

To Chairman Ben Clark, Tribal Council Member, Tribal Members and the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

I am coming to you all today to provide some clarity to the long 14 year debate on who was Ina Jackson and how her rights and families rights have been violated for so many years. All information I will speak about today is not my opinion but all factual information and can be backed up by Federal and Tribal Documents. Documents can be found on www.mooretowndistributees.com

To summarize the Creation of Mooretown Rancheria and who are the Lineal members. Since 1957 when H.R. Bill 2824 passed this law to allow the government to give title to the land of the current Indians living on the lands the day the law passed. This was on August 19, 1957. The land before that was land that was only open for an assignment without any rights to title but to allow landless Indians to live on and have protection by the Federal Government. Under Section 12 of the Act of August 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 619) and Public Law 85-671

When this Law was passed Code of Federal Regulations Title 25- Indians Part 242 – California Rancherias and Reservations-Distribution of Assets was created as directions to follow on Land Distribution.

242.1 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this part is to provide policies and procedures governing the distribution of the assets of the following rancherias and reservations in the State of California:....Mooretown.....

242.2 Definitions

(b) “Distributee” means any Indian who is entitled to receive, under a plan prepared pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 619), any assets of a rancheria or reservation.

(c) “Dependent members”, as used in the phrase “dependent members of their immediate families”, includes all persons for whose support the distributee is legally liable according to the laws of the State of California and who are related by blood or adoption or by marriage, including common law or customary marriage, who are domiciled in the household of the distributee, and who receive more than one-half of their support from such distributee.

Notice that under dependent member’s definition you must receive more than one-half of the distributee’s support.

After this bill passed the following members Fred Taylor, Robert Jackson and Ina Jackson continued to send letters to the BIA requesting protection and a clear simple fee title to the land they occupied. During the communication via letters with the BIA the BIA acknowledge all three and insured them that their interest on the land would be protected. Fred Taylor sent a letter requesting that Kate Archuleta (Step Daughter) be given 20 acres of land from his 80 acre tract. The other 80 acre tract was to Robert and Ina Jackson. The land has always been Maidu Indian lands but legally by Federal Law the land was owned by the Government and distribution would come from them.

The current Area Director Leonard Hill stated in a letter (Dated April 9, 1958) to the Commissioners of the BIA that Robert and Ina Jackson occupied the Western Tract and that Fred Taylor occupied the Eastern Tract. He also went on to state that Kate Archuleta that lives in the neighboring town of Oroville did not live on the land but that her non-Indian Husband does.

Now before I continue the Law that was passed only allowed for landless Indians who occupied the land at the time the law passed had rights to request title. Here the Area Director acknowledge the only reason Kate Archuleta was requesting title was because Fred Taylor ask the BIA if she could have 20 acres. Again this was for her non-Indian Husband who had no rights to tribal lands.

Area Director Hill went on to explain that both residents Taylor and Jackson's received old age security payments and that there was adequate roads, electricity, and domestic water from a good spring.

Letters from Robert and Ina Jackson Dated September 15, 1958 and March 15, 1959 to the BIA stated that they both worked the land and they both came on the land at the same time as well as they hope to one day have a clear title to the land they occupy so they could rest assured they own their home and to protect their investment and labor they have expanded there.

On March 31, 1959 BIA Commissioner Homer Jenkins sent letter to the Jackson's informing them they know that Robert and Ina are concerned over the distribution of the assets of Mooretown Rancheria and wanted to reassure them that they will not lose any of their investment they have made on the land. In closing he added "We want to assure you and your wife again that your interest at Mooretown will be protected."

Another Letter that Commissioner Jenks wrote on same day to Kate Archuleta stated that her appeal letter that her and other members sent claiming all tribal rights to Mooretown Rancheria could not be accepted as her stepfather and his family lived on the Eastern Tract and Robert and Ina Jackson lived on the Western Tract. He informed Kate that until a plan is received by all of them his office cannot comment on its merits or accept any appeals.

Now before I move on again Kate Archuleta, Martin Archuleta, Merle Jackson and Violet Archuleta Stevens sent an appeal letter stating that they appeal any land distribution for Mooretown Rancheria. Again Kate didn't even live on the land her non-Indian Husband did as well as she was requesting distribution and not living on land. Another thing I find confusing is why Martin Archuleta, Merle Jackson, and Violet Archuleta Stevens didn't request distribution but yet appealed any distribution with Kate.

On July 21, 1959 the Distribution of Mooretown Rancheria was signed by Commissioner H. Rex Lee. In this entire distribution it list four members. Robert Jackson, Ina Jackson, Fred Taylor and Kate Archuleta. Here is the dispute made by a genealogist who used her opinion in 2005 and not facts or Statutory Construction. Next to Ina Jackson's name it states "Wife" under Robert Jackson's name. Genealogist stated she was only a wife and not a distributee. Under California Law Family Civil Code Chapter 3 section 161a states that this property would be considered

community property and that they would share in distribution jointly and as one unit. Also the distribution stated that it will only list the names of Distributees and Dependents. Not spouses. So for genealogist to say she is only a wife is in error. If she would have said Dependent that also would have been in error as nowhere does it state she is a dependent.

