

Doc. Date	Location	Description
1915.08.13	RDs AR Ex. 94	Letter, Indian agent to Commissioner, identifying 12 Indians at and near Sheep Ranch; census attached to this letter. The Agent identified Peter Hodge as the leader of this "band" of Indians; Hodge had homesteaded 160 acres, of which only one acre was useable. Hodge's homestead was 2 ½ miles north of town of Sheepranch. By contrast, the Agent proposes to buy one or two small parcels within the town of Sheepranch, based on their availability. No suggestion that Indians occupied those lots. Agent identified lots owned by a Mrs. Hoyle.
1916.04.16	RDs AR Ex 93	0.92 acres bought and held in trust by U.S. for benefit of Indians of Sheep Ranch. Bought from Cunninghams. Lot 1, block 13, in Sheepranch Townsite.
1929	Uram 13	Indian census roll of Calaveras County published. Referred to in Uram 13 (Wilson affidavit)
1935.06.06	Rose. A Uram PI ex. C	Letter, Superintendent Lipps to postmaster, identifying Jeff Davis as "the only eligible voter." No mention of "membership." A fuller document is at Ex. C to Uram's declaration in support of PI. Includes handwritten note "Indian 21 years old and over <u>living on</u> the Sheepranch Rancheria": Jeff Davis. (my emphasis). Also includes a list of Rancherias in Central Cal, with acreages. Sheepranch 2 acres. Next smallest has 25 acres. There are almost twice as many Rancherias with more than 100 acres than there are with less.
1935.06.08	RDs AR Ex 90	Jeff Davis votes to accept the IRA.
1960.08.01		Solicitor's Opinion re implementation of Rancheria termination acts. "The Indians of Central California had not at first been regarded as subject to Federal Guardianship because they were not members of a tribe having treaty relations with the United States, did not live on reservations, and held no restricted allotments."
1965.08.13		Publication of regulations governing termination of federal relationship – California Rancherias. 25 C.F.R. part 242. Defines "organized" and "unorganized": organization requires governing documents that set out membership criteria approved by SOI. Ambiguously worded: can't tell whether SOI approval is required for governing documents or for membership criteria. 25 C.F.R. § 242.2. Following section clarifies that, for unorganized Rancheria, residency is requirement for qualifying to receive distribution (and dependents of residents). Regs rescinded 1981.05.13 (q.v.)
1966.01.05	RDs AR ex. 89	Letter to file, Jess Town, Tribal Ops, recording meeting with Mabel Dixie. Mabel said she or some member of her family had been on Rancheria since the 1930s; postmaster said Mabel had been there for 8 years continuously.
1966.02.03	Rose. B	Letter, Area Director Hill to Dora Mata, rejecting her request for eligibility for distribution. "[Sheep Ranch] always considered to be an unorganized Rancheria." Notes and quotes the Rancheria regs published August 13, 1965. No mention of "membership." <u>Residing</u> on Rancheria was test for qualification. Document is also Docket #18-1 at 3 in D.D.C. case 1:05-cv-739.
1966.08.18	RD's AR Ex 88	Mabel Hodge Dixie determined to be sole distributee of Rancheria assets. "Several Indian families have lived on Rancheria since it was purchased by the United States. There have been no allotments or formal assignments issued and for the past 8 years the solitary house has been occupied by Mrs. Mable Hodge Dixie. . . . there has never been a formal type organization."
1966.10.12		Associate Commissioner approves plan of distribution for Rancheria assets. See 2007.04.02 RD's decision.

1967.04.11	RDs AR Ex 86	Rancheria deeded to Mabel Hodge Dixie. See 2007.04.02 RD's decision.
1967.09.06	RDs AR Ex 82a	Mabel Hodge Dixie quitclaimed deed back to U.S. See 2007.04.02 RD's decision.
1981.05.13		Publication of Federal Register Notice rescinding 25 C.F.R. part 242, Rancheria termination regs (see 1965.08.13). BIA is "rescinding the regulations governing the distribution of assets of rancherias and reservations that were subject to termination in California. No further assets of the affected reservations and rancherias remain to be distributed. Consequently, these regulations are no longer necessary."
