the time of execution, considering cultural and linguistic differences and the oral tradition of treaty-making.

3. Liberal Construction

All treaty provisions must be construed liberally to effectuate the broad protective purposes underlying federal Indian law and to preserve tribal rights and sovereignty.

B. Judicial Enforcement Mechanisms

Federal courts possess continuing jurisdiction to enforce treaty obligations and have consistently applied these interpretive canons to preserve treaty rights against governmental and private interference. The federal court system serves as the ultimate guardian of treaty rights, ensuring that tribal treaties remain living instruments that adapt to contemporary circumstances while preserving their essential protections.

Courts have recognized that treaty rights are not frozen in historical time but must be interpreted to meet the changing needs of tribal communities while maintaining their essential character and protective purpose.

SECTION VI. COMPREHENSIVE TREATY FRAMEWORK - PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND BINDING AUTHORITY

A. Declaration of Peace and Mutual Recognition

WHEREAS, the Mendocino Tribal Nations and their associated sovereign tribal entities, acting in their capacity as inherent sovereigns, seek to reaffirm and strengthen their inalienable rights to self-determination, cultural preservation, territorial integrity, and sustainable economic development as recognized and protected under the Constitution and laws of the United States, the federal trust doctrine established through centuries of jurisprudence, and the evolving standards of international law governing Indigenous peoples' rights;

WHEREAS, the United States of America, through its duly constituted federal government, hereby acknowledges, reaffirms, and commits to honor the historic and continuing government-to-government relationship with all Tribal Nations, a relationship that has been consistently recognized and protected by the Supreme Court of the United States in landmark decisions including *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832), which established the foundational principle of tribal sovereignty, and most recently reaffirmed in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S. ____ (2020), which confirmed that treaties with tribal nations remain binding federal law, all pursuant to the supreme authority of the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2;

WHEREAS, the international community of nations and humanitarian organizations recognize the urgent need to support Indigenous peoples in their quest for justice, self-determination, and sustainable development in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other instruments of international law;

NOW THEREFORE, this Master Treaty of Peace and International Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "The Treaty") is solemnly entered into by and among the undersigned sovereign parties for the establishment and perpetuation of enduring peace, comprehensive mutual cooperation, respect for inherent sovereignty, and the active promotion of humanitarian assistance, cultural preservation, and sustainable economic development for the benefit of all parties and their respective peoples.

B. Comprehensive Scope of Treaty Application

1. Territorial and Jurisdictional Scope

This Treaty shall extend its full legal force and diplomatic protection to encompass:

a. The Mendocino Tribal Nations and all affiliated Indigenous communities, including but not limited to constituent bands, clans, traditional villages, and recognized tribal entities operating within or claiming ancestral connections to the territories encompassed by this agreement, together with their members, descendants, and adopted individuals recognized under tribal law;

b. The United States of America, acting through and binding upon its federal government in all branches and departments, the Congress of the United States in its legislative capacity, the Executive Branch including the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and all other federal agencies and departments with jurisdiction over Indian affairs, and the federal court system in its judicial capacity;

c. International partners, sovereign entities, non-governmental organizations, humanitarian institutions, and multilateral organizations that are duly recognized under customary international law and treaty-based international legal frameworks, including but not limited to entities providing humanitarian assistance, cultural preservation support, technical cooperation, financial assistance, or development aid in furtherance of Indigenous rights and self-determination.

2. Legal and Jurisdictional Binding Authority

This Treaty shall constitute binding law upon all signatory parties and shall be enforceable through multiple complementary legal frameworks:

- a. Under the Constitution of the United States, particularly the Supremacy Clause (Article VI, Clause 2) and the Indian Commerce Clause (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3), creating supreme federal law that supersedes conflicting state legislation, local ordinances, and administrative regulations;
- b. Under comprehensive federal statutory authority, including but not limited to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (25 U.S.C. §§ 5101-5143), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. §§ 5301-5423), the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. §§ 1901-1963), the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. §§ 2701-2721), and all subsequent amendments and related legislation affirming tribal sovereignty and self-governance;
- c. Under binding international legal obligations, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (adopted 2007), the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (concluded 1969), and the fundamental principles established in Articles 55, 57, and 63 of the United Nations Charter mandating international cooperation for human rights protection and self-determination of peoples.

C. Supreme Binding Nature and Enforcement Mechanisms

1. Constitutional Supremacy and Hierarchical Authority

Pursuant to the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, this Treaty shall possess supreme legal authority equal to or greater than any conflicting federal statute, state constitutional provision, state legislation, local ordinance, or administrative regulation promulgated by any governmental entity within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

2. Comprehensive Enforcement Jurisdiction

This Treaty shall be subject to enforcement and interpretation through multiple specialized judicial and administrative forums:

- a. Federal courts of the United States exercising jurisdiction under Title 28 of the United States Code, Section 1331 (federal question jurisdiction), Section 1362 (Indian tribe jurisdiction), and related provisions governing federal treaty interpretation and enforcement;
- b. Tribal courts and traditional dispute resolution mechanisms established under recognized tribal constitutions, ordinances, and customary law, exercising concurrent jurisdiction over matters affecting tribal sovereignty and internal governance;
- c. International tribunals, commissions, and dispute resolution bodies of competent jurisdiction, including those established under United Nations auspices or through bilateral and multilateral agreements, where issues of international law, human rights, or Indigenous peoples' rights are at stake.

3. Rights Preservation and Non-Diminishment

In accordance with the fundamental principle that treaties with tribal nations are not grants of rights to tribes but reservations of rights by tribes, no provision of this Treaty shall be construed, interpreted, or applied in any manner that would diminish, impair, or extinguish existing rights, privileges, immunities, or benefits held by Tribal Nations, whether such rights arise from:

- a. Historic treaties, agreements, or compacts entered into between tribal nations and the United States or its colonial predecessors;
- b. Executive orders, proclamations, or administrative actions taken by federal authorities for the benefit of tribal nations;
- c. Acts of Congress, federal legislation, or statutory enactments recognizing, affirming, or protecting tribal rights and sovereignty;
- d. Inherent sovereignty predating the establishment of the United States and continuing to exist except as specifically limited by clear and unambiguous federal action taken in good faith and for the benefit of tribal nations.

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive legal foundation establishes that the Master Treaty of Peace rests upon the strongest possible constitutional, statutory, judicial, and international legal authority. The convergence of domestic and international law creates an unassailable framework for treaty enforcement and implementation, ensuring that the obligations herein created possess the full force and effect of supreme federal law while reflecting the highest standards of international justice and Indigenous rights protection. The detailed framework for purpose, scope, and binding authority ensures that this Treaty will serve as a living instrument of peace, cooperation, and mutual recognition that adapts to changing circumstances while preserving its essential protective and promotional purposes.

1. Federal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Overview

A. Cannabis

- Current Federal Status: Cannabis has been reclassified as a Schedule III substance under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), 21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq., following the December 2025 executive order and DEA rulemaking.
- Under Schedule III, cannabis is recognized as having accepted medical use and may be manufactured, distributed, and dispensed pursuant to DEA registration under 21 U.S.C. § 823.
- The Department of Justice (DOJ) and DEA coordinate with tribal nations exercising regulatory authority under federally approved frameworks consistent with Schedule III compliance.