Now fast forward to when Mooretown Rancheria became a Federal Recognize Tribe all of our Tribal Constitutions have always listed four distributees and has always recognized Ina Jackson as one. In all communication with the BIA on Lineal members it was listed as four distributees. Ina Jackson would be considered one has her and Robert Jackson shared in distribution of Mooretown rancheria and the 80 acre tract. Both were Native American, Had been married over 42 years and they both came onto the property at the same time. During the Distribution by the Federal Government and all letters and communication Ina Jackson was not treated as a dependent but as a distributee who shared jointly with Robert Jackson. Being labeled as a “wife” is not a dependent legally as well as morally. Being labeled as “wife’ is exactly who she was to Robert Jackson, they were one unit, shared jointly under marriage law, was 50/50 on working on land and money. Ina Jackson worked the same on the land as Robert Jackson, she had income coming into household as Robert Jackson as well as her signature and name being listed on wanting protection was on the letters to the BIA.

Now comes the issue at hand. Money, Corruption, and Greed followed. In January 1999 Mooretown Rancheria made changes to its Tribal Constitution and stated that a direct lineal descendants of Kate Archuleta, Fred Taylor, Robert Jackson and Ina Jackson, who were listed as distributees in the plan for Distribution of the Assets of the Mooretown Rancheria as recorded in the Federal Register dated August 1, 1961 are considered lineal members.

In April 2005 current Chairman Gary Archuleta and Tribal Council violated our Tribal Constitution and hired Grabowski and Associates to complete a genealogy only on Ina Jackson. Under our Tribal Constitution Article (12) XII- Duties of Officers Section 6: Nepotism (C) No Officer or other member of the Tribal Council shall participate in or attempt to influence a decision of the Tribal Council that will have a direct effect on an immediate family member other than a decision that affects the family member in the same way as all other members of the tribe. So for Gary and the Tribal Council at that time to only request this for Ina Jackson’s family was a violation. Grabowski and Associates completed their genealogy report and stated that Ina Jackson was not considered a distributee but only a wife to Robert Jackson. She used her opinion and not any factual documentation. When the BIA was contacted they stated that no one has ever contacted them to determine who Ina Jackson was. Again all records point to Ina Jackson as a distributee. Again the Distribution Plan stated in Black and white that it will only list distributees and dependents. Did not say it will list spouses.

In April 2005 Chairman Gary Archuleta and Tribal council violated our Tribal Constitution again under Article (7) VII- Powers of the Governing Council of Mooretown Rancheria Section 1 (g).. The only way a lineal member can be terminated is if he or she relinquishes their rights on his or her own.

On April 19, 2005 Gary Archuleta wrote a letter stated that our Tribal Constitution needs to be amended because genealogist stated Ina Jackson was not a distributee. He went on to state that in

order to do this it will require a vote of the lineal membership in order to comply with our Constitution to make changes. In order to accomplish this and have Ina removed it must require 2/3 majority vote. The Ina Jackson descendants were told they could not attend the meeting and were not allowed to vote. At the time of the meeting Ina Jackson descendants were still lineal members and their votes were never heard or took into account. If they were able to vote then Gary Archuleta and Tribal Council would not have had the 2/3 majority vote in order to amend the constitution and Ina Jackson's family would not have been reclassified.

After the Vote Gary Archuleta and Tribal Council decided to reclassify Ina Jackson descendants as adopted members. When Ina Jackson descendants went to appeal and provide proof Gary Archuleta stated that he would not accept any evidence from the family and that the tribe had voted. Over the years Ina Jackson descendants have been fighting to get Ina Jackson recognized as a distributee and all has fallen on deaf ears. Emails, letters and phone calls to BIA fell on deaf ears. When Ina Jackson descendants hired another genealogist to review Grabowski and Associates reports they found many errors as well as found that she used her opinion and not factual documentation. When Gary Archuleta was given the 2nd genealogy report he sent a letter telling members that it was one sided and that it could not be taken for face value.

Gary Archuleta has held his office all the way up to 2017 when he resigned. Over those years from 2005 to 2017 myself and other members have tried to reach out to him and have him correct his mistake. He would never accept new records and stood by Grabowski and Associates report. This violated our due process and our rights to an appeal.

In 2007 US Court of Appeals Case NO 04-17482 stated that Mooretown Rancheria had four distributees. This was a case where another family that live on the land but did not have distribution was fighting Mooretown Rancheria on becoming lineal members. The reason I bring this case up is because the Court of Appeals recognized that Mooretown Rancheria had four distributees, not three as Grabowski and Associates claimed. The Court of Appeals also stated "A 1998 Tribal resolution further narrowed full tribal membership to "only those members who are direct lineal descendants of the four distributees.: Other tribal members were reclassified by the resolution as adoptee members. In 1998 Mooretown Rancheria sent the BIA a copy of its Constitution ad Enrollment List, limiting tribal membership to lineal descendants of the four 1959 distributees.

