

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
2 SARA J. DRAKE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
3 WILLIAM L. WILLIAMS, JR.  
Deputy Attorney General  
4 T. MICHELLE LAIRD  
Deputy Attorney General  
5 NEIL D. HOUSTON  
Deputy Attorney General  
6 State Bar No. 168058  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
7 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
8 Telephone: (916) 322-5476  
Fax: (916) 327-2319  
9 E-mail: Neil.Houston@doj.ca.gov  
*Attorneys for Defendant*

*Per Government Code § 6103, State of  
California is exempt from filing fee*

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
12 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
13 CENTRAL BRANCH  
14

15 **CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK TRIBE,**  
16  
Plaintiff,

17 v.  
18

19 **THE CALIFORNIA GAMBLING**  
20 **CONTROL COMMISSION; and DOES 1**  
21 **THROUGH 50, Inclusive,**  
Defendants.

Case No. 37-2008-00075326-CU-CO-CTL

**SEPARATE STATEMENT OF  
UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS AND  
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT  
OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: April 26, 2013  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Dept: 62  
Judge: The Honorable Ronald L. Styn  
Trial Date: June 4, 2013  
Action Filed: January 8, 2008

23  
24 Pursuant to section 437c of the Code of Civil Procedure and Rule 3.1350 of the California  
25 Rules of Court, Defendant California Gambling Control Commission ("Commission") submits  
26 this separate statement of undisputed material facts, together with references to supporting  
27 evidence, in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment against Plaintiff California Valley  
28

Miwok Tribe. Throughout this statement, the supporting evidence cites to the declarations, verified pleadings, and exhibits concurrently filed and served with this statement.

**UNDISPUTED FACTS RELEVANT TO FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION  
OF THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT COMBINED WITH  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE (FAC)  
[INJUNCTIVE RELIEF]**

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>1. Under the Compacts, the Commission is required to collect license fees from gaming tribes, deposit them in the RSTF, and, under the Compacts and Government Code sections 12012.75 and 12012.90, make quarterly payments of those funds according to the Compact's specified distribution plans.</p> <p><b>Gov. Code, §§ 12012.75; 12012.90;</b></p> <p><b>Compact §§ 4.3.2, 4.3.2.1 (Ex. A to Req. for Jud. Not. (RJN)); see also Decl. of Sylvia Cates (Cates Decl.) ¶ 2.</b></p>	<p>1.</p>
<p>2. The Compacts and Government Code provide that quarterly payments shall be made to Non-Compact Tribes, noncompact tribes, and eligible recipient Indian tribes, respectively—these are alternative and functionally equivalent designations of federally-recognized California Indian tribes that operate fewer than 350 slot machines.</p> <p><b>(Id.)</b></p>	<p>2.</p>
<p>3. The Commission administers the RSTF in the nominal capacity of "trustee," for the purpose of receiving, depositing, and disbursing the funds on a quarterly basis to Non-Compact Tribes.</p> <p><b>Compact, § 4.3.2, subd. (a)(ii) (Ex. A to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 2.</b></p>	<p>3.</p>

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>4. Aside from its duties as administrator of the RSTF, the Commission has no discretion "with respect to the use or disbursement of the [RSTF] funds."</p> <p><b>Compact, § 4.3.2.1, subd. (b) (Ex. A to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 2.</b></p> <p>This language has been clarified in later compacts. <b>See Tribal-State Compact Between the State of California and the Pinoleville Pomo Nation, § 5.1, subd. (a) (Ex. F to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 7.</b></p>	<p>4.</p>
<p>5. The Miwok Tribe is a federally-recognized Indian tribe that operates fewer than 350 slot machines, and thus qualifies as a Non-Compact Tribe under the Compacts and Government Code.</p> <p><b>First Amended Complaint Combined With Petition for Writ of Mandate, at p. 3 ¶ 6.</b></p>	<p>5.</p>
<p>6. The <i>Salazar</i> case was filed on January 24, 2011, by the California Valley Miwok Tribe (consisting of different individuals than the Burley Faction that is the plaintiff in this action), the Tribal Council, Yakima Dixie, Velma Whitebear, Antonia Lopez, Michael Mendibles, Evelyn Wilson, and Antone Azevedo (collectively referred to herein as the "D.C. Plaintiffs"). The <i>Salazar</i> case challenges Assistant Secretary of the Interior (ASI) (Indian Affairs) Larry Echo Hawk's December 10, 2010 decision recognizing the Burley Faction as the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p><b>Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. C to RJN. See also Docket (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. G to RJN.)</b></p>	<p>6.</p>
<p>7. As a result of <i>Salazar's</i> filing, ASI Echo Hawk withdrew his December 2010 decision for reconsideration, and then reissued it with modifications on August 31, 2011 (August 31 Decision). On October 17, 2011, the D.C.</p>	<p>7.</p>