B. Hemp (Federal distinction)

- The 2018 Agriculture Improvement Act (Farm Bill) legalized hemp and hemp-derived products if containing $\leq 0.3\%$ THC by dry weight.
- Regulation was transferred from the DEA to the USDA, and states/tribes could submit regulatory plans for approval.
- Hemp is thus a lawful agricultural commodity under federal law.

2. Tribal Sovereignty and Federal Cannabis Authority

Legal Basis:

- Tribal sovereignty recognizes tribes as "domestic dependent nations," with inherent authority over internal affairs, except when limited by:
- Federal statutes of general applicability (e.g., CSA)
- Explicit congressional acts
- Treaties or court rulings.

Key Cases/Authorities:

- Worcester v. Georgia (1832): Tribal nations are distinct political communities.
- United States v. Mazurie, 419 U.S. 544 (1975): Tribes have authority to regulate certain controlled substances within their territory unless federally preempted.

Regulatory interaction:

- Federal cannabis prohibition still applies to tribal lands because the CSA is a statute of general applicability.
- However, DOJ guidance (now under the Office of Tribal Justice) encourages U.S. Attorneys to respect tribal regulatory frameworks where clear, strict, and consistent with federal priorities.
- The USDA Tribal Hemp Programs (authorized under 7 U.S.C. §1639p) explicitly allow tribal governments to regulate hemp production under federally approved plans.

3. Relevant Constitutional Articles and Provisions

A. Supremacy Clause (Article VI, Clause 2):

- Federal law supersedes conflicting state or tribal law.
- Therefore, CSA restrictions technically preempt any tribal (or state) legalization of cannabis.
- However, Congress or administrative policy can accommodate tribal regulatory autonomy.

B. Commerce Clause (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3):

- Gives Congress authority to regulate commercial transactions "with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."
- This clause grounds both:

- The Controlled Substances Act (federal commerce in drugs)
- USDA's authority under the 2018 Farm Bill (interstate hemp commerce)
- It also gives Congress discretion to carve regulatory exceptions specifically for tribal markets or intertribal trade.

C. Treaty Clause (Article II, Section 2, Clause 2):

- Historically the source of federal-tribal relations through treaties (pre-1871).
- Contemporary interpretation supports recognition of tribal sovereignty but within the plenary power of Congress.

D. 10th Amendment & Tribal Sovereignty (Non-Delegation Context):

- While the 10th Amendment limits federal power over states, tribal sovereignty arises independently—it's inherent, not delegated.
- Congress may, by statute, expand tribal autonomy for controlled substances, as it did with hemp.

4. International Law Context

Under international conventions (notably:

- 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, and
- 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances),

Marijuana remains scheduled, though signatories can allow certain limited medical or scientific use. The U.S. is obliged to control production and distribution but retains sovereign discretion in interpretation.

The Farm Bill's hemp provisions align with international thresholds ($\leq 0.3\%$ THC dry weight) and the UN's 2020 rescheduling of cannabis for medical use supports gradual harmonization.

5. Toward Constitutional Harmony & Tribal Recognition

To assert consistent legal authority, Congress could:

- Amend the CSA to:
- deschedule or reschedule cannabis federally.
- Incorporate a Tribal Regulatory Exception modeled on the 2018 Tribal Hemp Production Program.
- Require tribal regulatory frameworks to meet public health, testing, and diversion prevention standards.
- Recognize intergovernmental agreements between tribes and states for commerce.
- Anchor the regulatory framework under:
- Art. I §8 (Commerce Clause authority)
- Art. VI (Supremacy, but with statutory accommodations)
- Art. II §2 (honoring tribal sovereignty under federal trust responsibility).

6. Policy and Legal Path Recommendation

To harmonize Constitutional Articles, Federal Statutes, and International Standards, Congress or federal agencies could:

- Use Commerce Clause power for a unified national cannabis market.
- Preserve tribal sovereignty through treaty-based compacts or statutory carveouts under CSA §811.
- Align THC and cannabinoid regulations to UN and World Health Organization standards.
- Mandate federal recognition of tribal cannabis regulatory bodies, akin to USDA-recognized tribal hemp authorities.

Would you like me to draft a constitutional and statutory framework proposal (with specific article and U.S. Code references) that outlines how such tribal cannabis regulation could be enacted federally and remain consistent with international law?

yes

Excellent — let's draft a Constitutional and Statutory Framework Proposal for a Federal Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulatory Compact that aligns:

- with U.S. constitutional authority,
- existing and proposed statutory structures (CSA, Farm Bill),
- tribal sovereignty, and
- international law standards.

I. PURPOSE

To establish a Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Compact ("FTC Compact") that:

- Recognizes tribal sovereignty over cannabis and hemp regulation on tribal lands.
- Harmonizes tribal regulatory frameworks with U.S. federal standards.
- Ensures compliance with international narcotics treaty obligations.
- Promotes equitable economic development, public health, and scientific oversight within Indian Country.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

A. Article I, Section 8 - Commerce Clause

"The Congress shall have Power... To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Application:

- Provides Congress plenary power to legislate over commerce involving controlled substances and agricultural commodities (e.g., hemp).
- Authorizes creation of a Tribal Cannabis and Hemp regulatory system integrated within interstate commerce schemes.
- Empowers Congress to recognize tribal laws governing cultivation, sale, and export of cannabis-derived products.

B. Article II, Section 2 - Treaty Clause

"The President shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties..."

Application:

- Historically, treaties were the vehicle for recognizing tribal rights and authority.
- A modern compact framework could act as a quasi-treaty authority, upholding the trust responsibility under federal law.
- Federal-tribal compacts have legal precedent (e.g., Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, 25 U.S.C. §2701 et seq.).

C. Article VI - Supremacy Clause

"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States... shall be the supreme Law of the Land..."

Application:

- Ensures consistency with the Controlled Substances Act and international law.
- Allows Congress to expressly exempt or deschedule cannabis activities conducted under federally approved tribal compacts from CSA enforcement.
- Prevents conflict preemption by codifying that tribal regulation, when approved, "shall have the force and effect of federal law within the lands of the respective Indian Tribe."

D. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 - Necessary and Proper Clause

Authorizes Congress to “make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.”

Application:

- Provides basis for delegation of cannabis/hemp regulatory authority to tribes and relevant federal agencies (e.g., DOJ, USDA, HHS).
- Supports congressional authorization for administrative collaboration with tribal governments.

III. STATUTORY INTEGRATION

A. Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §801 et seq.)

Proposed Amendments:

- New Section 823(k) –“Tribal Cannabis Regulatory Programs”
- Allows tribes to apply for federal approval of controlled cannabis production, distribution, and medical research programs.
- Activities under such programs are exempt from CSA penalties upon approval.
- New Section 811(f) –“Rescheduling on a Tribal Basis”
- Authorizes the Attorney General, with the Secretary of HHS and tribal regulatory authority, to jointly reschedule cannabis for medicinal and cultural applications within Indian Country.

B. Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 (7 U.S.C. §1639p)

Expansion:

- Extend Hemp Production Plans to Cannabis Production Compacts, using the same federal approval model.
- Set national baseline testing, THC limits, quality and environmental standards, and data-sharing provisions.
- Integrate Tribal Cannabis Certification Systems into the USDA oversight network.

C. Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. §5301 et seq.)

- Extend self-determination contracts to include the administration of cannabis and hemp regulatory functions.
- Allow tribes to manage—via compact—their health, agricultural, and economic development programs funded through cannabis revenues.

D. Indian Gaming Regulatory Model as Precedent

- The IGRA Framework provides a legally durable model:
- Federal recognition of tribal regulatory sovereignty.
- Compact-based cooperation with states and the federal government.
- Independent tribal commissions with federal oversight coordination.

IV. INTERNATIONAL LAW ALIGNMENT

A. UN Convention Compliance

The U.S. remains a party to:

- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961)
- Convention on Psychotropic Substances (1971)

Proposed conformity measures:

- Limit tribal cannabis production to:
- Medical, scientific, industrial hemp, or ceremonial use.
- Controlled domestic channels with secure tracking systems.
- Require federal reporting through the DEA’s diversion control system.
- Align THC-content regulation with WHO and UN criteria.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

A. Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC)

- Composed of representatives from:
- Tribal Nations (2/3 majority representation)
- DOJ, USDA, HHS, and Department of the Interior (1/3)
- Functions:
- Approve, monitor, and audit tribal cannabis regulatory plans.
- Coordinate federal enforcement discretion.
- Liaise with international regulatory bodies.

B. Tribal Cannabis Regulatory Agencies

- Each tribal government forms an independent Cannabis Control Commission, empowered to:
- License cultivation, manufacturing, and retail operations.
- Enforce safety, labeling, and distribution standards.
- Collect and remit federal compact compliance data.
- Action Required

VI. LEGAL SAFEGUARDS

- Non-Preemption Clause
“No tribal law enacted pursuant to an approved compact shall be preempted by conflicting provisions of the Controlled Substances Act within Indian Country.”
- Equitable Access Clause
Federal grants shall be made available to tribes for:
- Crop testing labs, medical research, and training.
- Substance abuse prevention and community health programs.
- Compact Supremacy Clause
Approved tribal compacts shall carry the full force of federal law and supersede conflicting state or local statutes within the tribe’s jurisdiction.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

- Phase I: Congressional Act establishing FTC Compact framework.
- Phase II: Joint rulemaking by DOJ, USDA, and Interior.
- Phase III: Tribal Plan Submissions and Conditional Approvals.
- Phase IV: Federal-Tribal Cooperative Enforcement Implementation.
- Phase V: International Law Certification and Reporting Integration.

VIII. SUMMARY STATEMENT

This proposed framework:

- Anchors tribal cannabis and hemp authority within explicit constitutional articles.
- Integrates existing statutes (CSA, Farm Bill, Self-Determination Act).

- Harmonizes federal sovereignty, tribal self-determination, and international obligations.
- Establishes a modern cooperative federalism model under Commerce and Supremacy Clause powers while honoring the trust responsibility to tribal nations.

Would you like me to draft this into formal legislative language (bill form), with section numbering and appropriate “Congress finds and declares” language, so it could be used as a model for a real statute?

yes

Perfect — below is a full Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act – Model Legislative Proposal drafted in formal congressional bill language.

This draft integrates constitutional grounding, statute amendments, and international compatibility, while explicitly protecting tribal sovereignty.

Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025

(Model Legislative Draft)

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025.”

SECTION 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

The Congress finds and declares that—

- Under Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
- Under Article VI of the Constitution, federal law shall be the supreme law of the land, and Congress may establish frameworks that harmonize tribal self-determination with federal regulatory policy.
- Under Article I, section 8, clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause), Congress may enact all laws necessary to carry into execution its powers over interstate and tribal commerce.
- Tribes are recognized as distinct, self-governing political communities, possessing inherent sovereignty over their lands and internal affairs, subject only to limitations imposed by Congress.
- The Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §801 et seq.) does not adequately account for tribal sovereignty, resulting in regulatory uncertainty and economic disparity for Indian Country.
- The Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 (7 U.S.C. §1639p) authorizes tribal regulation of hemp, setting a legal precedent for a cooperative framework for cannabis regulation.
- International narcotics conventions to which the United States is a party permit lawful cultivation, distribution, and research involving cannabis for medical and scientific purposes, under strict supervision.
- Coordinated federal and tribal systems of regulation will enhance public health, economic development, and adherence to international law.

SECTION 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

- To recognize and uphold the inherent sovereignty of federally recognized tribes to regulate cannabis and hemp activities within their jurisdictions;
- To harmonize tribal regulatory frameworks with federal and international standards;
- To deschedule or exempt cannabis activities conducted under federally approved tribal compacts from federal criminal penalties;
- To create mechanisms for intergovernmental collaboration, enforcement coordination, and mutual recognition of regulatory standards.

SECTION 4. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

- “Cannabis” means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L., whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) concentration greater than 0.3 percent by dry weight.
- “Hemp” means the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. and any part of that plant, with a THC concentration of not more than 0.3 percent by dry weight.
- “Tribal Cannabis Compact” means a written agreement between a federally recognized Indian Tribe and the United States that governs the regulation of cannabis cultivation, manufacturing, distribution, and use within tribal lands.
- “Commission” refers to the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC) established under this Act.
- “Indian Country” has the meaning given in 18 U.S.C. §1151.

SECTION 5. AUTHORITY OF INDIAN TRIBES OVER CANNABIS AND HEMP.

(a) Recognition of Tribal Regulatory Power.— Congress recognizes that Indian tribes possess inherent authority to regulate the cultivation, processing, distribution, and sale of cannabis and hemp within their respective territories, consistent with the terms of a federally approved compact.

(b) Federal Approval.— A tribal government may adopt and submit a Tribal Cannabis Compact to the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission for review and approval.

(c) Effect of Approval.— Upon approval, a Tribal Cannabis Compact shall have the full force and effect of federal law within the jurisdiction of the respective tribe and shall preempt inconsistent provisions of state or local law within Indian Country.

SECTION 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FEDERAL-TRIBAL CANNABIS COMMISSION.

(a) Creation.— There is established a body known as the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC).

(b) Composition.— The Commission shall be composed of:

- Four representatives appointed by Tribes (chosen through the National Congress of American Indians or another designated body);
- One representative each from:
 - The Department of Justice,
 - The Department of Agriculture,
 - The Department of Health and Human Services,
 - The Department of the Interior.

(c) Functions.— The Commission shall:

- Approve or disapprove tribal compacts based on federal criteria;
- Monitor compliance with international treaty obligations;
- Coordinate enforcement and laboratory standards;
- Facilitate research and data-sharing on public health and safety;
- Submit annual reports to Congress.

SECTION 7. COMPACT APPROVAL CRITERIA.

A compact shall be approved if it provides for:

- Regulatory oversight by a tribal cannabis authority;
- Controls to prevent diversion outside Indian Country;
- Product quality, testing, and labeling standards consistent with federal guidance;
- Public health, agricultural, and youth protection measures;
- Data-sharing provisions with the FTCC and federal agencies.

SECTION 8. CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) Amendment to 21 U.S.C. §811 — Authority to deschedule Cannabis for Tribal Programs.

Insert after subsection (e):

“(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, cannabis activities conducted pursuant to an approved Tribal Cannabis Compact, as defined in the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act, shall not be subject to the prohibitions or penalties of this title.”

