

| EXHIBIT NO. | PAGES                 |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| Exhibit 1   | Pages 000001 - 000002 |
| Exhibit 2   | Pages 000003 - 000011 |
| Exhibit 3   | Pages 000012 - 000015 |
| Exhibit 4   | Pages 000016 - 000018 |
| Exhibit 5   | Pages 000019 - 000022 |
| Exhibit 6   | Pages 000023 - 000024 |
| Exhibit 7   | Pages 000025 - 000037 |
| Exhibit 8   | Pages 000038 - 000039 |
| Exhibit 9   | Pages 000040 - 000045 |
| Exhibit 10  | Pages 000046 - 000048 |

# **EXHIBIT 1**

**000001**

RANCHERIA CERTIFICATE OF TITLE

Name of Rancheria: Lytton Rancheria Tract No. 1

Grantor: R. A. Gobbi and Ethel Gobbi, husband and wife

Grantee: United States of America

Date Purchased ~~at Executive Order~~ June 14, 1926 Grant Deed

Deed Recorded: I.C. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Vol. 23 Page 21 & 22 County Sonoma

State California Vol. 169 Page 6 & 7 Date March 16, 1927

Title Insurance: \_\_\_\_\_ Policy No. 3917 Title Co. Western Title Insurance Co.

Accepted By: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Property:

See Attachment.

Water Rights:

Mineral Rights:

All minerals owned by the United States of America.

# **EXHIBIT 2**

**000003**



Sacramento Indian Agency  
California

March 17, 1939

To: The Commissioner of Indian Affairs  
Washington, D.C.

RE: SACRAMENTO INDIAN AGENCY: THE SUTTER COUNTY LAND

Sir:

There is a somewhat tense situation among Sutter County  
Indians over a question of land assignment on Lytton Rancheria,  
with number three bonded against Bert Steele and John Myers, so I  
will not set the situation in full.

On July 23, 1926, Mr. E. J. Merritt, Assistant Commissioner of  
Indian Affairs, approved the purchase of 50 acres now land in on  
the Lytton Rancheria, for \$10,000, to be paid from three funds:

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| "Purchase of Land for Landless Indians in California<br>(without year)," - - - - - | \$2,500. |
| "Purchase of Land for Landless Indians in California,<br>1926" - - - - -           | 6,500.   |
| "Purchase of Land for Landless Indians in California,<br>1927" - - - - -           | 1,000.   |

The deed reads as follows, so far as essentials go:

GRANT DEED

"For value received, we, E.A. Cobbi and Ethel F. Cobbi,  
husband and wife,

"GRANT TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"all that real property situate in the Rancho Sgtoyee,  
County of Sutter, State of California, described as follows

(follows description by notes and bounds)

46

Note that the deed runs to the United States, that the purchase was made "for Landless Indians in California," and that no tribe or band is mentioned in the deed.

For more than ten years after completion of this land purchase, no Indian made any use of it. But the files show the following:

THE UNIVERSITY STATE  
OF CALIFORNIA  
1913: IN PUBLIC INDUSTRIAL HOSES AND BARN  
Lytton, Colusa County  
California

December 1, 1923

Mr L. L. Harrington,  
Superintendent of Interior & Indian Affairs,  
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:-

We are looking for a piece of land to grow corn for feeding our dairy. Right close to us at the Lytton station is fifty acres, which I understand belongs to the Indian department, which lies idle. It has never been cultivated for some years. The soil is very suitable for growing corn. As it is very close to our institution, which, as possibly you know, cares for the delinquent and underprivileged boys of the state, of which we have some two hundred. We would like to cultivate that land and put in corn to be used as I have previously stated.

Would you please let us have a line, advising us what the possibilities are of us operating this particular piece of land.

(Signed) W. G. Whitte  
Epigadier,  
Superintendent

Such use by the Salvation Army was approved by the Assistant Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of the Interior on Dec. 17, 1925.

On February 10, 1937, I received the following:

Feb. 9, 1937

Sacramento Indian Agency:

Would it be possible for I, Bert Steele, as my wife is a Sonoma Co. Indian, to build a house on the land near Lytton Station, as we were flooded out of a home. It has been impossible for us so far to find a home to rent. Please let me know soon as possible.

(Signed) Bert Steele,  
PO Box 92,  
Holdsburg, California

Inquiry revealed that the Salvation Army was still using Lytton Rancheria; that no Indian ever had lived on it; that Bert Steele <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ a 1/4 blood Indian with a reputation for industry, living in the town nearest said rancheria; and married, as he said, to a Sonoma County Pomo Indian woman. I, therefore, wrote him the same day his letter arrived, authorizing him to build a home on the rancheria. Shortly thereafter I served notice on the Salvation Army that their permit to use the place would be terminated as soon as they removed the crop then growing.

Lytton Rancheria is an irregular shaped tract, with one parcel of 16 acres off by itself in the northeast corner. As much of this corner is low and wet, I told Steele I would assign him

this 16 acres, out of which he might get 10 acres that are cultivable. I further told Steele that if he had any relatives or friends who were desirous of building a home and cultivating land, to send them around to see me, because it was embarrassing for the Government to be buying more land for California Indians while much already bought was growing weeds or leased to white men.

Steele built a one-room cabin with his own money in 1937 and moved in. Out of the last Rehabilitation fund I then made him a grant of \$350 for materials out of which he built, with his own hands and the help of his sons, the house in which he now lives. This was finished in July of 1938. Our Roads Division shaped up and travelled a road to his house. Our Irrigation Division has drilled two wells, ~~rather than~~ one in the 10 acre tract where Steele lives, the other at the south end of the property.

Steele's brother-in-law, John Myers, a Stewart's Point, Sonoma County, Paico, married to a charming Indian girl from Sedona Bay, came to me and was given permission to build his home on the south end of the rancharia. I promised to assign him 10 acres of land to cultivate. He built his home in November, 1938; moved in during the first week in December. It is just a small one-room frame cabin, built entirely with his own money without assistance from Government.

The chronology of these events is somewhat important.