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>Plaintiffs filed a first amended complaint that challenges ASI Echo Hawk's August 31 Decision.</p> <p><b>Letter, Echo Hawk to Dixie dated April 1, 2011 (Ex. D to RJN); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 5.</b></p> <p><b>Echo Hawk decision dated August 31, 2011 (Ex. E to RJN); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 6.</b></p> <p><b>First Amended Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. H to RJN.)</b></p>	
<p>8. By its express terms, the August 31 Decision is stayed pending the outcome of <i>Salazar</i>.</p> <p><b>Echo Hawk decision dated August 31, 2011 (Ex. E to RJN, at p. 8); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 6.</b></p>	8.
<p>9. At the present time, as evidenced by the <i>Salazar</i> case, a dispute exists as to the composition and leadership of the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p><b>First Amended Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. H to RJN.</b></p>	9.
<p>10. On the one hand, the Miwok Tribe may consist only of the Burley Faction, consisting of five members, or, on the other hand, it may consist of a much larger group of Indians, possibly including up to 242 adult members.</p> <p><b>(Id.)</b></p>	10.
<p>11. Depending upon the outcome of the <i>Salazar</i> case, the BIA may, or may not, take final action recognizing the Miwok Tribe to consist of the Burley Faction and recognizing Silvia Burley as the Tribal Chairperson.</p> <p><b>(Id.)</b></p>	11.

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
12. The Commission makes no independent determinations on the merits of intra-tribal leadership disputes.	12.
<b>Decl. of Tina Littleton (Littleton Decl.), ¶ 3.</b>	
13. The Commission takes no position on the merits of intra-tribal leadership disputes.	13.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 4.</b>	
14. When uncertainty exists as to a Non-Compact Tribe's authorized leadership, the Commission, as administrator of the RSTF, defers to the BIA's determinations.	14.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 5.</b>	
15. Because the BIA deemed it unorganized and lacking a Tribal Chairperson and, for that reason, suspended PL 638 contract funding disbursement to the Miwok Tribe in 2005, the Commission suspended its disbursement of quarterly RSTF payments, pending BIA's recognition of an authorized Miwok Tribe leader or leadership group with which to conduct its government-to-government business—as evidenced either by BIA's resumption of PL 638 funding, or other BIA action.	15.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 6.</b>	
16. As of this date, the BIA has not recognized an authorized leader or leadership group for the Miwok Tribe, nor has the BIA resumed disbursing PL 638 funds to the Miwok Tribe.	16.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 7.</b>	
17. As of this date, the Commission is holding accrued quarterly RSTF payments totaling \$8,763,001.99, plus interest in the amount of \$420,246.17, for eventual disbursement to the Miwok Tribe.	17.

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 8.</b>	
<p>18. The Commission will promptly disburse the accrued RSTF payments to the Miwok Tribe once the BIA has identified the Miwok Tribe's authorized leader or leadership group.</p> <p><b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 9.</b></p>	18.
<p>19. The Legislature has provided that shortfalls in the RSTF (which would otherwise preclude disbursing a total of \$1.1M per year to each Non-Compact Tribe) are backfilled from the Special Distribution Fund, which, to the extent not used for that purpose are used for the public benefit to mitigate the off-reservation impacts and costs of tribal gaming.</p> <p><b>Gov. Code, § 12012.90, subd. (e).</b></p> <p><b>Gov. Code, § 12012.85.</b></p>	19.