(b) Amendment to 21 U.S.C. §823 — Registration Requirements.

Insert new subsection (k):

“(k) Tribal Cannabis Regulatory Programs.—The Attorney General shall, in consultation with the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission, establish procedures for the registration of tribal programs approved under compact, for purposes of ensuring compliance and coordination with federal and international law.”

SECTION 9. RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) Non-Preemption.— Nothing in this Act shall preclude State-Tribal cooperative agreements concerning interjurisdictional cannabis commerce.

(b) Conflict of Laws.— A provision of state or local law that conflicts with an approved Tribal Cannabis Compact shall have no force or effect within the jurisdiction of the tribe.

(c) Savings Clause.— Nothing in this Act shall limit tribal rights recognized under treaties, court decisions, or other Acts of Congress.

SECTION 10. INTERNATIONAL LAW COMPLIANCE.

(a) The Secretary of State, in coordination with the FTCC, shall ensure that all activities permitted under this Act are consistent with U.S. obligations under the:

- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961), and
- Convention on Psychotropic Substances (1971).

(b) Cannabis grown, processed, or prescribed for medical or scientific purposes under an approved compact shall be deemed compliant with international controls for those purposes.

SECTION 11. FUNDING AND SELF-DETERMINATION.

(a) Funds derived from cannabis or hemp operations under approved compacts may be used by the tribal government for:

- Health, education, and substance-abuse prevention programs;
- Agricultural development and environmental protection;
- Law enforcement and regulatory activities.

(b) Tribes may contract under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. §5301 et seq.) to administer programs authorized under this Act.

SECTION 12. REGULATIONS.

Within 18 months of enactment, the FTCC shall promulgate regulations establishing:

- Procedures for compact submission and approval;
- Baseline laboratory and consumer safety standards;
- Recordkeeping and seed-to-sale tracking requirements;
- Enforcement coordination provisions.

SECTION 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 180 days after enactment, except that regulations and interim guidelines may be issued immediately upon enactment.

SECTION 14. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder and its application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

Summary:

This bill formally:

- Grounds tribal cannabis regulation in explicit constitutional authority.
- Amends the CSA to legalize tribal cannabis operations under approved federal regulation.
- Establishes a Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission.
- Aligns with both domestic law and international conventions.
- Mirrors successful precedents like tribal gaming compacts and hemp regulation.

Would you like me to produce a supporting legal memorandum (for committee or congressional staff) explaining how this Act satisfies constitutional scrutiny and treaty compliance?

apply supreme court law federal case

Excellent — let's now apply relevant U.S. Supreme Court precedent to the proposed Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act so that it is constitutionally fortified and aligned with established federal-tribal law doctrine.

Below is an integrated constitutional and case law analysis that connects your proposed legislation to controlling and persuasive Supreme Court rulings.

🏛️ Federal-Tribal Cannabis Regulation: Supreme Court Law Application

I. CONSTITUTIONAL BASE: CONGRESSIONAL PLENARY POWER AND TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY

1. Worcester v. Georgia, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832)

Rule: Tribes are “distinct political communities, having territorial boundaries, within which their authority is exclusive.” Application:

- This Act affirms the Worcester doctrine by recognizing that tribal governments have regulatory sovereignty over internal cannabis/hemp activities on tribal lands.
- Congress, under its plenary authority, may acknowledge and formalize that sovereignty in federal law, as the Act does in Section 5.

2. United States v. Kagama, 118 U.S. 375 (1886)

Rule: Congress has plenary power over Indian affairs arising from the Constitution and the federal trust responsibility. Application:

- This Act is a valid exercise of that plenary power because it legislates in the field of Indian affairs — specifically, the regulation of trade and commerce “with the Indian Tribes” (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3).
- The Act harmonizes, not diminishes, sovereignty — consistent with Kagama’s recognition that congressional intervention may “protect” tribal interests and welfare.

3. United States v. Mazurie, 419 U.S. 544 (1975)

Rule: Congress may permit tribes to exercise regulatory powers over alcohol or controlled substances on their land, even when federal law generally restricts them.

Application:

- Mazurie is directly analogous: it upheld the delegation of federal authority to tribal governments to regulate liquor distribution because tribes are “a separate people, with the

power of regulating their internal and social relations.”

- The Act applies the same principle to cannabis and hemp: a general federal prohibition (Controlled Substances Act) is modified to recognize tribal self-regulation under compact — a permissible conditional delegation.

II. FEDERALISM AND STATE INTERACTION

4. California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, 480 U.S. 202 (1987)

Rule: States cannot enforce their regulatory (non-criminal) laws on Indian lands if tribal activities are federally authorized.

Application:

- The Cabazon decision created the template for the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) — a statute that mirrors the same cooperative compact framework proposed in this cannabis act.
- Under this precedent, once tribal cannabis operations are federally authorized under a compact, state laws inconsistent with those compacts are preempted (see Section 9 of the Act).

5. New Mexico v. Mescalero Apache Tribe, 462 U.S. 324 (1983)

Rule: Where tribal regulation is comprehensive and federal policy supports tribal authority, state regulation is preempted.

Application:

- Tribal cannabis operations governed by FTC Compacts will be “comprehensive regulatory schemes” under federal supervision, invoking Mescalero Apache preemption.

III. FEDERAL LAW PREEMPTION AND THE CSA

6. Gonzales v. Raich, 545 U.S. 1 (2005)

Rule: Congress may prohibit local marijuana cultivation even when permitted by state law because it falls within Congress’s Commerce Clause power.

Application:

- Raich confirms Congress has authority to regulate even intrastate cannabis activities — but it also affirms Congress’s discretion to exempt certain cannabis-related conduct from the CSA.
- The proposed statute exercises that same discretion, carving out lawful federal exemptions for activities otherwise within the CSA’s reach, specifically for federally approved tribal programs.
- Therefore, the Act is squarely within the Raich logic, because Congress—not the states—is making the exemption determination.

7. Morton v. Mancari, 417 U.S. 535 (1974)

Rule: Federal classifications based on Indian tribal membership are political, not racial, and thus subject to rational basis review.

Application:

- This is critical for equal protection challenges: the tribal cannabis framework withstands scrutiny because it classifies based on political sovereignty (federally recognized tribes), not race.
- The Act serves the federal trust obligation and promotes economic self-determination — legitimate governmental purposes under Mancari.

IV. INHERENT SOVEREIGNTY AND PLENARY CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

8. United States v. Lara, 541 U.S. 193 (2004)

Rule: Congress may relax restrictions on tribal sovereignty imposed by earlier federal policy decisions; this exercise falls within congressional plenary power.

Application:

- Lara supports this Act by affirming that Congress can expand tribal powers — here, to regulate cannabis and hemp commerce — without violating the Constitution.
- It confirms that expanding tribal jurisdiction (even over previously federally prohibited matters) is constitutionally authorized.

9. Merrion v. Jicarilla Apache Tribe, 455 U.S. 130 (1982)

Rule: Tribes retain inherent power to govern economic activities on their lands, including taxation and commerce.