Steel built his house in 1937. It wasn't until the end of 1938 that the first protest was made. Steele had been on the place for over a year, and they all know it, before anyone objected.

Sacramento, Dec 6, 1938.

Mr Roy Nash, Supt.  
Sacramento Indian Agency

Dear Mr Nash:

We, the undersigned members of the Geyserville Band of Indians from the Dry Creek Rancheria, Sonoma County, called as a delegation to see you this morning but found that you were not in. What we called for specifically was to protest against allowing Mr. Bert Steele, and others not members of the Dry Creek Band of Indians, to live on the tract of land near the Lytton school house, which was purchased several years ago for the Dry Creek Indians of the Geyserville Band of Indians.

(He goes on to say that neither Supt Dorrington nor Supt Lipps would let them build on the rancheria unless they put up houses of a fairly good standard.)

We now find that the Indian Agency has allowed Mr Bert Steele to move on the property and erect his house, and we do not consider him a member of the Dry Creek or Geyserville Band of Indians. We also believe that he was given a piece of land some place else and has had his opportunity and sold his rights at Covelo. We feel that he should have come to us first before he got permission to build on the land.

Also, a man by the name of John Wesley Myers has erected a one-room cabin on the property. We understand Myers has a piece of land at Stewarts Point and is a member of the Stewarts Point Band of Pomo Indians.

If Mr Steele had treated us decent, we would have had no objections for him to live there, as we were not using the land; but he told us that we were degraded people and that we did not know how to handle our own affairs, and as the land was bought for us in the first place, we feel we should have some say as to

who is allowed to live on the property. In order that you may verify the statements we have given you regarding Mr Dorrington's instructions to us, if you will contact Mrs. Belle Lorouff, who gets her mail at Coyserville and who, at one time, was President of the Womens Clubs of Sonoma County, it is felt that she will tell you the same as we have, how Mr Dorrington instructed us regarding building on the property.

We have also heard that Mr Steele said that 16 acres of the land had been allotted to him for his own use.

Quite a few of the Coyserville Indians would move to Lytton if given the opportunity. There are approximately eight houses at Coyserville, and there are approximately 80 members of the group. The others have no homes and live any place they can find a house for shelter.

Will you kindly let us hear from you as to what action you can take regarding this matter?

SIGNED: ~~Manuel~~ Manuel Soriova

Stephen Smith

Joe Williams

Alfred Elgin

On receipt of the above, I did what of course I should have done before putting Steele on the land,- got out the voluminous files and familiarized myself with the history. The above statement is about correct. In the agitation for the purchase of this tract, the Coyserville and Dry Creek Indians were in everybody's mind; Congressman Lea was in on it and will remember.

Also it is true that Egert Steel is an outsider. His mother was a half-blood Pit River; his father a half-blood Hgmelackie.

Steele was allotted in Round Valley, 10 acres in the valley and 50 acres mountain. The valley allotment was entirely in the bed of Short Creek and when Steele sold it for \$40 he got more than it

was worth. The mountain allotment was worthless except as part of  
some large grazing unit. He got fee patents and sold both in 1920.  
His wife is Fono and from Sonoma County.

The other fellow, Myers, does hail originally from the  
Stewarts Point Rancheria on the coast, a coast that is absolutely  
worthless. All the Indians will have to be moved from there. We  
have this year driven two deep wells and no water can be located.

On the 10th of February, Mr Fred Baker, Land Field Agent, and  
myself met all the Indians of this district in Mendocino. It was  
as heated a session as I have attended in some time. There had  
been a lot of loose talk about shooting Steele; the children in  
school were telling his children that they would never live to  
drink the water from the wells we were drilling, etc. etc.

Steele countered by getting himself sworn in as a deputy sheriff,  
and keeping his rifle handy and his powder dry.

Now, legally, since the land was bought under the appropriation  
"Landless Indians of California" with no tribe or band mentioned  
in the deed, of course I had the right to settle any landless  
Indian thereon. There has been no legal error on my part,  
although I freely admit the tactical error. But since Steele has  
built his house, occupied it for a year and a half, ploughed up  
his ground and planted his crops, I cannot see the Government  
permitting him to be run off by threats of bodily injury. I have  
told both Steele and Myers just to sit tight. The whole thing

is much ado about nothing.

For the land itself is not worth squabbling over. We paid it at least twice what is worth. The idea of its being a home for 50 Indians is preposterous. I wouldn't think of putting more than four families on the place.

The practical question is, what can we do toward rehabilitating those homeless Seneca County Indians somewhere else?

Unfortunately, the Coopersville band on the rancheria voted against the Indian Reorganization Act; so present funds cannot be used for purchasing additional land for them. There were 50 eligible voters at the original election; the vote was 3 for; 17 against.

That being the case, the only practical solution is for Congressman Lea to introduce a bill authorizing a special rehabilitation fund for Seneca County. It is in his district and he is very much interested in working out a solution. The Department has not favored this procedure in regard to the Auburn Indians, but I see no alternative. It is this, or waiting for the award from the Court of Claims.

Sincerely,

ROY NASH

Superintendent

Hon. Clarence F. Lea  
House of Representatives  
Washington



# EXHIBIT 3

000012

January 29, 1927.

370.3  
Lytton Ranch

Mrs. Belle Leroux,  
Geyserville,  
Sonoma County,  
California.

My dear Mrs. Leroux:

This will acknowledge receipt of your valued favor of the 25th inst., having reference to purchase of land at Lytton for Dry Creek and Geyserville Indians and requesting information as to status of same at this time, stating that you desire to make mention of it in an address you are to deliver before the Woman's Club at Santa Rosa early next week.

You are respectfully advised that from all indications the deal for purchase of land from Mr. Gobbi, near Lyttonville School, will be closed at a reasonably early date, as all matters pertaining to the title were recently submitted to Washington and now only await final action by the authorities.

It is not my intention or desire to keep anything from the public which they are entitled to know, but you are fully aware of the unpleasant results following too much publicity in the past, and while it is not believed further protest will avail anything or disturb the deal, you should nevertheless be very guarded in your remarks, as the Lytton people have been so very unreasonable and inconsistent in the premises that we may expect anything.