UNDISPUTED FACTS RELEVANT TO SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION  
OF THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT COMBINED WITH  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE (FAC)  
[DECLARATORY RELIEF]

<u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u>	<u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u>
<p>1. Under the Compacts, the Commission is required to collect license fees from gaming tribes, deposit them in the RSTF, and, under the Compacts and Government Code sections 12012.75 and 12012.90, make quarterly payments of those funds according to the Compact's specified distribution plans.</p> <p><b>Gov. Code, §§ 12012.75; 12012.90;</b></p> <p><b>Compact §§ 4.3.2, 4.3.2.1 (Ex. A to Req. for Jud. Not. (RJN); see also Decl. of Sylvia Cates (Cates Decl.) ¶ 2.</b></p>	1.
<p>2. The Compacts and Government Code provide that quarterly payments shall be made to Non-Compact Tribes, noncompact tribes, and eligible recipient Indian tribes, respectively—these are alternative and functionally equivalent designations of federally-recognized California Indian tribes that operate fewer than 350 slot machines.</p> <p><b>(Id.)</b></p>	2.
<p>3. The Commission administers the RSTF in the nominal capacity of “trustee,” for the purpose of receiving, depositing, and disbursing the funds on a quarterly basis to Non-Compact Tribes.</p> <p><b>Compact, § 4.3.2, subd. (a)(ii) (Ex. A to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 2.</b></p>	3.
<p>4. Aside from its duties as administrator of the RSTF, the Commission has no discretion “with respect to the use or disbursement of the [RSTF] funds.”</p>	4.

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>Compact, § 4.3.2.1, subd. (b) (Ex. A to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 2.</p> <p>This language has been clarified in later compacts. See <b>Tribal-State Compact Between the State of California and the Pinoleville Pomo Nation</b>, § 5.1, subd. (a) (Ex. F to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 7.</p>	
<p>5. The Miwok Tribe is a federally-recognized Indian tribe that operates fewer than 350 slot machines, and thus qualifies as a Non-Compact Tribe under the Compacts and Government Code.</p> <p><b>First Amended Complaint Combined With Petition for Writ of Mandate, at p. 3 ¶ 6.</b></p>	5.
<p>6. The <i>Salazar</i> case was filed on January 24, 2011, by the California Valley Miwok Tribe (consisting of different individuals than the Burley Faction that is the plaintiff in this action), the Tribal Council, Yakima Dixie, Velma Whitebear, Antonia Lopez, Michael Mendibles, Evelyn Wilson, and Antone Azevedo (collectively referred to herein as the "D.C. Plaintiffs"). The <i>Salazar</i> case challenges Assistant Secretary of the Interior (ASI) (Indian Affairs) Larry Echo Hawk's December 10, 2010 decision recognizing the Burley Faction as the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p><b>Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. C to RJN. See also Docket (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. G to RJN.)</b></p>	6.
<p>7. As a result of <i>Salazar's</i> filing, ASI Echo Hawk withdrew his December 2010 decision for reconsideration, and then reissued it with modifications on August 31, 2011 (August 31 Decision). On October 17, 2011, the D.C. Plaintiffs filed a first amended complaint that challenges ASI Echo Hawk's August 31 Decision.</p>	7.



<u><b>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b></u>	<u><b>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</b></u>
<p>Letter, Echo Hawk to Dixie dated April 1, 2011 (Ex. D to RJN); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 5.</p> <p>Echo Hawk decision dated August 31, 2011 (Ex. E to RJN); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 6.</p> <p>First Amended Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. H to RJN.)</p>	
<p>8. By its express terms, the August 31 Decision is stayed pending the outcome of <i>Salazar</i>.</p> <p>Echo Hawk decision dated August 31, 2011 (Ex. E to RJN, at p. 8); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 6.</p>	8.
<p>9. At the present time, as evidenced by the <i>Salazar</i> case, a dispute exists as to the composition and leadership of the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p>First Amended Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. H to RJN.</p>	9.
<p>10. On the one hand, the Miwok Tribe may consist only of the Burley Faction, consisting of five members, or, on the other hand, it may consist of a much larger group of Indians, possibly including up to 242 adult members.</p> <p>(<i>Id.</i>)</p>	10.
<p>11. Depending upon the outcome of the <i>Salazar</i> case, the BIA may, or may not, take final action recognizing the Miwok Tribe to consist of the Burley Faction and recognizing Silvia Burley as the Tribal Chairperson.</p> <p>(<i>Id.</i>)</p>	11.
<p>12. The Commission makes no independent determinations on the merits of intra-tribal leadership disputes.</p>	12.

