



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, DC 20240

DEC 22 2010

Ms. Sylvia Burley
California Valley Miwok Tribe
10601 Escondido Place
Stockton, California 95212

Dear Ms. Burley:

This letter is to inform you of the Department of the Interior's response to the decision of the Interior Board of Indian Appeals (IBIA) in *California Valley Miwok Tribe v. Pacific Regional Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs*, 51 IBIA 103 (January 28, 2010) (Decision).

The Decision stemmed from Sylvia Burley's appeal of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Pacific Regional Director's April 2, 2007 decision to affirm the Central California Agency Superintendent in his efforts to "assist" the Tribe in organizing a tribal government. In the Decision, the IBIA dismissed each of Ms. Burley's three complaints for lack of jurisdiction.¹ The IBIA did, however, refer Ms. Burley's second claim to my office, because it was in the nature of a tribal enrollment dispute. *Decision*, 51 IBIA at 122.

This letter is intended to address the limited issues raised by Ms. Burley's second complaint, as referred to my office by the IBIA: the BIA's involvement in the Tribe's affairs related to government and membership.

Background

This difficult issue is rooted in the unique history of the California Valley Miwok Tribe. A relatively small number of tribal members had been living on less than 1 acre of land in Calaveras County, California known as the Sheep Ranch Rancheria, since 1916. In 1966, the Department was preparing to terminate the Tribe pursuant to the California Rancheria Termination Act, as part of that dark chapter of Federal Indian policy known as the "Termination Era." As part of this effort, the Department had intended to distribute the assets of the Sheep Ranch Rancheria to Ms. Mabel Dixie, as the only eligible person to receive the assets.

The Department never completed the process of terminating the Tribe, and the Tribe never lost its status as a sovereign federally-recognized tribe.

¹ Ms. Burley's complaints were: 1.) The BIA Pacific Regional Director's April 2, 2007 decision violated the Tribe's FY 2007 contract with the BIA under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, or the Regional Director's decision constituted an unlawful reassumption of the contract; 2.) the Tribe is already organized, and the BIA's offer of assistance constitutes an impermissible intrusion into tribal government and membership matters that are reserved exclusively to the Tribe; and, 3.) the Regional Director erred in stating that the Tribe was never terminated and thus is not a "restored" tribe. *Decision*, 51 IBIA at 104.

In 1998, Yakima Dixie, a tribal member acting as the leader of the Tribe, adopted Sylvia Burley, Rashel Reznor, Anjelica Paulk, and Tristian Wallace as members of the Tribe. At that time, the Department recognized those five individuals, along with Yakima Dixie's brother Melvin, as members of the Tribe. *Decision*, 51 IBIA at 108.

On September 24, 1998, the Superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Central California Agency advised Yakima Dixie, then serving as Tribal Chairman, that Yakima Dixie, Melvin Dixie, Sylvia Burley, Rashel Reznor, Anjelica Paulk, and Tristan Wallace were able to participate in an effort to reorganize under the Indian Reorganization Act. *California Valley Miwok Tribe v. United States*, 424 F. Supp. 2d. 197, 198 (D.D.C. 2006). In that same letter, the Superintendent also recommended that the Tribe establish a general council form of government for the organization process, and provided the Tribe with a draft version of a resolution to implement such a form of government. On November 5, 1998, by Resolution # GC-98-01, the Tribe established the General Council. *Id.*

Several months afterwards, in April 1999, Yakima Dixie resigned as Tribal Chairman. On May 8, 1999, the Tribe held a general election, in which Yakima Dixie participated, and elected Sylvia Burley as its new chairperson. The BIA later recognized Sylvia Burley as Chairperson of the California Valley Miwok Tribe. *Id.*

Shortly thereafter, the Tribe developed a draft constitution, and submitted it to the BIA for Secretarial review and approval in May 1999.² During this effort, it is apparent that a leadership dispute developed between Ms. Burley and Mr. Dixie.

On March 6, 2000, the Tribe ratified its Constitution and later requested that the BIA conduct a review and hold a secretarial election pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act. *Id.* at 199. In the interim, on March 7, 2000, the Superintendent issued a letter to Sylvia Burley stating that the BIA "believed the Tribe's General Council to consist of the adult members of the tribe, i.e., Mr. Dixie, Ms. Burley, and Ms. Reznor,"³ and stated that the leadership dispute between Mr. Dixie and Ms. Burley was an internal tribal matter." *Id.*

In February 2004, Ms. Burley submitted a document to the BIA purporting to serve as the Tribe's constitution. The BIA declined to approve the constitution because it believed that Ms. Burley had not involved the entire tribal community in its development and adoption. Letter from Dale Risling, Sr. to Sylvia Burley (March 26, 2004). The BIA noted that there were other Indians in the local area who may have historical ties to the Tribe. In that same letter, the BIA indicated that it did not view the Tribe as an "'organized' Indian Tribe," and that it would only recognize Ms. Burley as a "person of authority" within the Tribe, rather than the Chairperson. Letter from Dale Risling, Sr. to Sylvia Burley (March 26, 2004). The Office of the Assistant Secretary – Indian Affairs affirmed this position in a letter stating:

[T]he BIA made clear [in its decision of March 26, 2004] that the Federal government did not recognize Ms. Burley as the tribal Chairman. Rather, the BIA would recognize her as a 'person of

² The Tribe withdrew its original request for Secretarial review of its constitution in July 1999.