Perhaps it will be better to not mention the Lytton land in particular when discussing the subject with your Club, but advise them that the land will undoubtedly be purchased and suggest that they (the Club) prepare to aid along the lines mentioned by you, with the understanding that any aid available is to apply to any land which may be purchased for the Indians; or, it may be that your Club women are broad enough and of such character that they can and will meet the situation squarely and join with a different spirit than have others. You must be the judge. But in

B.L.-2-

any event they should be cautioned not to give out any unnecessary information at this time.

Congressman Lee is fully in accord with our plans and expressed his belief that the Lytton tract is the best we could secure.

With renewed expression of best wishes, I am always

Very sincerely,

L. A. Dorrington,  
Superintendent.

LAD-E

L-1  
50896-26

August 26, 1926.

Commissioner of Indian Affairs,  
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Commissioner:

This has reference to your letter of July 26, 1926, with above citation having reference to purchase of land from Mr. R. A. Gobbi of Healdsburg, California for Dry Creek and Geyserville Band of Indians, Alexander Valley, Sonoma County, California.

As directed therein, the Deeds, Abstracts, (Title Insurance Policy) and voucher in the sum of \$10,000.00 which is in full payment of both tracts are herewith submitted for your consideration and necessary action.

If the Deeds are approved and returned, they will be recorded with the Recorder of Sonoma County, California, and the Abstracts brought down to cover same showing the title to be with the United States.

The matter of taxes for 1926-27 which are now a lien, but not yet due or payable will be taken care of by Mr. Gobbi, he having agreed to deposit with this Agency an amount sufficient to cover same, and we will see that it is done.

There does not appear to be anything further required of this agency at this time.

Trusting this will close the deal, I remain at your command

Yours very truly,

L. A. DORRINGTON  
Superintendent

LAD:EC  
Enc.

000015

80

# **EXHIBIT 4**

**000016**

~~Copy~~

Geyserville, Cal.

Jan. 9, 1939.

Clarence F. Lea,

Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Lea:

You will no doubt remember when several years ago the Dept., at Washington bought a piece of land here near the Litton school house. Now we are having trouble here about it, and I have been requested to write and lay the matter before you in hope some answer will be received explaining the reason for it. Three or four years ago, our people went over to Sacramento asking Mr. Lipp for permission to move onto their land, and was refused on the grounds that the dept., did not wish them to build shaks there and would soon have plans for getting money to build decent houses. They have never heard from that again. This winter, a man named Bert Steel from the Covelo reservation who was undesirable there, tried to get in at the Stewards Point place, and then came over here, together with another man from the Stewards Point reservation, and took 16 acres apiece of the Litton place, built them houses on the most desirable parts of the land and these people hate this man Steel, and most positively resent his coming here, and feel with those who have heard of it that neither one of them have any right on this place, there is bitter feeling and serious trouble will result if something is not done about it soon. A delegation of Indians went to Sacramento about six weeks ago and met with Mr. Hooper, who looked up the papers that proved this land had been bought for them alone and they prepared a protest to put into the hands of the chief of the Dept., Mr. Nash, no answer ever came from it. Then they came to me, thinking I would be listened to. I telephoned to the office at Sac, Mr. Hooper talked to me and said they would look into it. No answer, then the two tribes got up a petition, with the 84 names of the whole two bands, I wrote a letter with it and sent it to Mr. Nash, about 4 weeks ago. No answer as we only asked for information about the right of these men to build there and why our own could not have the place, we should have had some word. Last week 3 Indians went to the office and still got no satisfaction. Jan. 7th the two bands held a protest meeting at the old reservation, and some talking had to be done to prevent violence, last night the delegates came to me again asking that I write to you and perhaps you, at least would write to us at once and say what we are to do. It seems that a man named F. S. Sloth of Lake Port is lending the money for these people to build and so far as our people can find out, gave the men permission to build on the Litton place.

Now the cabin belonging to an Indian named Marion Miranda, of the Wahpo reservation, down along the river toward Healdsburg, burned down while back, and this same Sloth, is to lend him money to come and build on the new place. None of our two bands, the Geyserville and Drycreek bands, that the place was purchased for have had permission to go there and build, and not one of them would live near this Steel. There is very bad blood between them and always has been between those tribes, the one he belongs to and these.

I am begging you, Mr. Lea, to send us an answer at once before there is something done we will all regret explaining the reasons for this trouble. These men, Steel and Meyers planted out hay and a road has been built on the place and

they, our own Indians want their own place and I do not blame them.

This last time the tree Indians went to Sacramento to talk to the U. S. District Attorney, who they thought would give them advice, but he said he was working under Nash and could not give out any information, I was of the opinion that he should give free advice to any one.

I think this covers the situation at present, please answer at once.

Sincerely, ~~us~~

Mrs. Belle Leroux (Signed)

Manuel Cordova       "  
Steven Smith       "  
Joseph Williams     "  
Alfred Elgin       "

Delegates

Geyserville R. 1, Box 150,  
Sonoma Co., Cal.

COPY

# **EXHIBIT 5**

**000019**



See page 3 for  
Continued

REVISED TABULATION OF ELECTION RETURNS ON THE INDIAN  
REORGANIZATION ACT, FROM THE RANCHERIAS UNDER THE  
JURISDICTION OF THE SACRAMENTO INDIAN AGENCY,  
CALIFORNIA, LISTED IN THE ORDER IN WHICH SUCH RETURNS  
WERE RECEIVED AT THE SACRAMENTO OFFICE:

| <u>No.</u> | <u>Rancheria:</u>            | <u>Date</u> | <u>Number<br/>Eligible Voters:</u> | <u>In Favor:</u> | <u>Against:</u> |
|------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1.         | Lookout                      | June 8      | 12                                 | 6                | 2               |
| 2.         | Fort Bidwell                 | " 8         | 41                                 | 27               | 2               |
| 3.         | Alturas                      | " 8         | 13                                 | 6                | 8               |
| 4.         | Likely                       | " 8         | 30                                 | 19               | 1               |
| 5.         | Table Mountain               | " 8         | 16                                 | 2                | 10              |
| 6.         | Big Valley                   | " 8         | 43                                 | 21               | 4               |
| 7.         | Gold Spring                  | " 8         | 47                                 | 0                | 25              |
| 8.         | Sulphur Bank<br>(Lower Lake) | " 8         | 20                                 | 11               | 7               |
| 9.         | Scotts Valley                | " 8         | 17                                 | 0                | 10              |
| 10.        | Croche Creek                 | " 8         | 15                                 | 7                | 3               |
| 11.        | Upper Lake<br>(Hardisty)     | " 8         | 36                                 | 7                | 4               |
| 12.        | Middletown                   | " 8         | 13                                 | 10               | 0               |
| 13.        | East Lake<br>(Robinson)      | " 8         | 46                                 | 19               | 15              |
| 14.        | Coyotte Valley               | " 10        | 8                                  | 0                | 1               |
| 15.        | Pineville                    | " 10        | 51                                 | 29               | 1               |
| 16.        | Potter Valley                | " 10        | 26                                 | 10               | 5               |
| 17.        | Redwood Valley               | " 10        | 15                                 | 16               | 0               |

2- Tabulation Reorganization Election Returns (Cont'd):

| <u>No.</u> | <u>Rancheria:</u>          | <u>Date:</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Eligible Voters:</u> | <u>In Favor:</u> | <u>Against:</u> |
|------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 18.        | North Fork                 | June 10      | 8                                     | 0                | 8               |
| 19.        | Pleayuns                   | " 10         | 11                                    | 5                | 7               |
| 20.        | Griseville                 | " 10         | 25                                    | 14               | 1               |
| 21.        | Sherwood                   | " 10         | 35                                    | 10               | 12              |
| 22.        | Hopland                    | " 10         | 56                                    | 28               | 5               |
| 23.        | Cloverdale                 | " 11         | 20                                    | 10               | 0               |
| 24.        | Laytonville                | " 10         | 20                                    | 7                | 11              |
| 25.        | Alexander Valley           | " 11         | 14                                    | 14               | 0               |
| 26.        | Jackson                    | " 12         | 8                                     | 3                | 5               |
| 27.        | Fuchsams                   | " 11         | 40                                    | 37               | 0               |
| 28.        | Jamestown                  | " 11         | 6                                     | 0                | 5               |
| 29.        | Dry Creek<br>(Gayserville) | " 11         | 40                                    | 8                | 17              |
| 30.        | Colusa                     | " 12         | 35                                    | 25               | 1               |
| 31.        | Big Sandy                  | " 8          | 58                                    | 1                | 25              |
| 32.        | Manchester                 | " 11         | 48                                    | 30               | 0               |
| 33.        | Sheep Ranch                | " 12         | 1                                     | 1                | 0               |
| 34.        | Stewart's Point            | " 11         | 70                                    | 51               | 10              |
| 35.        | Buena Vista                | " 12         | 4                                     | 2                | 0               |
| 36.        | Rumsey                     | " 12         | 11                                    | 10               | 0               |
| 37.        | Taylorville                | " 12         | 4                                     | 2                | 0               |
| 38.        | Burnsville                 | " 12         | 9                                     | 6                | 0               |

3 - Tabulation Reorganization Election Returns (Cont'd):

| <u>No.</u> | <u>Rancheria:</u> | <u>Date:</u> | <u>Number of Eligible Voters:</u> | <u>In Favor:</u> | <u>Against:</u> |
|------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 39.        | Berry Creek       | June 13      | 49                                | 0                | 26              |
| 40.        | Auburn            | " 14         | 33                                | 5                | 16              |
| 41.        | Nevada City       | " 14         | 18                                | 0                | 2               |
| 42.        | Grindstone        | " 14         | 27                                | 11               | 0               |
| 43.        | Wilton            | " 15         | 14                                | 13               | 0               |
| 44.        | Redding           | " 11         | 12                                | 2                | 4               |
| 45.        | Montgomery Creek  | " 10         | 7                                 | 5                | 2               |
| 46.        | Pit River         | " 10         | 2                                 | 0                | 2               |
| 47.        | Peskenta          | " 11         | 26                                | 17               | 0               |
| 48.        | Mooretown         | " 13         | 43                                | 0                | 34              |
| 49.        | Enterprise        | " 13         | 29                                | 7                | 17              |
| 50.        | Strawberry Valley | " 14         | 10                                | 0                | 8               |
| 51.        | Big Bend          | " 10         | 3                                 | 2                | 0               |
| 52.        | Cortina           | " 12         | 23                                | 12               | 0               |

*no record found as to who the additional favor voters were. 3/15/94*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Rancherias in Favor of Act - | 34  |
| " " " Opposed to " -                   | 18  |
| Total voters in favor of Act -         | 551 |
| " " opposed to Act -                   | 294 |

No Returns From:

Reasons:

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Shingle Springs - | Election held, no returns received. |
| Santa Rosa -      | Indians refused to hold election.   |
| Cedarville -      | No Indians living there.            |
| Lytton -          | No Indians living there.            |
| Sebastopol -      | No Indians living there.            |
| Strathmore -      | No Indians living there.            |
| Millerton -       | No Indians living there.            |
| Calfax -          | No Indians living there.            |

# **EXHIBIT 6**

**000023**

5-11-38 - Lytton Rancheria.

MAR 31 1939  
6861 TS HAW

MEMORANDUM

Subj: LYTTON RANCHERIA

John Myers is son of Sarah Knapp (Kashia)

Wife is Dolores Santos, daughter of Mary Santos, Windsor  
" of Joe Santos, Jenner

Myers address is Box 403, Healdsburg.

Nash

# **EXHIBIT 7**

**000025**

August 11, 1944

Sacramento Indian Agency  
 Sacramento 2, California

Attention: John G. Rockwell, Superintendent

Dear Sir:

We, the following members of the Bert Steele family, had a conference at Lytton Rancheria August 10. We agreed that Edward Steele should take over his father's property and assignment at Lytton Rancheria with the understanding that he would provide a home for his mother and sisters as long as his sisters are minor and dependents. We relinquish any claim upon any of Bert Steele's property at Lytton.