<u><b>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b></u>	<u><b>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</b></u>
<b>Decl. of Tina Littleton (Littleton Decl.), ¶ 3.</b>	
13. The Commission takes no position on the merits of intra-tribal leadership disputes.	13.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 4.</b>	
14. When uncertainty exists as to a Non-Compact Tribe's authorized leadership, the Commission, as administrator of the RSTF, defers to the BIA's determinations.	14.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 5.</b>	
15. Because the BIA deemed it unorganized and lacking a Tribal Chairperson and, for that reason, suspended PL 638 contract funding disbursement to the Miwok Tribe in 2005, the Commission suspended its disbursement of quarterly RSTF payments, pending BIA's recognition of an authorized Miwok Tribe leader or leadership group with which to conduct its government-to-government business—as evidenced either by BIA's resumption of PL 638 funding, or other BIA action.	15.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 6.</b>	
16. As of this date, the BIA has not recognized an authorized leader or leadership group for the Miwok Tribe, nor has the BIA resumed disbursing PL 638 funds to the Miwok Tribe.	16.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 7.</b>	
17. As of this date, the Commission is holding accrued quarterly RSTF payments totaling \$8,763,001.99, plus interest in the amount of \$420,246.17, for eventual disbursement to the Miwok Tribe.	17.
<b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 8.</b>	
18. The Commission will promptly disburse	18.

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>the accrued RSTF payments to the Miwok Tribe once the BIA has identified the Miwok Tribe's authorized leader or leadership group.</p> <p><b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 9.</b></p>	
<p>19. The Legislature has provided that shortfalls in the RSTF (which would otherwise preclude disbursing a total of \$1.1M per year to each Non-Compact Tribe) are backfilled from the Special Distribution Fund, which, to the extent not used for that purpose are used for the public benefit to mitigate the off-reservation impacts and costs of tribal gaming.</p> <p><b>Gov. Code, § 12012.90, subd. (e).</b></p> <p><b>Gov. Code, § 12012.85.</b></p>	<p>19.</p>

**UNDISPUTED FACTS RELEVANT TO THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**OF THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT COMBINED WITH**  
**PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE (FAC)**  
**[PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE]**

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>1. Under the Compacts, the Commission is required to collect license fees from gaming tribes, deposit them in the RSTF, and, under the Compacts and Government Code sections 12012.75 and 12012.90, make quarterly payments of those funds according to the Compact's specified distribution plans.</p> <p><b>Gov. Code, §§ 12012.75; 12012.90;</b></p> <p><b>Compact §§ 4.3.2, 4.3.2.1 (Ex. A to Req. for Jud. Not. (RJN)); see also Decl. of Sylvia Cates (Cates Decl.) ¶ 2.</b></p>	<p>1.</p>

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>2. The Compacts and Government Code provide that quarterly payments shall be made to Non-Compact Tribes, noncompact tribes, and eligible recipient Indian tribes, respectively—these are alternative and functionally equivalent designations of federally-recognized California Indian tribes that operate fewer than 350 slot machines.</p> <p><i>(Id.)</i></p>	2.
<p>3. The Commission administers the RSTF in the nominal capacity of “trustee,” for the purpose of receiving, depositing, and disbursing the funds on a quarterly basis to Non-Compact Tribes.</p> <p><b>Compact, § 4.3.2, subd. (a)(ii) (Ex. A to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 2.</b></p>	3.
<p>4. Aside from its duties as administrator of the RSTF, the Commission has no discretion “with respect to the use or disbursement of the [RSTF] funds.”</p> <p><b>Compact, § 4.3.2.1, subd. (b) (Ex. A to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 2.</b></p> <p>This language has been clarified in later compacts. <b>See Tribal-State Compact Between the State of California and the Pinoleville Pomo Nation, § 5.1, subd. (a) (Ex. F to RJN; see also Cates Decl. ¶ 7.</b></p>	4.
<p>5. The Miwok Tribe is a federally-recognized Indian tribe that operates fewer than 350 slot machines, and thus qualifies as a Non-Compact Tribe under the Compacts and Government Code.</p> <p><b>First Amended Complaint Combined With Petition for Writ of Mandate, at p. 3 ¶ 6.</b></p>	5.
<p>6. The <i>Salazar</i> case was filed on January 24, 2011, by the California Valley Miwok Tribe (consisting of different individuals than the</p>	6.