1983.03.08	Rose K	<b>Decision</b> , DAS-IA Fritz to Osage Tribe: "We define formally organized to mean the adoption by all members of the Tribe of a formal governing document which describes the full manner in which the tribe governs itself and includes a full definition of who its members are."
1989.01.09	RDs AR Ex. 82	RD identifies a cloud on title to Rancheria because of discrepancy between Agency records at the Region and records at the Portland Title Plant. One shows U.s. ownership (via quitclaim) and one shows ownership in Ms. Dixie's heirs.
1998.08.05	Uram 26	Letter, Dixie to Bureau, informing of the adoption of Silvia et al. See also 2007.04.02 RD's decision.
1998.09.24	Rose C	Letter, Superintendent Risling to Dixie re meeting with Dixie and Burley to discuss process of formally organizing. Letter uses phrase "dependent members" in paragraph on membership, it is clear from context that the reference is to dependent <u>family</u> members. Cites to ALJ determination in 1971 for the identification of those with vested property interests in Rancheria (as affirmed on 4/14/1993). Yakima and Melvin only living people "possessing the right to initially organize the tribe." Notes Aug. 5, 1998, adoption of Burley et al. These adoptees "possess the right to participate in initial organization." <b>Key:</b> "At the conclusion of our meeting, you were going to consider what enrollment criteria should be applied to future prospective members. Our understanding is that such criteria will be used to identify the persons eligible to participate in the initial organization of the tribe." "Tribes in the process of initially organization consider how to govern themselves until such time as the Tribe adopts a constitution."
1998.11.05	Rose D Uram 6	Tribe's General Council Resolution establishing government. "Tribe desires to <u>pursue</u> formal organization.' Membership consists of "at least" the five named people. Last resolution: "The General Council shall exist until a Constitution is formally adopted by the Tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior . . . unless this resolution is rescinded through subsequent resolution of the General Council." It appears that only Yakima, Silvia, and Rashel were over 18 at the time. Only Yakima and Silvia voted.
1999.04.21		Purported letter from Yakima Dixie, announcing his resignation as Chairman. See 2007.04.02 RD's decision. Yakima asserts he did not sign it. Dixie declaration, Uram #9, pages 39-40/163.
1999.04.21	Uram 27	Letter from Yakima Dixie, denying his resignation as Chairman. See also 2007.04.02 RD's decision.
1999.05.xx		Burley purports to hold election. See Dixie affidavit, ¶9 (Uram #9)
1999.12.11		Dixie purports to ratify a Constitution. See 51 IBIA 109
2000.02.04	Rose E	Letter, Superintendent Risling to Dixie re dispute between Silvia and Yakima. Notes adoptees have "right to participate in the initial organization of the Tribe." The three people over 18 "formed <u>the</u> group . . . entitled to participate in the organization of the tribe." (JWP emphasis). "We also recommend that the group consider eliciting the participation of

		descendants" of the 1915 census. Responds to – and rejects – the proposed Constitution of 12/11/1999. Notes that, now that Melvin has been located, he is in the tribe.
2000.03.06		Burley faction purports to ratify a constitution. See 51 IBIA 110. Rejected 10/31/2001.
2000.03.07	Rose F	Letter, Superintendent Risling to Burley. Burley refused to take part in the proposed meeting of 2/15/2000, as being "inconsistent with tribal management of its own affairs." Has a paragraph about Dixie's purported son Rocky McKay – Super says it is up to Tribe to determine acceptability of evidence of paternity. Generally, this letter treats the five as the established and exclusive membership, emphasizing deference to the tribe.
2000.03.08		Tribe purports to ratify a Constitution, listing the five as the membership. See 2007.04.02 RD's decision.
2001.10.31		Letter, Superintendent to Burley, rejecting Burley's purported Constitution of 2000. See IBIA decision at 51 IBIA 310
2003.09.28	Uram 15	Letter, Dixie to BIA (Fry –Tribal Ops office). Regarding meetings between Dixie and Fry intended to assist the tribe conduct a secretarial election. Demanding responses from Fry.