✓ Mrs. Mary Steele  
 ✓ Eleanor Steele  
 ✓ Harris Steele  
 ✓ Sarah Steele  
 ✓ Thomas F. Steele  
Rosaline Madeg  
William Bert Steele

Application For Assignment for Use.

Application is hereby made for an assignment of the following described portion of the Lytton Rancheria, for the undersigned applicant.

Starting at the northeast corner of the Lytton Rancheria and following the boundary west 9.78 chains; thence south 17.60 chains; thence west approximately 520 feet to the division line of the assignment of J. W. Meyers; thence south 740 feet; thence east to the boundary of the rancheria, a distance of approximately 520 feet; thence north about 570 feet to a designated corner of the rancheria; then following the boundary north 50  $\frac{3}{4}^{\circ}$  east 13.34 chains; thence north 1  $\frac{3}{4}^{\circ}$  west 11.50 chains to the point of beginning. This land is all in the part of the rancheria that is described as tract No. 1, and contains about 24 acres.

It is understood that this assignment for use will be in full effect and force as long as the land is used for farming purposes by me or my heirs, and that in the event the land is not used for such purposes, other than occupancy only, or due to the continued absence by me from the rancheria and neglect of the land, that the Sacramento Indian Agency reserves the right to cancel this assignment.

It is also understood that any improvements that I place on the land will belong to me or my heirs. Should the assignment be cancelled it will be my privilege to remove or sell the improvements within ninety (90) days.

Edward Steele

Aug 11 1944  
Date.

Approved:

John G. Rockwell

John G. Rockwell

Superintendent, Sacramento Indian Agency

Aug. 16, 1944  
Date



The above "Application For Assignment for Use" was made by Bert Steele November 18, 1943. At the time this application was made, Mr. Brodhead held a conference with Mr. Steele and with Mr. John W. Meyers. In this conference, it was agreed that the description of the land listed above would be reserved for Mr. Steele.

This application was considered in the office and was agreed to. It was typed up and was just ready to be sent to Mr. Steele for signature when we learned of his death.

Edward Steele, a son of Mr. Bert Steele, has, throughout the time that Mr. Bert Steele resided at Lytton, helped his father on the place. In addition to that, he has assisted his parents since he has been in the Army. He is interested in farming the place, and he also wants to take care of his mother and sisters.

This plan is agreeable to the family of Bert Steele in so far as the various members have been able to be contacted. Mrs. Steele and her daughters want to continue to live at Lytton and the family wants to have the assignment made to Edward Steele as a home for him, his mother, and sisters. It is understood that if Mr. Edward Steele receives this assignment that he will take over what property Bert Steele possessed together with what obligations he had.

The assignment is made under the understanding that it will be used as a home and farm for Edward Steele and his mother and sisters.

Attached to this assignment is a letter expressing approval by the members of the Steele family that Edward be given this assignment.

Edward Steele

Aug 11, 1944  
Date

Approved: John G. Rockwell  
John G. Rockwell,  
Superintendent, Sacramento Indian Agency

August 14, 1944  
Date

Application For Assignment For Use.

Application is hereby made for an assignment of the following described portion of the Lytton Rancheria, for the undersigned applicant.

1. The southern part of the Lytton Rancheria described in the land description of this rancheria as "Tract No. 2", containing 5 acres.
2. A part of the remainder of the Rancheria described as "Tract No. 1", and described as follows: Starting at the <sup>south point</sup> northeast corner of tract No. 2, and following the boundary, a distance of 19.6 chains, or 1,289.6 feet; then east along the boundary line a distance of 483 feet; then south 740 feet; then east 483 feet to the side of the road that leads to the northern part of the rancheria; then south along the road 310 feet; then west 250 feet; then south 243 feet to the northeast corner of tract No. 2; leaving a roadway approximately 40 feet wide along the east boundary of the assignment. This lot contains approximately 19 acres.

It is understood that this assignment for use will be in full effect and force as long as the land is used for farming <sup>or other</sup> purposes, by me or my heirs, and that in the event the land is not used for such purposes, other than occupancy only, or due to the continued absence by me from the rancheria and neglect of the land, that the Sacramento Indian Agency reserves the right to cancel this assignment.

It is also understood that any improvements that I place on the land will belong to me or my heirs. Should the assignment be cancelled it will be my privilege to remove or sell the improvements within ninety (90) days.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

John G. Rockwell

John G. Rockwell,  
Superintendent, Sacramento Indian Agency

John Wesley Myers  
D. Louis Victor Myers

April 8, 1944  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date.

3093. Lytton Rancheria

Sacramento Indian Agency  
Sacramento 2, California

September 7, 1943

---

Mr. E. J. Maysee  
Foster Ranch  
Hopland, California

Dear Mr. Maysee:

Mr. Brodhead recently contacted Mr. Gilbert in Healdsburg relative to your request to building a cabin on the Lytton Rancheria.

I think you understand that it is the desire of the Government that all land that is useable on our rancherias be used. Consequently, we do not like to make assignments except where the individual has a clear-cut plan for the use of the land assigned to him.

In the second place, one must also consider whether or not the land is at the present time being used by someone else. Until this matter can be thoroughly discussed with Mr. Myers and with Mr. Bert Steele, who are residing upon the Lytton Rancheria, this office does not care to make an assignment there.

I wonder if it would be better if you could find a little piece of land somewhere at a reasonable price and build your cabin on it. In many respects I should think this would be more satisfactory to you.

Sincerely yours,

John G. Rockwell  
Superintendent

JGR/mft

000030

41

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS  
FIELD SERVICE

P. O. Box 475,  
Santa Rosa, California  
April 10, 1940

File No. 3073-*Lytton*  
Subject *Harold J. Brodhead*  
H-Rec'd APR 11 1940  
SACRAMENTO INDAGCY  
To *F. L.*

Mr. Roy Nash, Superintendent,  
Sacramento Indian Agency,  
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Nash:

It never rains, but it pours. One time it is Bert Steele asking about Lytton Rancheria. Next, it is Wesley Meyers. This time it is Meyers. He is once more asking about permission to sell his improvements and move. Again I explained that his moving might forfeit any rights to other land. I did not tell him it would but that it might. But there are many questions in his mind. I can not answer them.