³ Pursuant to the Tribe's Resolution # GC-98-01, the General Council shall consist of all adult members of the Tribe.

authority within California Valley Miwok Tribe.’ Until such time as the Tribe has organized, the Federal government can recognize no one, including yourself, as the tribal Chairman.

Letter from Acting Assistant Secretary – Indian Affairs Michael D. Olsen to Yakima Dixie (February 11, 2005). At that point, the BIA became focused on an effort to organize the Tribe under the Indian Reorganization Act, and to include a number of people who were not officially tribal members in that effort.⁴

In 2005, the BIA suspended a contract with the Tribe, and later asserted that there was no longer a government-to-government relationship between the United States and the Tribe. 424 F. Supp. 2d. at 201.

Sylvia Burley, on behalf of the Tribe, filed a complaint against the United States in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia seeking declaratory relief affirming that it had the authority to organize under its own procedures pursuant to 25 U.S.C. § 476(h), and that its proffered constitution was a valid governing document. *Id.* The United States defended against the claim by arguing that its interpretation of the Indian Reorganization Act was not arbitrary and capricious, and that it had a duty to protect the interests of all tribal members during the organization process – which included those individual Miwok Indians who were eligible for enrollment in the tribe. See *Id.* at 202. The District Court ruled that the Tribe failed to state a claim for which relief could be granted, which was affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. *Id.* at 202; 515 F.3d. 1262.

On November 6, 2006, the Superintendent of the BIA Central California Agency issued letters to Sylvia Burley and Yakima Dixie, stating, “[i]t is evident, however, that the ongoing leadership dispute is at an impasse and the likelihood of this impasse changing soon seems to be remote. Therefore, we renew our offer to assist the Tribe in the organizational process.” Letter from Troy Burdick to Sylvia Burley and Yakima Dixie (November 6, 2006). The Superintendent then stated “[t]he Agency, therefore, will publish notice of a general council meeting of the Tribe to be sponsored by the BIA in the newspapers within the Miwok region. This will initiate the reorganization process.” *Id.*

Sylvia Burley appealed this decision to the BIA Pacific Regional Director, who affirmed the Superintendent’s decision on April 2, 2007. That same month, the BIA Pacific Regional Office published notice of the reorganizational meeting in a newspaper in the region. Sylvia Burley appealed the Regional Director’s decision to the IBIA, which subsequently dismissed her claims, while referring the second claim to my office.

Discussion

⁴ The BIA, Yakima Dixie, and Sylvia Burley all agreed that there was a number of additional people who were potentially eligible for membership in the Tribe. See, *California Valley Miwok Tribe v. United States*, 515 F.3d 1267 - 1268 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (noting that the Tribe has admitted it has a *potential* membership of 250) (emphasis added).

I must decide whether to move forward with the BIA's previous efforts to organize the Tribe's government, or to recognize the Tribe's general council form of government – consisting of the adult members of the tribe – as sufficient to fulfill our nation-to-nation relationship.

The Department of the Interior is reluctant to involve itself in these internal tribal matters. To the extent that Department must touch upon these fundamental internal tribal matters, its actions must be limited to upholding its trust responsibility and effectuating the nation-to-nation relationship.

A. Tribal Citizenship

In this instance, the facts clearly establish that the Tribe is a federally recognized tribe which shares a nation-to-nation relationship with the United States. Moreover, the facts also establish that Mr. Dixie adopted Sylvia Burley, Rashel Reznor, Anjelica Paulk, and Tristian Wallace as members of the Sheep Ranch Rancheria in 1998.

The California Valley Miwok Tribe, like all other federally recognized tribes, is a distinct political community possessing the power to determine its own membership, and may do so according to written law, custom, intertribal agreement, or treaty with the United States. See, Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law, § 4.01[2][b] (2005 Edition); see also, *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*, 436 U.S. 49, 54 (1978) (“To abrogate tribal decisions, particularly in the delicate area of membership, for whatever ‘good’ reasons, is to destroy cultural identity under the guise of saving it”) quoting *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*, 402 F.Supp. 5, 18-19 (D.N.M. 1975).

I understand the difficult circumstances facing those individual Miwok Indians living in Calaveras County, California and who lack an affiliation with a federally recognized tribe. Affiliation with a tribe lies at the core of Indian identity. This is one reason why the Department is working to improve the process by which tribes can become federally recognized, and have their nation-to-nation relationship with the United States restored.