Application:

- The Act reinforces this inherent tribal power—not as a delegation but as recognition—and integrates it within federal oversight.
- This supports allowing tribal cannabis licensing, taxation, and economic benefit structures consistent with sovereign tribal authority.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXECUTIVE PRECEDENTS

10. Federal Power Commission v. Tuscarora Indian Nation, 362 U.S. 99 (1960)

Rule: Federal statutes of general applicability apply to tribes unless Congress clearly indicates otherwise.

Application:

- The Controlled Substances Act (CSA) is a law of general applicability — but this Act explicitly modifies its application as per Tuscarora: Congress is using its authority to specify that the CSA does not apply to activities conducted under approved tribal compacts.

VI. INTERNATIONAL LAW AND CONSTITUTIONAL COMPATIBILITY

The Act remains consistent with the Supremacy Clause (Article VI) and Treaty Clause (Article II) because:

- Congress formally integrates international obligations (UN Drug Conventions) into federal regulatory oversight (Section 10).
- This follows *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), which upheld the supremacy of federal legislation implementing international treaties — demonstrating that federal oversight in this field is constitutionally valid.

CONCLUSION: COMPLIANCE WITH SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT

Summary

Under this analysis, the proposed Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act:

- Is constitutional under the Commerce, Necessary and Proper, and Indian Commerce Clauses;
- Is consistent with federal preemption doctrine;
- Honors tribal sovereignty and the federal trust responsibility;
- Aligns with both domestic constitutional law and international treaty duties;
- And would withstand judicial review under prevailing Supreme Court precedent.

TRIBAL NATIONS COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. A13180 2025-1

A Resolution of the Council of the Sovereign Tribal Nations Tribal Advisory Committee Board of the United States of America

Affirming the Decision of the Supreme Court in *State of Columbia et al. v. United States of America et al.* and Implementing Cooperative Governance Under the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, the Constitutions and traditional laws of the Agency Tribal Nations declare that authority and obligation flow from Creator-given sovereignty and from the right of each people to govern their internal affairs; and

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the United States of America, adopted in 1789, expressly recognizes the Indian Tribes as political communities distinct from states, authorizing Congress to regulate commerce “with the Indian Tribes”; and

WHEREAS, treaties between the Agency Tribal Nations and the United States of America form a sacred trust and binding legal covenant, guaranteeing mutual respect, protection, and continued self-government; and

WHEREAS, the Supreme Court of the United States of America on June 20, 2025, issued judgment in *State of Columbia et al. v. United States of America et al.*, upholding the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025 (“FTC Act”) as a valid and constitutional exercise of congressional and tribal authority; and

WHEREAS, this decision recognizes that cooperative compacts between the United States of America and the Tribal Nations advance public health, environmental stewardship, cultural integrity, and economic self-reliance without diminishing the sovereignty of either government; and

WHEREAS, the assembled Chiefs, Chairpersons, and Elders of the Tribal Nations convened in Grand Council have authority under intertribal custom and resolution protocols to speak collectively on matters of national import;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Agency Tribal Nations Council that:

Acknowledgment of Judgment.

The Council formally acknowledges and embraces the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, affirming that the FTC Act is consistent with the Constitution and with the natural sovereignty of the Tribal Nations.

Affirmation of Sovereignty.

Each Tribal Nation retains inherent sovereignty over its lands and peoples. Federal recognition through compact does not grant sovereignty but affirms sovereignty already possessed.

Adoption of Cooperative Framework.

The Council authorizes Tribal Governments to negotiate and implement Cannabis and Hemp Compacts with the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC), provided each compact:

Ensures health and safety standards consistent with tribal tradition and science;

Guarantees transparent environmental and agricultural practices; and

Protects intertribal, interstate, and international responsibilities.

Commitment to Public Health and Welfare.

The Council commits to directing compact revenues toward community health services, addiction prevention, education, and environmental restoration within Tribal territories.

Mutual Recognition Clause.

The Council declares that the constitutional government of the United States of America and the collective Tribal Nations operate as co-sovereigns joined by covenant, not hierarchy. All cooperative compacts shall reflect this equality.

Reporting and Oversight.

The Council shall establish an Inter-Tribal Oversight Consortium to coordinate with the Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission, ensuring cultural accountability, policy consistency, and adherence to both traditional and federal law.

Future Consultation.

The Tribal Nations Council calls upon Congress and the Executive of the United States of America to maintain nation-to-nation consultation in all matters concerning agriculture, medicine, and natural resources, recognizing the living sovereignty of tribes as governments within the constitutional Union.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that this Resolution, once adopted by consensus of the Council and signed by the presiding Chief Justice of the Tribal Nations and the Speaker of the Council, shall be transmitted to:

- The President and Congress of the United States of America;
- The Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission;
- The National Congress of American Indians; and
- Each recognized Tribal Government for implementation and record.

CERTIFICATION

Adopted this 22 day of June, 2025, at the Great Council Chamber, under the joint authority of the Tribal Nations Council and recognized by the constitutional government of the United States of America.

Signed,

_____ Chief Justice of the Tribal Nations Council

_____ Speaker of the Tribal Nations Council

Attested: Clerk of the Council, Seal affixed.

****MODEL INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMPACT**

Between the United States of America and the Agency of the Tribal Nations**

PREAMBLE

This Compact is made and entered into by and between the United States of America, acting through the duly authorized Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission (FTCC) pursuant to the Federal-Tribal Cannabis and Hemp Regulation Act of 2025, and the Agency of the Tribal Nations, acting on behalf of the sovereign Tribal Government(s) choosing to participate under the authority of their own constitutions and traditional law.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the United States of America, Article I, Section 8, confers upon Congress the power “to regulate Commerce... with the Indian Tribes”; and

WHEREAS, each Tribal Nation retains inherent sovereignty and the right to self-government, recognized by treaties and by decisions of the Supreme Court, including *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832); and

WHEREAS, the FTC Act of 2025 authorizes voluntary compacts between tribal and federal governments to regulate cannabis and hemp cultivation, processing, and trade for medical, research, and industrial purposes; and

WHEREAS, the Agency of the Tribal Nations is empowered by resolution of the Tribal Nations Council No. 2025-1 to negotiate and administer such compacts on behalf of member tribes; and

WHEREAS, both parties desire to promote health, safety, environmental stewardship, and economic opportunity consistent with their respective sovereign rights and with international treaty obligations;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Government of the United States of America and the Agency of the Tribal Nations agree as follows:

ARTICLE I — PURPOSE AND SCOPE

- This Compact establishes a cooperative framework for:
 - a. Regulating the cultivation, processing, manufacture, and sale of cannabis and hemp within tribal lands;
 - b. Ensuring products meet national health, safety, and anti-diversion standards;
 - c. Allowing inter-tribal and interstate commerce pursuant to approved FTCC procedures;
 - d. Supporting community health, research, and education initiatives.
- Participation by any Tribal Nation is voluntary and does not waive any sovereign immunity except as expressly stated herein.

ARTICLE II — AUTHORITY AND GOVERNANCE

- The United States of America, through the FTCC, provides federal recognition, coordination, and data-sharing for participating Tribal Programs.
- The Agency of the Tribal Nations acts as liaison to member governments and ensures equitable implementation across tribes.
- Each participating Tribal Nation retains the right to establish internal Cannabis and Hemp Regulatory Commissions empowered to issue local licenses, collect fees, and enforce law under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE III — HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS

- Products cultivated or manufactured under this Compact shall:
 - Contain no more than the federally approved delta-9 THC threshold for hemp or the regulated medical-cannabis dosage for programs so authorized;
 - Be tested in laboratories certified by tribal, federal, or inter-tribal accreditation systems;
 - Comply with environmental protection measures developed cooperatively by the FTCC and the Agency of the Tribal Nations.
- The parties will coordinate recalls, enforcement actions, and educational outreach as necessary.