Meyers says he was told to not do anything, after the question of who was eligible to live on the land was raised by the Geyserville Indians. He says he was promised a decision later that he never received. He has never received any official statement that he is entitled to the land. Under these conditions he feels that he cannot farm or improve the land.

He told me one thing that I did not know before. that Steele had told him he was using too much land last year, and put stakes down through his grain field. A survey, showing divisions would prevent this, of course.

Meyers complaints were so many that I see no advantage of attempting to write them all to you. He says he would like to talk to you personally, but does not want to make the drive into Sacramento without having reasonable assurance of finding you. He says that he would drive in and talk with you if he can have an appointment with you.

I write this at his request.

*Harold J. Brodhead*  
Harold J. Brodhead,  
Farm Agent

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS  
FIELD SERVICE

File No. ....  
Subject .....

H-Rec'd .....

SACRAMENTO INDIAN AGENCY

To

Santa Rosa, California, March 3, 1940

Mr. Roy Nash,  
Superintendent, Sacramento Indian Agency,  
Sacramento, California.

Dear Mr. Nash:

Relative to your verbal instructions given me in your office February 20th, to contact John Meyers and Bert Steele on the Lytton Rancheria, I have the following to report:

I made contacts with these men March 2nd. Mr. Meyers is quite anxious to sell out and leave the Lytton Rancheria. Of course, the house was built with his own money without Government aid. He says an Indian by the name of Glen Martin is anxious to buy the house and take over his assignment on the Lytton Rancheria. Both Mr. Meyers and Mr. Martin are asking if this is permissible, and asked me to procure the information for them. Mr. Meyers says that he does not want any more of the land now standing idle on the Lytton Rancheria to farm. In my conversation with Mr. Meyers I explained to him it would not be possible at this time for him to procure an individual home as he had asked about during ~~the~~ previous conversation.

I contacted Bert Steele later in the day on March 2nd, first asking him what information he wanted concerning the unassigned land in the same Rancheria. Bert told me he wanted to farm it, and at this time had a crop on part of it. He wanted to be assured of an opportunity to harvest the crop. He also, of his own free will, stated he wanted to crop this land and use the money to aid in paying his reimbursable loan. He says that he understands that if the privilege be given him to farm the land that it would not mean an agreement to assign the land to him.

Very truly yours,

*Harold J. Brodhead*

Harold J. Brodhead,  
Farm Agent.

MEMO. FOR FILE:

307.3 Lytton ←

George James from Stewarts Point (who has been working in Sonoma County) was in and was asking about whether or not his daughter, May James Muro, who is married to a Mexican Indian and has 3 small children, (address: Gen. Del., Healdsburg) could move into the Wesley Meyers place if he would consent either on free use or rental basis, on the Lytton Rancheria.

Wesley Meyers has been in hospital at Santa Rosa but it is not known whether he is there now or not. He is a brother of Mrs. Bert Steele, but it is believed he and Bert Steele had some trouble. Bert Steele has 16 acres at Lytton and Meyers had about 8.

Mr. Hooper told him there was absolutely no chance for his daughter to go on this place as her husband was not an Indian. He seemed to be satisfied with that.

Sept. - 1940

000033

44

COPY

P. O. Box 92  
Healdsburg, California  
March 23, 1950.

To the Department of Indian Affairs  
Sacramento, California

Re: Lytton Rancheria, Healdsburg, California.

Gentlemen:

The undersigned, widow, Mary Steele, and children of Bert Steele, deceased, respectfully represent:

That upon the death of Bert Steele in the year 1943, he and his family were in possession of a twenty-five acre ranch at and near Lytton Rancheria, and in about the year 1945, by mutual agreement among the surviving widow and the children, the ranch was assigned over to Edward Steele, son of Bert Steele, deceased, under an arrangement whereby he was to diligently work and operate the ranch, pay his mother's obligations, and maintain or help maintain the mother, Mary Steele, and under said arrangement he was to make repairs and generally care for the property.

That for a period of the last three years, said Edward Steele has neglected and failed to carry out the arrangement and trusts aforesaid; that he has spent very little time on the ranch during the last three years, and has failed to help his mother in the proper respect and has contributed very little to her maintenance and support, and has paid none of her obligations.

That it is the desire of the undersigned that the arrangement as above stated be terminated and that the twenty-five acre ranch above mentioned be assigned to the mother Mary Steele and Daniel Steele, her son, under a working arrangement that is satisfactory to the Department of Indian Affairs specifically providing that Daniel T. Steele will properly operate the ranch, keep the buildings in repair and the land under cultivation and provide a place for the mother to live on said ranch, pay all of her obligations and in all other respects provide a home for her on said premises.

Accepted and Approved:

(SGD) L. F. BERGER

Acting Area Director for California

Mrs. Mary Steele

Mother

Miss Eleanor Steele

Sarah Steele Gonzalez

Edward C. Steele

Mr. Romeo Freer Steele

Loris Steele Shively

000034

35

300  
DC:leh  
064-Lytton Rancheria

Sacramento Area Office  
Sacramento 4, California

May 24, 1950

Mr. Daniel T. Steele  
c/o Edward C. Steele  
P. O. Box 92  
Healdsburg, California

Dear Mr. Steele:

The transfer of the assignment on the Lytton Rancheria from Edward Steele to yourself and your mother, Mary Steele, in accordance with the petition of March 23 is hereby approved. A copy of the approved petition is attached.