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>Burley Faction that is the plaintiff in this action), the Tribal Council, Yakima Dixie, Velma Whitebear, Antonia Lopez, Michael Mendibles, Evelyn Wilson, and Antone Azevedo (collectively referred to herein as the "D.C. Plaintiffs"). The <i>Salazar</i> case challenges Assistant Secretary of the Interior (ASI) (Indian Affairs) Larry Echo Hawk's December 10, 2010 decision recognizing the Burley Faction as the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p><b>Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. C to RJN. See also Docket (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. G to RJN.)</b></p>	
<p>7. As a result of <i>Salazar's</i> filing, ASI Echo Hawk withdrew his December 2010 decision for reconsideration, and then reissued it with modifications on August 31, 2011 (August 31 Decision). On October 17, 2011, the D.C. Plaintiffs filed a first amended complaint that challenges ASI Echo Hawk's August 31 Decision.</p> <p><b>Letter, Echo Hawk to Dixie dated April 1, 2011 (Ex. D to RJN); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 5.</b></p> <p><b>Echo Hawk decision dated August 31, 2011 (Ex. E to RJN); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 6.</b></p> <p><b>First Amended Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. H to RJN.)</b></p>	<p>7.</p>
<p>8. By its express terms, the August 31 Decision is stayed pending the outcome of <i>Salazar</i>.</p> <p><b>Echo Hawk decision dated August 31, 2011 (Ex. E to RJN, at p. 8); see also Cates Decl., ¶ 6.</b></p>	<p>8.</p>
<p>9. At the present time, as evidenced by the <i>Salazar</i> case, a dispute exists as to the composition and leadership of the Miwok Tribe.</p>	<p>9.</p>

<u><b>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b></u>	<u><b>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</b></u>
<b>First Amended Complaint (<i>Salazar</i>) (Ex. H to RJN.</b>	
10. On the one hand, the Miwok Tribe may consist only of the Burley Faction, consisting of five members, or, on the other hand, it may consist of a much larger group of Indians, possibly including up to 242 adult members.  ( <i>Id.</i> )	10.
11. Depending upon the outcome of the <i>Salazar</i> case, the BIA may, or may not, take final action recognizing the Miwok Tribe to consist of the Burley Faction and recognizing Silvia Burley as the Tribal Chairperson.  ( <i>Id.</i> )	11.
12. The Commission makes no independent determinations on the merits of intra-tribal leadership disputes.  <b>Decl. of Tina Littleton (Littleton Decl.), ¶ 3.</b>	12.
13. The Commission takes no position on the merits of intra-tribal leadership disputes.  <b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 4.</b>	13.
14. When uncertainty exists as to a Non-Compact Tribe's authorized leadership, the Commission, as administrator of the RSTF, defers to the BIA's determinations.  <b>Littleton Decl, ¶ 5.</b>	14.
15. Because the BIA deemed it unorganized and lacking a Tribal Chairperson and, for that reason, suspended PL 638 contract funding disbursement to the Miwok Tribe in 2005, the Commission suspended its disbursement of quarterly RSTF payments, pending BIA's recognition of an authorized Miwok Tribe leader or leadership group with which to	15.

<b><u>Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</u></b>	<b><u>Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence</u></b>
<p>conduct its government-to-government business—as evidenced either by BIA's resumption of PL 638 funding, or other BIA action.</p> <p><b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 6.</b></p>	
<p>16. As of this date, the BIA has not recognized an authorized leader or leadership group for the Miwok Tribe, nor has the BIA resumed disbursing PL 638 funds to the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p><b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 7.</b></p>	16.
<p>17. As of this date, the Commission is holding accrued quarterly RSTF payments totaling \$8,763,001.99, plus interest in the amount of \$420,246.17, for eventual disbursement to the Miwok Tribe.</p> <p><b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 8.</b></p>	17.
<p>18. The Commission will promptly disburse the accrued RSTF payments to the Miwok Tribe once the BIA has identified the Miwok Tribe's authorized leader or leadership group.</p> <p><b>Littleton Decl., ¶ 9.</b></p>	18.
<p>19. The Legislature has provided that shortfalls in the RSTF (which would otherwise preclude disbursing a total of \$1.1M per year to each Non-Compact Tribe) are backfilled from the Special Distribution Fund, which, to the extent not used for that purpose are used for the public benefit to mitigate the off-reservation impacts and costs of tribal gaming.</p> <p><b>Gov. Code, § 12012.90, subd. (e).</b></p> <p><b>Gov. Code, § 12012.85.</b></p>	19.

1 Dated: March 6, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

2 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
3 SARA J. DRAKE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
4 WILLIAM L. WILLIAMS, JR.  
Deputy Attorney General  
5 T. MICHELLE LAIRD  
Deputy Attorney General

6  
7 

8 NEIL D. HOUSTON  
9 Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Defendant*

10  
11 SA2008300115  
31635622.docx  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28