Nevertheless, the United States cannot compel a sovereign federally recognized tribe to accept individual Indians as tribal citizens to participate in a reorganization effort against the Tribe's will. See *Santa Clara Pueblo*, supra. It is possible that there are other individual Indians in the area surrounding Sheep Ranch who are *eligible* to become members of the Tribe. Mr. Dixie and Ms. Burley, along with the BIA, have previously indicated such. See 515 F.3d at 1267-68 (D.C. Cir. 2008).

There is a significant difference, however, between eligibility for tribal citizenship and actual tribal citizenship. Only those individuals who are actually admitted as citizens of the Tribe are entitled to participate in its government. The proper recourse for those individuals eligible for tribal citizenship, but who are not yet enrolled, is to work through the Tribe's internal process for gaining citizenship.

It is indisputable that Mr. Dixie adopted Sylvia Burley, Rashel Reznor, Anjelica Paulk, and Tristian Wallace as citizens of the Tribe. Moreover, it is indisputable that the BIA previously accepted the Tribe's decision to enroll these individuals as tribal citizens, as evidenced by its letter of September 24, 1998.

Whatever good reasons the BIA may have had for requiring the Tribe to admit new citizens to participate in its government are not sufficient to overcome the longstanding principles of reserving questions of enrollment to the Tribe.

B. Tribal Government

As with matters of enrollment, each tribe is vested with the authority to determine its own form of government. This authority is a quintessential attribute of tribal sovereignty. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law, § 4.01[2][a] (2005 Edition).

The Department recommended in a letter to the Tribe, that it "operate as a General Council," which would serve as its governing body. Letter from BIA Central California Superintendent Dale Risling to Yakima K. Dixie, Spokesperson for the Sheep Ranch Rancheria (September 24, 1998). In its letter to the Tribe, the Department advised the Tribe that, "[t]he General Council would then be able to proceed with the conduct of business, in a manner consistent with the authorizing resolution." *Id.* The Department previously considered this form sufficient to fulfill the government-to-government relationship. See award of P.L. 93-638 Contract CTJ51T62801 (February 8, 2000).

The determination of whether to adopt a new constitution, and whether to admit new tribal citizens to participate in that effort, must be made by the Tribe in the exercise of its inherent sovereign authority, and not by the Department.

Conclusion

I have reviewed the documents referenced in this letter, as well as the numerous submissions made by Mr. Dixie and Ms. Burley to my office since the issuance of the IBIA Decision in January 2010.

I conclude that there is no need for the BIA to continue its previous efforts to organize the Tribe's government, because it is organized as a General Council, pursuant to the resolution it adopted at the suggestion of the BIA. Consequently, there is no need for the BIA to continue its previous efforts to ensure that the Tribe confers tribal citizenship upon other individual Miwok Indians in the surrounding area.

Based upon the foregoing principles of tribal sovereignty, and our government-to-government relationship with the Tribe, I am directing that the following actions be undertaken:

1. The BIA will rescind its April 2007 public notice to, "assist the California Valley Miwok Tribe, aka, Sheep Ranch Rancheria (Tribe) in its efforts to organize a formal governmental structure that is acceptable to all members."
2. The BIA will rescind its November 6, 2006 letters to Sylvia Burley and Yakima Dixie stating that the BIA will initiate the reorganization process for the California Valley Miwok Tribe.


3. I am rescinding the February 11, 2005 letter from the Office of the Assistant Secretary to Yakima Dixie stating that the BIA does not recognize any government of the California Valley Miwok Tribe.
4. The BIA will rescind its letter of March 26, 2004 to Sylvia Burley stating that it “does not yet view your tribe to be an ‘organized’ Indian Tribe,” and indicating that Ms. Burley is merely a “person of authority” within the Tribe.
5. Both my office and the BIA will work with the Tribe’s existing governing body – its General Council, as established by Resolution # GC-98-01 – to fulfill the government-to-government relationship between the United States and the California Valley Miwok Tribe.

My decision addresses those issues referred to my office by the decision of the IBIA.

Lastly, I recognize that issues related to membership and leadership have been significant sources of contention within the Tribe in recent years. I strongly encourage the Tribe’s governing body, the General Council, to resolve these issues through internal processes so as to mitigate the need for future involvement by the Department in these matters. To this point, I understand that Resolution #GC-98-01 provides for proper notice and conduct of meetings of the General Council. I likewise encourage the Tribe’s General Council to act in accord with its governing document when settling matters relating to leadership and membership, so as to bring this highly contentious period of the Tribe’s history to a close.

A similar letter has been transmitted to Mr. Yakima Dixie, and his legal counsel.

Sincerely,



For Larry Echo Hawk

Assistant Secretary – Indian Affairs

cc: Mike Black, Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs
Amy Dutschke, BIA Pacific Regional Director
Robert Rosette, Rosette and Associates, PC