Sincerely yours,

(SGD) L. F. BERGER

For JAMES B. RING  
Acting Area Director

Enclosure

000035

33



LYTTON RANCHERIA---  
Assignments  
August 6, 1953

---

FOREWARD

Assignments on the Lytton Rancheria were an administrative problem for a long time. The land was purchased about 1925. It was not used by any Indians until 1937, when Superintendent Nash gave Bert Steele permission to use the lower end of Tract #2 of the purchase. Rehabilitation funds were used to purchase building materials, and Bert Steele, built a cabin thereon, for his use. Two combination irrigation and domestic water systems were developed on the Rancheria; one of them near the site of Steele's cabin, and one on the upper end of the purchase on Tract #2.

Somewhere about this time John W. (Wesley) Myers was permitted to use Tract #2, 5 acres in size.

Then troubles developed. Indians on Dry Creek, Geyserville, and Alexander Valley, by petition, arguments, and fights, protested the permitting of these lands to Steele and Myers, neither one of them being Indians of those groups. Also Steele, protested Myers use of the 5 acres, even though he was a brother-in-law of Myers.

The use of the land by Myers and Steele was clarified by Mr. Nash, through the Central Office. (Office letter of April 8, 1939 - File Reference 17384-39, Lytton Files). Steele and Myers dissension continued. At one time Myers was going to move. Finally Superintendent Nash verbally told Steele he had all the land he (Steele) was going to get. This was stated before the undersigned.

Myers built his own home with his own funds. But the land where he lived was of gravelly texture, and limited in use. And just below (north) of the 5 acre tract was unused land of better texture. Myers verbally requested the use of more of this land, giving his reason that he would purchase calves and grow them out to feeder age and sell them and by so doing increase his income. About November 20, 1944, the undersigned went to Lytton as instructed by Superintendent Rockwell, and by use of a tape measure attempted to divide the entire tract in two equal sized pieces of lands. A penned sketch of this attempted division is also in the Lytton Files. It was Superintendent Rockwell's intention to assign the lands as divided to Myers and Steele. But within a week Steele was dead, so for a while the assignments were stymied. Myers did not wait for a formal assignment, but immediately fenced his proposed portion, and did purchase or otherwise acquired dairy calves to utilize the land. He was also raising chickens, and was farming some of the land for grain, for feed.

The Lytton files show that he made application for this tract April 8, 1944 (Application prepared in this office). The assignment was approved by Superintendent Rockwell, but date of approval was not shown.

The Steele family was still living in the buildings on the lower end of the tract, but not using the lands.

Edward Steele, son, who was in the Armed Forces when the land was divided, then applied for the land, with the understanding he would maintain a home there for his mother and sisters. This was approved by Superintendent Rookwell, August 16, 1944. But Edward Steele, who had been disabled in World War II, and in the undersigned's opinion was mentally disturbed by the World War II experiences did not comply with his agreement, so by petition of the Steele family including Edward Steele, it was reassigned to Daniel T. Steele, and his mother Mary Steele. Date of petition March 23, 1950. This assignment was approved by L. F. Berger, Acting Area Director, approval undated, but letter of transmittal dated May 24, 1950.

Please bear in mind this division was made by use of a tape measure only, so the land will have to be surveyed accurately and plotted according to a survey.

PRESENT RECOGNIZED ASSIGNEES:

John Wesley Myers and wife, Dolores Santos Myers  
Mary Steele, and son, Daniel T. Steele

*Harold Stoddard*

# EXHIBIT 8

000038

*Copy for  
Mr. John W. Meyer  
Notar. M. Meyer*

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Sacramento Area Office  
Sacramento 4, California

August 19, 1958

For several years, persons holding assignments on Rancherias in California have been anxious to have clear title to the lands they are occupying so they can feel secure in the ownership of their homes. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been sympathetic to these desires but was not in position to grant such requests until the Congress enacted enabling legislation.

Through the efforts of the assignees on the Rancherias, working with their Congressmen, and the cooperation of this Bureau, the present Congress enacted the necessary legislation and the law was signed by President Eisenhower on August 18, 1958. A copy of the Act is enclosed with this letter. The contents of the Act are generally familiar to you, since representatives from this office have discussed the subject with you on several occasions, but we ask you to read it carefully and discuss it with the members of your Rancherias as several things will have to be done before we can comply with your request for a clear fee simple title to your property.

You must first determine who you think is entitled to a share in the rancheria, how you want the property divided, what you want to keep as community property to be operated by an association or corporation which we will help you set up, and any other details that occur to you. You have waited so long for this legislation that we hope you can get busy right away and immediately call whatever meetings of your people are necessary to arrive at definite conclusions. You will note the Act authorizes an expenditure of \$509,235, but the Congress did not appropriate that money and we will have to proceed with the funds now on hand. This will be adequate for the time being and we are anxious to get started.

Representatives from this office will get in touch with you in the near future to arrange meetings to help you develop your plans and we hope you will have discussed the matter among yourselves and decided how you want to proceed before such a meeting is arranged.

Sincerely yours,



Area Director

Enclosure

000039

# EXHIBIT 9

000040

A PLAN FOR DISTRIBUTION OF THE ASSETS OF THE  
LYTTON RANCHERIA, ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS  
OF PUBLIC LAW 85-671, ENACTED BY THE 85TH CONGRESS,  
APPROVED AUGUST 18, 1958

The Lytton Rancheria is comprised of 50 acres, located in Sonoma County, California. (A legal description of the rancheria is attached.) The land is almost level and is used principally for homesites. Each homesite has been provided with an ample domestic water supply from private wells and no further improvement for water is necessary. U.S. Highway 101 passes within a mile of the rancheria from which a hardtop county road leads to the south boundary. A forty-foot gravel road along the east boundary of the Myers assignment is used by the Steele family. The Steele family, occupants of Lot No. 1, will have need for an easement from the occupants of Lot No. 2 for ingress and egress purposes. The exterior boundaries have been surveyed and corners established. Interior surveys will be needed. The cost of the development of the present water system has been placed as a lien against the rancheria. The homes are in private ownership and no Government buildings are involved. There are no funds on deposit to the credit of the rancheria, either in an Individual Indian Money Account in the Area Office or in the United States Treasury. Those named in this plan are recognized as the only people of the rancheria who hold formal assignments and are entitled to share in the distribution of the property.