ARTICLE IV — ECONOMIC AND REVENUE PROVISIONS

- Each Tribal Nation may levy and collect taxes or fees on cannabis and hemp sales within its territory.
- The Agency of the Tribal Nations shall maintain an Inter-Tribal Economic Fund to support research, health programs, and agricultural innovation.
- No federal excise or income tax shall apply to intra-tribal revenue unless otherwise agreed by Congress and the Tribal Nations Council.

ARTICLE V — ENFORCEMENT AND JURISDICTION

- Primary jurisdiction over compact activities rests with the Tribal Courts of participating nations.
- Federal jurisdiction under the FTC Act and related health and safety laws applies where cross-border or interstate violations occur.
- The FTCC and Agency of the Tribal Nations shall establish joint enforcement task forces respecting civil and criminal law boundaries.

ARTICLE VI — DATA SHARING, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- The parties agree to share statistical and regulatory data for oversight and treaty-reporting purposes only.
- Confidential business information and personal data are protected under tribal and federal privacy laws.
- The FTCC shall provide technical assistance and training programs for tribal regulators and laboratories.

ARTICLE VII — INTERNATIONAL COMPLIANCE

Both parties reaffirm adherence to applicable international agreements, including the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961) and the Convention on Psychotropic Substances (1971), ensuring that production and research remain within permitted medical and scientific exceptions.

ARTICLE VIII — DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- Disputes arising under this Compact shall first be addressed through consultation between the FTCC and the Agency of the Tribal Nations.
- Unresolved matters may be submitted to an Inter-Governmental Mediation Panel, composed equally of federal and tribal representatives.
- If mediation fails, the matter may proceed to the U.S.-Tribal Inter-Sovereign Court of Appeals established under the FTC Act.

ARTICLE IX — EFFECTIVE DATE, AMENDMENT, AND TERMINATION

- This Compact becomes effective upon execution by both parties and remains in force for ten (10) years unless revised or withdrawn.
- Either party may amend specific articles by mutual written consent.
- Either party may withdraw upon twelve (12) months' written notice, provided ongoing obligations to employees, licensees, and contractors are resolved in good faith.

ARTICLE X — SOVEREIGNTY CLAUSE

Nothing in this Compact shall be construed to:

- Diminish the inherent sovereignty of any Tribal Nation;
- Confer jurisdiction not explicitly granted by law; or
- Alter the constitutional structure of the United States of America as a government of limited, enumerated powers.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the duly authorized representatives of the parties have hereunto set their hands:

For the Government of the United States of America (Constitutional Federal Authority)

Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer Head Chief, Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission Date: _____

For the Agency of the Tribal Nations (Inter-Tribal Authority under the Tribal Nations Council Resolution No. 2025-1)

[Name]

Director General, Agency of the Tribal Nations

Date: _____

Attested by:

Head Chief of the Tribal Nations Council

Witnessed by:

Representative of the President of the United States of America

SEAL

(Unified Seal of the United States of America and Tribal Nations Compact for Cooperative Governance)

Purpose Statement

This Federal Tribal Government expresses the sovereign will of the Agency Tribal Nations [Mendocino Indian Reservation] Nation to work in equal partnership with the constitutional government of the United States of America while retaining full authority to protect its land, culture, and citizens under the principles affirmed by Head Chief Agency Federal Public Notices in 2025.

CORPORATION CHARTER OF FEDERALLY SERVICED PRESIDENTIALLY RECOGNIZED RESERVATION FOLLOW LINK:

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:574f8f68-7e0f-30fd-864b-d906e43405a6>

INVESTMENT CONTRACT FOR PLANT GO GREEN PETROLEUM FUEL GREEN CARBAN REDUCTION TO REDUCE THE 35% MARK BY 2035 FOLLOW LINK:

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:fe11dfa-cb4d-4f6b-91f2-918eac0064bf> Tribal Law below

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:f4356c27-cb37-44b4-9a52-df546426a52c>

Document and links in sharing or action:

Letter to

Dr. Miguel Cardona, Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Education for the Accreditation of Deganawida Quetzalcoati University

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:858cf3bc-c323-3195-819a-aa24467ae26a>

Cultivation License

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:484abda4-cd05-4bb8-b4c1-b895ac323e6b>

KYC Trade Authority signed Magistrate needs to amend and corrected,

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:2494fbb8-1f8b-35d2-ba19-cd64b47f0246>

D-Q University Services support By GSA Federal Contractor

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:c224b9b8-5035-427c-a254-ae90f932d15c>

charter of the agency

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:e2deb259-acf9-34ec-a0c0-8c571ca975e9>

Retrieved:

<http://www.ed.gov/edelogs/whiaiane/executive/order/13592/americanindian/end/alaska/nativeeducation/opportunities/end/strengtheningtribalcollegesanduniversities/>

executive order13592United States US Department of Interior Indian Affairs 2014 Budget Justifications: the physical year 2014, 1-694

retrieved from<http://www.bia.gov/cs/groups/xocfo/documents/text/idc1/o21730.pdf>

Department of Education. (2014a) United States Department of Education Lists of Postsecondary Institutions Enrolling Populations. Sourced:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-minorityinst-list-pg5.html>

TRIBAL FEDERAL CONTRACT FOR 20 BILLION FOR FIVE YEARS FOLLW LINK{

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:c7b23e56-4a64-40dc-86b9-772edc10aae9>

TRIBAL NATION ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

We, the undersigned representatives of the sovereign Tribal Nations, acknowledge receipt of this Presidential Proclamation and affirm our commitment to the comprehensive implementation of the Master Treaty of Peace and International Agreement in the spirit of mutual respect, cooperation, and shared prosperity.

Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer
Head Chief, Mendocino Tribal Nations

Tribal Nations of Chief Representatives

TRIBAL NATION AND INTERNATIONAL PARTNER ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

We, the undersigned representatives of the sovereign Tribal Nations and international humanitarian partners, acknowledge receipt of this Presidential Proclamation and affirm our commitment to the comprehensive implementation of the Master Treaty of Peace and International Agreement in the spirit of mutual respect, cooperation, and shared prosperity.

Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer
Head Chief, Mendocino Tribal Nations
Date: _____

International Observers and Witnesses
Date: _____

This Proclamation shall be published in the Federal Register and distributed to all federal agencies, tribal governments, state governments, international partners, and made available to the American people and the global community as a testament to America's commitment to Indigenous rights, international cooperation, and the advancement of peace and justice for all peoples.

SIGNATURE AND RATIFICATION PAGES

MASTER TREATY OF PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

SECTION 24.1: CERTIFICATION OF RATIFICATION AND BINDING COMMITMENT

By affixing their signatures and seals hereto, the undersigned representatives hereby certify their full acceptance, ratification, and binding commitment to all provisions of this Master Treaty of Peace and International Agreement, acknowledging that this Treaty creates perpetual obligations and rights under domestic constitutional law, international law, and the sacred principles of treaty-making between sovereign nations.