2004.03.04	118 Stat 542	IRA amended – 25 USC 476(h): Tribal Sovereignty.--Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act-- (1) each Indian tribe shall retain inherent sovereign power to adopt governing documents under procedures other than those specified in this section. (2) nothing in this Act invalidates any constitution or other governing document adopted by an Indian tribe after June 18, 1934, in accordance with the authority described in paragraph (1)." I do not believe that this provision can apply to an unorganized tribe: the identification of the people who constitute a tribe must be a prerequisite to the exercise of tribal sovereignty.
2004.03.26	Rose G Uram 7	Letter, Superintendent Risling to Burley, rejecting demonstration of "organized" tribe through submission of Constitution received 2/11/04. Burley has "position of authority with an unrecognized tribe." Sets out requirement for involvement of entire tribal community in initial organization. States one apparent factual error – asserts that Butlers and Jeffs "have inherited an interest in the Rancheria." Could be correct if by "Rancheria" he means the political entity; certainly incorrect if he means the piece of real estate. States that it is "only after greater tribal community is identified that governing documents should be drafted and the Tribe's base [roll] and membership criteria identified."
2005.02.11	Rose H Uram 8	<b>Decision</b> Letter, DAS-IA Olsen to Dixie. Dixie's appeal of BIA's (1999) recognition of Burley as Chairman rendered moot by RD's decision of 3/26/2004 (Ex. G). "Until such time as the Tribe has organized, the Federal government can recognize no one, including yourself, as the tribal Chairman." Also, "the BIA does not recognized any tribal government, and therefore, cannot defer to any tribal dispute resolution process at this time." Significant change from approach taken in Super's letter of 3/7/2000.
2006.01.06		Tribe submits purported membership roll from which Dixie has been removed. See 2007.04.02 RD's decision.
2006.02.xx	Uram 16	Tribal Constitution by Dixie group. Includes enrollment qualification criteria.
2006.02.02	Uram 20	Letter, Dixie government to Burley; proposal to meet. Actually from Chadd, proposing Silvia meet with Velma, and Tiger Paulk to meet with Chadd.
2006.03.30		Decision, CVMT v. U.S., DDC Granting US MTD for failure to state a claim. "Background" is inaccurate. Says: in 1915, 13 Miwok were living on 160 acres near Sheep Ranch, CA, and that government purchased two of the 160 acres in 1916. See entries at 1915 and 1916, above. But clearly, the purchased Rancheria was <u>never</u> the place of residence of

		all the Indian beneficiaries of the purchase of the parcel. Court goes on to relate that “the number of people living there dwindled, to the point that [in 1934, for IRA vote] the government recognized only one individual as a tribal member.” But court never explains how it knows that the numbers “dwindled” – clear from Agent's letter that the 13 originally-identified Indians did not live on the parcel. And IRA was limited to “Indians on a reservation.” If anything, the Indian population of the Rancheria went <i>UP</i> , from zero to one, between 1915 and 1935. The evidence from 1934 says nothing about “members” – it is entirely about identifying the people eligible to vote on the IRA, and therefore, identifying those people residing on the Rancheria land – all 0.96 acres of it.
2006.08.17		Unpublished opinion by 9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. Affirming ED Cal. decision to dismiss as time-barred Silvia Burley’s suit challenging the Bureau’s decision to convey Rancheria to Dixie. CVMT v. U.S., No. 04-16676, 2006 WL 2373434. In Burley’s filings, she asserted the Rancheria belonged to the broader community of Sheep Ranch Miwoks, numbering up to 250. See Blackwell letter of 12/12/2008.
2006.11.06	Rose I Uram 1	Letter, ( <b>decision</b> ), Superintendent Burdick to Burley and Dixie, renewing offer to help tribe organize. Recognizes intractable impasse. Announces plan to publish in local papers an announcement of a meeting of all claimants to membership. Notes alternatives to Constitution, such as a Tribe's "traditions." Hardly applicable in the case of a never-organized Rancheria. This was the purported "decision" appealed by Burley, leading to RD’s decision of 4/2/2007.