No minors will receive deeds in the distribution of the real estate and all adults participating are capable of handling their own affairs. All distributees are fully advised of the opportunity to participate in the vocational training program afforded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and none has indicated any interest.

The Indians of the Lytton Rancheria desire termination under the provisions of Public Law 85-671 and request that the Bureau of Indian Affairs undertake the following actions.

1. Make such surveys as are necessary to convey a merchantable and recordable title to each lot.
2. Furnish each distributee the approximate value of each lot at the time of conveyance.
3. Secure an easement for a forty-foot road right-of-way along the east edge of Lot No. 2 for occupants of Lot No. 1.
4. Cancel all reimbursable indebtedness owing to the United States on account of unpaid construction and/or operation and maintenance charges for water facilities.
5. Convey to individual Indians according to this plan unrestricted title to lands now belonging to the United States, subject to existing rights-of-way, easements or leases. Title will also include such mineral and water rights as are now vested in the United States.

The distributees who will receive title to particular lots and the dependent members of their immediate families are:

| NAME                      | LOT NO. | RELATIONSHIP            | DEATH DATE             | ADDRESS   |              |
|---------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------|
| Mary Steele               | 1       | Joint                   | 4-14-1894              | 725 Hudspeth<br>Santa Rosa, California            |              |
| Edward Steele             |         | Distributee<br>Grandson | 9-17-1950              |   | Same         |
| Daniel T. Steele          | 1       | Joint                   | 2-10-1920              | 561 Alexander Valley Rd<br>Healdsburg, California |              |
| Coral Joyce Steele        |         | Distributee             |                        |   |              |
| Sharon James Steele       |         | Wife                    | 1-15-1932              |   | Same         |
| Daniel Thomas Steele, Jr. |         | Stepdaughter            | 3-10-1955              |   | Same         |
| Janice Elaine Steele      |         | Son                     | 6-16-1954              |   | Same         |
| Bert Steele               |         | Daughter                | 8-24-1956              |   | Same         |
| Doris G. Steele Miller    | 1       | Joint                   | 4-03-1927              | 18181 Hassett Lane<br>Geyserville, California     |              |
| Calvin Miller             |         | Distributee             |                        |   |              |
| Mary Miller               |         | Son<br>Daughter         | 5-10-1944<br>6-12-1949 |   | Same<br>Same |
| Dolores Myers             | 2       | Joint                   | 4-18-1909              | 515 Alexander Valley Rd<br>Healdsburg, California |              |
| Nadine A. James           |         | Distributee<br>Niece    | 12-18-1940             |   | Same         |
| James E. Myers            | 2       | Joint                   | 12-12-1931             | Same  |              |
| James J. Myers            |         | Distributee<br>Son      | 9-02-1952              |   | Same         |

Upon approval of this plan, or a revision thereof, by the Secretary of the Interior and acceptance by a majority of the adult Indian distributees, as provided in Section 2(b) of Public Law 85-671, the distributees and the dependent members of their immediate families listed in this plan shall be the final list of Indians entitled to participate in the distribution of the assets of the Lytton Rancheria, and the rights or beneficial interests in the property of each person.



whose name appears in this list shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed but shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance before the transfer of title to such property.

When the assets of the Lytton Rancheria have been distributed pursuant to this plan and Public Law 85-671, the persons who receive any part of such assets and the dependent members of their immediate families will thereafter not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for these persons because of their status as Indians. All statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall not apply to them, and the laws of the several states shall apply to them in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction. Nothing in this plan, however, shall affect the status of such persons as citizens of the United States.

All provisions of Public Law 85-671 shall be applicable in the execution of this plan and general notice of the contents shall be given by posting a copy of this plan in the Post Office in Healdsburg, Sonoma County, California, by posting a copy in a prominent place on the Lytton Rancheria, by mailing a copy to the head of each individual family participating in this plan and by mailing a copy to any person who advises the Sacramento Area Office that he feels that he may have a material interest in the plan.

This plan was prepared by the Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sacramento Area Office, pursuant to the authority delegated on February 26, 1959, and after consultation with the Indians of the Lytton Rancheria.

Approved, with authority retained to revise or change if appeals are received within 30 days after general notice to this plan is given.

/signed/ H. REX LEE  
Associate Commissioner

Date: May 29, 1959

# **EXHIBIT 10**

**000046**

FEDS

SETTLEMENT SUMMARY

1) We will concede that the Sugar Bowl (Scotts Valley), Chico, Lytton and Guidiville Rancherias were unlawfully terminated and their assets distributed contrary to the Rancheria Act.

2) We will stipulate that the deeds conveyed to the individual Indian distributees are voidable at the option of the individual and the Secretary will take back into trust any distributed lands at the request of the original distributee, a dependent of an original distributee or blood descendant of either.

We are not willing, at this time, to agree to take back the land in trust from just any Indian successor in interest without regard to how that Indian may be or have been connected to the rancheria.

3) We are willing to stipulate that the termination proclamations for each of the rancherias were prematurely published and of no force or effect.

4) We are willing to stipulate that the distributees are not "terminated" and are restored to their prior status as Indians.

5) We are willing to restore the Indians of the rancherias to the same status they had before their purported termination.

6) We are not able at this time to make any commitment with regard to the purchase of lands which were originally conveyed to the Indian distributees and which have passed into non-Indian ownership. The availability of funds to purchase land for Indians is simply too speculative and the needs in California must be balanced against the Bureau's nationwide priorities for such purchases.

7) We are willing to treat the rancheria lands which are returned to trust as having the same status as they had prior to the purported termination, provided we have the written consent of all affected individual Indians to such status on a form approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

8) The Bureau is not yet in a position to make a commitment on priority status for the rancherias in applying for grants to improve the conditions of the homes and lands returned to trust status. We need to have a better understanding of what the specific needs and desires of the rancherias residents are. As you know, we have recently been in touch with Indian Health Service to determine what assistance they can provide. They are aware of the June 3 status conference and the plan to hold settlement discussions following the conference. We expect to have more information from them at that time.