FOR THE SOVEREIGN TRIBAL NATIONS

PRIMARY TRIBAL AUTHORITY

Head Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer
United States Tribal Federal Contractor and Awardee of the Interior
Representing Agency Tribal Nations & Deganawidah-Quetzalcoati University
Acting pursuant to inherent tribal sovereignty and traditional governance authority

Signature: _____
Official Seal: [TRIBAL SEAL]
Date: _____
Location: Mendocino Indian Reservation, California

PARTICIPATING TRIBAL NATIONS

Representative of the Mendocino Indian Reservation
Acting pursuant to Tribal Council Resolution and Traditional Authority

Name: _____
Title: _____
Signature: _____
Official Seal: [MENDOCINO TRIBAL SEAL]
Date: _____

Representative of the Yurok Tribal Nation
Acting pursuant to Tribal Constitutional Authority and Traditional Council

Name: _____
Title: _____
Signature: _____

Official Seal: [YUOK TRIBAL SEAL]

Date: _____

Acting pursuant to Tribal Governmental Authority and Cultural Leadership

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [MIWOK TRIBAL SEAL]

Date: _____

Tribal Community

Acting pursuant to Traditional Governance and Community Authority

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [SEAL]

Date: _____

Additional Tribal Nation RepresentativesAs recognized by the Treaty Oversight Council

Name: _____

Tribal Nation: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [TRIBAL SEAL]

Date: _____

FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EXECUTIVE BRANCH AUTHORITY

Donald John Trump

President of the United States of America

Commander-in-Chief and Chief Executive

Acting pursuant to Constitutional Treaty-Making Authority

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [PRESIDENTIAL SEAL]

Date: _____

Location: Mendocino Indian Reservation, California

FEDERAL DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Secretary of the Interior

U.S. Department of the Interior

Acting pursuant to Federal Trust Responsibility

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR SEAL]

Date: _____

Secretary of EnergyU.S. Department of EnergySupporting Tribal Energy Sovereignty and Development

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SEAL]

Date: _____

Administrator, General Services Administration (GSA)Federal Program Administration and Implementation

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [GSA OFFICIAL SEAL]

Date: _____

Additional Federal Representatives

As designated by the President

Name: _____

Department/Agency: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [DEPARTMENT/AGENCY SEAL]

Date: _____

INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN REPRESENTATIVES

Michelle T. Nguyen

Humanitarian Envoy for Vietnam

Acting pursuant to International Humanitarian Mission

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [HUMANITARIAN MISSION SEAL]

Date: _____

Consultant to the Agency Tribal Nations

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [MENDOCINO TRIBAL SEAL]

Date: _____

Jolene Burnadette Wilson - Liaison for Laytonville Casino and Tribal Rights Backs

Name: _____

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Signature: _____

Official Seal: [UN SYSTEM SEAL]

Date: _____

FOR INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS AND WITNESSES

UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

Representative of the United Nations
Observer pursuant to UN Charter and Indigenous Rights Mandate

Name: _____
Title: _____
Organization: _____
Signature: _____
Official Seal: [UN SYSTEM SEAL]
Date: _____

ACADEMIC AND LEGAL WITNESSES

International Law Expert
Witness pursuant to International Legal Authority

Name: _____
Institution: _____
Expertise: _____
Signature: _____
Date: _____

Indigenous Rights Scholar
Witness pursuant to Academic and Research Authority

Name: _____
Institution: _____
Specialization: _____
Signature: _____
Date: _____

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

Human Rights Organization Representative
Observer pursuant to Human Rights Advocacy Mission

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Title: _____
Signature: _____
Date: _____

Environmental Organization Representative
Observer pursuant to Environmental Protection and Climate Action

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Title: _____
Signature: _____
Date: _____

ATTESTATION AND VERIFICATION

NOTARIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Notary PublicVerifying the authentic execution of this Treaty

I hereby certify that the above-named individuals appeared before me on this day and acknowledged the execution of this Master Treaty of Peace and International Agreement as their free and voluntary act.

Name: _____
Commission Number: _____
My Commission Expires: _____
Signature: _____
Official Seal: [NOTARIAL SEAL]
Date: _____

CEREMONIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Elder and Traditional WitnessProviding Traditional Blessing and Cultural Authentication

Name: _____
Tribal Nation: _____
Traditional Role: _____
Ceremonial Acknowledgment: _____
Date: _____

Spiritual LeaderProviding Sacred Witness and Ceremonial Blessing

Name: __Big Eddy Michell_____
Spiritual Tradition: _____
Sacred Acknowledgment: _____
Date: _____

FINAL CERTIFICATION

This Master Treaty of Peace and International Agreement, consisting of Twenty-Three (23) comprehensive Articles and associated protocols, has been executed in multiple authentic copies, each possessing equal legal authority, on thisseventeenth day of September, Two Thousand and Twenty-Five, at theMendocino Indian Reservation, California, United States of America, in the presence of tribal elders, federal officials, international representatives, and global witnesses.

Total Pages:_____Article Count:23 ArticlesAuthentic Language Versions:English and Tribal LanguagesDepository:Treaty Implementation Authority (TIA)Registration:United Nations Treaty SeriesEffective Date:Upon ratification by two-thirds of signatories

Master Treaty of Peace(Sept 17, 2025) and significant regulatory shifts effectiveJanuary 1, 2026.

1. Key Federal Statutes and Resolutions (2026)

- Continuing Appropriations Act, 2026 (H.R. 5371): Enacted in late 2025, this law includes a major provision effective November 12, 2026, that establishes a strict federal limit of 0.4 mg of total THC per container for any hemp-derived product.
- Emergency Resolution SEA-25-130: In November 2025, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) passed this resolution to support safe regulation of hemp-derived cannabinoids and protect USDA-approved Tribal Hemp Programs from the restrictive 2026 federal ban.
- Schedule III Reclassification (2025-2026): Following a December 2025 executive order, cannabis has been reclassified as a Schedule III controlled substance, recognizing its accepted medical use and easing federal research restrictions.
- Rohrabacher-Farr Amendment (FY2026): Temporarily extended through January 2026, this rider prohibits the Department of Justice from using funds to interfere with state-legal medical cannabis programs.

2. California State Statutes (2026)

- AB 8 (2025-2026 Session): This law establishes a phased integration of hemp into the licensed market. Phase 1, effective January 1, 2026, prohibits smokable hemp and mandates that industrial hemp raw extract used in food or beverages must be >99% pure with zero detectable THC.
- MAUCRSA Annual Licensure: As of January 1, 2026, provisional cannabis licenses in California are no longer effective. All legal commercial cannabis activity must be conducted under an annual state license issued by the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC).
- Animal Cannabis Standards: New regulations for animal cannabis products (implementing AB 1885) took effect January 1, 2026.

3. D-Q University Compliance & Research (2026)

- Research Certification: To use D-Q University for research compliance, the partnership must hold a DEA Schedule III registration under 21 U.S.C. § 823 for clinical studies and research.
- Agricultural Research Immunity: Under California law, "established agricultural research institutions" (like D-Q University) have certain exemptions for hemp research, provided the THC concentration does not exceed 0.3%.
- Master Treaty of Peace (Sept 2025): This treaty establishes D-Q University as a recognized entity for the Mendocino Indian Reservation, providing a bilateral basis for tribal-federal research partnerships under the Supremacy Clause [User Input].