2006.11.10		Burley appeal to RD of Superintendent's decision of 11/6/2006.
2007.04.02	Uram 5	<b>Decision</b> Regional Director to Burley. "The Agency does not yet view the Tribe to be an "organized" Indian Tribe. This is due to the fact that both of you have failed to identify the whole community who are entitled to participate in the Tribe's efforts to organize." RD remanded matter to Superintendent to proceed with plan to publish a meeting notice "as soon as possible." This decision was appealed by Burley to the IBIA, resulting in decision at 1/28/2010.
2007.04.03	Uram 18	Letter, Dixie government to Tribe. Encouraging potential members to submit applications in response to BIA announcement in paper. Attached is a three-page history of the Tribe, focusing on events post 1966, especially Burley’s purported attempt to take over the tribe. The history is signed by Chadd Everyone. One fact that the history reveals is that Velma White Bear, a close relative of Yakima and who lived at Sheep Ranch for five years, appears to be the competent and educated driving force behind the Dixie tribal government.
2007.04.11	Rose J Uram 17	Announcement in local paper re organizational meeting. Burley asserts this was invalid and improper because it was done while Superintendent's decision was still subject to appeal.
2008.04.19	Uram 24	Letter, Dixie government (Chadd Everyone) to tribal community, re meeting to be held April 19 to discuss draft Constitution, specifically membership criteria.
2008.07.09	Uram 25	Draft Dixie Constitution, with appended note by Everyone.
2008.12.12	Uram 28	Letter, Blackwell to Cal. Deputy Atty. General. Sets out history of tribe. I question statement that the .92 acres was purchased so the 12 members could live on it. Letter says “organizing the tribe formally” means “establishing a tribal government,” but should point out that organization requires both the establishment of governing documents AND the definition of membership criteria. Having elaborated the history leading to current impasses, letter concludes that “the

		only answer is to wait for the tribe to organize itself” and asserts that “neither the BIA nor any court has the authority to resolve the leadership dispute.” Citing to <i>Goodface v. Grassrope</i> .
2009.03.19	Uram 10	Letter, Reznor to Magee (Deputy County Counsel) objecting to Whitebear's participation in ICWA case. Attached to Whitebear Affidavit.
2010.01.28		<b>IBIA decision</b> at 51 IBIA 103. Dismissing most of Burley appeal, and referring purported “tribal enrollment dispute” to AS-IA.
2010.12.22	Uram 2	AS-IA decision letter, recognizing Burley government. Issued in response to referral from IBIA on question of tribal membership.
2011.01.07	Uram 9	Burley holds meeting of General Council, under authority of December 22 letter. Dixie affidavit ¶20.
2011.03.05	Uram 9	Dixie Affidavit
2011.03.05	Uram 12	Michael Mendibles affidavit. He “owns ancestral lands adjacent to the Sheep Ranch Rancheria,” and descends from people on the 1915 census.
2011.03.05	Uram 13	Evelyn Wilson affidavit.
2011.03.05	Uram 14	Antone Azevedo affidavit. Lived on Sheep Ranch with family, 1950 – 1959.
2011.03.06	Uram 21	Pete Ramirez affidavit.
2011.03.06	Uram 23	Gilbert Ramirez affidavit. Elaborating on tribal dance group and efforts of Burley to deny the existence of such a group.
2011.03.07	Uram 10	Whitebear affidavit; interesting discussion of the non-Burley tribe actions in Indian Child Welfare Act cases.
2011.03.08	Uram 11	Antonia Lopez affidavit.
2011.03.08	Uram 22	Brianna Creekmore affidavit. (page 3 and 4 transposed). Elaborating on work to help USFS with habitat restoration – efforts hampered by Silvia and put at risk by December 22 decision.
2011.04.01	Uram 3	AS-IA letter withdrawing 12/22/2010 letter
2011.04.08	Uram 4	AS-IA letter clarifying withdrawal and setting out briefing schedule for reconsideration
2011.04.30	Uram 19	Dixie Tribal Council Resolution and roster.
2011.05.01	Rose L	Undated, unsigned, apparently current memo on the role of Chad Everyone and gaming interests in co-opting Dixie for their purposes. Twenty-four attachments to this exhibit. Simply as a procedural matter, this additional memorandum pushes Rosette's submission past the 30-page limit.