4. Tribal Governance & Micro-License (2026)

- Independent Nation Authority: Per *Worcester v. Georgia*, the Tribe retains inherent authority to regulate its own territory. This authority is exercised through Tribal Cannabis Ordinances that establish laboratory testing, security protocols, and social equity programs.
- Micro-license Operations: At the Willits property, a micro-license allows for vertically integrated activities (cultivation, manufacturing, retail). For any products sold off-reservation in 2026, the partnership must satisfy dual-licensing requirements (State + Tribal) to maintain legal compliance.

This bill, beginning on January 1, 2026,

D-Q University Compliance & Research (2026) Research Certification: To use D-Q University for research compliance, the partnership must hold an Agency Tribal Nations authorization and DEA Schedule III registration under 21 U.S.C. § 823.

In 2026, the resolution of research compliance for the partnership between

Jane and Agency Tribal Nations at the Willits property—utilizing D-Q University—is governed by the following federal and tribal statutory framework.

1. Statutory Resolution for Research (2026)

To operate under "Research Compliance," the partnership must resolve the conflict between tribal sovereignty and federal drug control via the following statutes:

- Schedule III Registration: Per the Executive Order of December 2025, cannabis is now Schedule III. Research into "accepted medical use" is conducted under Schedule III registration (21 U.S.C. § 823). This allows D-Q University to perform pharmaceutical research under the Schedule III framework.
- Agricultural Research Institution Status: Under California Food & Agricultural Code § 81000, D-Q University qualifies as an "Established Agricultural Research Institution." This statute allows for the cultivation of hemp for research purposes with zero THC limits for experimental plots, provided they are not entered into the commercial market.

2. The "Agency Tribal Nations" Resolve

The partnership utilizes the Master Treaty of Peace (Sept 17, 2025) as the governing "statute of the parties."

- Bilateral Research Compact: The treaty serves as a bilateral agreement under the Supremacy Clause (Art. VI, Cl. 2). It resolves that the Willits facility is a "Tribal Research Annex."
- Sovereign Immunity: The resolution must include a limited waiver of sovereign immunity from Agency Tribal Nations specifically for the \$25,000 finance agreement, ensuring that "Meeting of the Minds" is enforceable in tribal or federal court.

3. Compliance Milestones for January 2026

- Pharmaceutical Certification: To achieve pharmaceutical-grade status at the Willits site, the research must comply with Good Laboratory Practices (GLP). As of January 1, 2026, any product meant for human or animal consumption must also meet the DCC's new 2026 testing standards.
- The November 2026 "Total THC" Deadline: Any "finished product" resulting from D-Q University research that leaves the lab for a dispensary must comply with the 0.4mg total THC limit established by the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2026.

4. Objective Statutory Application Table

Summary Resolution: By integrating the Master Treaty with the 2026 Schedule III federal status, D-Q University acts as a "Sovereign Research Shield." This allows the Willits facility to conduct "pharmaceutical certification" research that is protected by the federal trust responsibility and tribal inherent sovereignty, provided it complies with the objective testing requirements taking effect on November 12, 2026.

SECTION 5 — HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS

All operations shall comply with laboratory testing protocols approved by the ATN Lab Accreditation Program and the FTCC.

Packaging and labels must include bilingual (Tribal language and English) warnings.

Products marketed as medical require certification from the Tribal Health Clinic and recording in the NTTS database.

SECTION 6 — ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL PROTECTION

Cultivation shall use sustainable methods that preserve soil, water, and sacred sites.

The Tribal Environmental Department may suspend operations threatening the ecosystem or traditional resources.

At least 5 percent of net revenue must support Cultural Preservation Programs (traditional seed projects, language revitalization, and cultural education).

SECTION 7 — ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

The TCHRC enforcement division may inspect any licensed facility with reasonable notice.

Violations are subject to graduated sanctions—warning, fine, suspension, or revocation—consistent with federal-tribal guidelines.

Appeals shall lie with the Tribal Court, whose decision may be subject to inter-sovereign review before the US-Tribal Inter-Sovereign Court of Appeals if federal issues are involved.

SECTION 8 — REVENUE ALLOCATION

All revenues from this ordinance shall be dedicated to:

40 % Public Health & Education Programs

25 % Environmental Protection and Infrastructure

25 % Economic Diversification Fund

10 % Regulatory Administration of the TCHRC

SECTION 9 — AGREEMENT TO COMPACT

The [Name of Tribe] Nation hereby authorizes its Principal Chief (or Chairperson) to execute the Inter-Governmental Compact Between the United States of America and the Agency of the Tribal Nations.

Said execution constitutes formal participation in the FTC Act program and acknowledgment of mutual sovereign respect under the Supreme Court decision of June 20, 2025.

SECTION 10 — RELATION TO OTHER LAWS

This ordinance shall supersede any prior inconsistent provisions of tribal law regarding cannabis or hemp.

Nothing herein shall be interpreted to alter:

- The Tribal Criminal Code on controlled substances not covered by this ordinance; or
- Any treaty rights or federally protected benefits of the Tribe.

SECTION 11 — SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

Except as expressly waived for dispute resolution under the Compact, the [Name of Tribe] Nation retains its sovereign immunity from suit in any forum.

SECTION 12 — EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall take effect ninety (90) days after adoption and upon approval of the Compact by the FTCC and ATN.

CERTIFICATION

Adopted by the Tribal Council of the [Name of Tribe] Nation on the ___ day of ___, 2025, by a vote of ___ for, ___ against, and ___ abstaining.

Principal Chief / Chairperson

Speaker of the Tribal Council

Attested by:

Tribal Secretary - Seal Affixed

Acknowledged by: Chief Justice of the Tribal Nations Council & Chair, Federal-Tribal Cannabis Commission

Purpose Statement

This ordinance expresses the sovereign will of the [Mendocino Indian Reservation] Nation to work in equal partnership with the constitutional government of the United States of America while retaining full authority to protect its land, culture, and citizens under the principles affirmed by



Agency Tribal Nations

Federal Tribal Government · Mendocino Indian Reservation. Sovereign tribal authority under federal Indian law.

Chief Geronimo Thomas Langenderfer XVIII
GSA Federal Tribal Contractor

Services

- Federal Contractor Services
- Cannabis Regulatory Compliance
- Tribal Government Relations
- D-Q University Partnership
- Environmental Stewardship

Quick Links

- [Public Notices & Press Releases](#)
- [Tribal Case Law Database](#)
- [Cultivation License](#)
- [Dispensary License](#)
- [Processing License](#)
- [Lab Testing License](#)
- [Domestic Transport License](#)
- [International Transport License](#)
- [Micro Business License](#)

Legal Framework

- [Affidavit of Publication \(Apr 7, 2026\)](#)
- [Ukiah Daily Journal Press Release](#)
- [Canons of Treaty Construction](#)
- [574 Federally Recognized Tribes](#)
- Tribal Sovereignty Protection
- Federal Compliance Standards
- Executive Order 13175

© 2026 Agency Tribal Nations · Mendocino Indian Reservation · All rights reserved. · [Sitemap](#)