In 2017 when now Chairman Benjamin Clark was provided evidence to show Ina Jackson was a distributee and that the past Chairman Gary Archuleta and Tribal Council had violated our rights he stated he would look into it.

In May 2018 the BIA in D.C. and Sacramento was contacted once again by myself on a request to define if Ina Jackson was a distributee or not on the 1959 Distribution of Assets of Mooretown Rancheria. This time I was able to get in touch with someone in the Reality Department who pushed my request to the proper channels. I informed them that a genealogist stated that my grandmother was only a wife on the land distribution and that on the distribution list it states they only list names that are Distributees or Dependents, not spouses. So I needed to know was she a Distributee or a Dependent. She cannot just be labeled as a wife.

In June 2018 I filed a FOIA request with the BIA to get all records on the Termination and Distribution of Mooretown Rancheria. I was able to gain all records in my request and review.

In October 2018 all communication with BIA in Sacramento stopped. In January 2019 I contacted Congresswomen Haaland in New Mexico and Senator James Lankford of Oklahoma and filed a grievance against the BIA as they had failed to review and reply to my request. In February 2019 I received a letter from BIA Superintendent Troy Burdick regarding my request in where he stated that Ina Jackson would not be considered a distributee and only a dependent. Now this is the first we have heard Ina Jackson was a dependent by the BIA. Grabowski and Associates states she was only a wife, not a dependent nor a distributee. BIA stated during my communication that she was only a wife. When pointing out to the BIA that "wife" is not on the list of people to be listed and that only people are either a Distributee or a Dependent. They stated they would continue to review other plans on how they were written.

Once I received his Official Letter I sent out an appeal with all documentation to prove that not only he was using his opinion but not using Statutory Construction in his decision. My appeal is now at the Desk of Regional Director Amy Dutshke. As of today I am waiting for a reply on my Inofficial of Official Notice to Amy's Office as 60 days has passed and we have not received a reply to my appeal. I have given them 10 days to provide a response to appeal or to give me a later date up to 60 days of when we will receive an answer. They received the letter on May 13th 2019.

I am asking the BIA to do what is right and review the evidence and Statutory Construction on the land distribution of Mooretown Rancheria. Ina Jackson was labeled as wife because under California Marriage Code she shared in distribution with Robert Jackson, she could not have been a dependent because she did not receive more than half of her support by Robert Jackson, She has been identified in all records up to 2005 with the BIA as a distributee as well as a US Court of Appeals in 2007 recognized Mooretown Rancheria having four distributees and not three. Her being labeled as wife is correct in that she shares in distribution with Robert Jackson as they are one unit. They both voted as one and lived their lives as one.

My evidence and documentation has yet to be rebutted. The BIA nor Mooretown has been able to furnish any solid evidence to show Ina Jackson was not a distributee. Grabowski and Associates report is voided as she cannot make a legal termination on who my grandmother was without supporting documentation. She never reached out to BIA, she never went to a court to define the meaning of "Wife" on a legal document. If she had she would have found that the definition of "wife" in the state of California on receiving land distribution while married would have been considered community property and that the wife shares in distribution jointly with husband. As well as she would have reviewed the legal meaning of dependent and would have found that she did not qualify as one as she did not receive more than half of Roberts support. The reason Grawboski and Associates made the statement Ina Jackson wasn't a distributee is because Chairman Gary Archuleta and current Tribal Council wanted that part of the family out. She was paid to not complete a genealogy but was paid to write out a false claim to benefit certain Tribal Members for gain.

I am asking Chairman Benjamin Clark and current Tribal Council to do the right thing and reclassify Ina Jackson's family as lineal members. We as a tribe can resolve these kinds of disputes and with all of the documentation we have provided you, Chairman Benjamin Clark and Tribal Council can correct the wrong doing of the past people. All proof and evidence are written in black and white. All records are from the BIA as well as from our Tribe. This is all factual documentation not opinions or theories. My grandmother Ina Jackson was a distributee, our past chairman and tribal council violated our tribal constitutional rights, and for the last 14 years we have continued to fight and prove them wrong. We do not hate anyone, we do not hold on to anger. We forgive everyone for what they did to our family and we only want those who violated our tribal constitution held accountable for their actions as well as to prevent this from happening again.

To my fellow Tribal Members and my family, many of you were unaware of what was going on and it isn't your fault. Many of you were fed lies and deceived. Many were asked to keep quiet as you would gain from this as you would receive more money per year with our family out. I am not looking to take anything away from my family or other members, I am looking for our Tribe to do the right thing and correct an error that was made. I say error because for the people that voted against us or for the people like Susan Tiesing who stated false lies that she was fed to media need to have an understanding that they were wrong and they can still make everything right.

Final to the Archuleta descendants, Kate Archuleta might have grown up on land, but she was not living on land at the time of distribution and that was another error that has been found. Not to mention that Kate Archuleta was a step daughter of Fred Taylor. For Gary Archuleta to single my family out when Kate Archuleta wasn't even part of the Taylors is wrong on his part. Fred Taylor was one of the only original Maidu Indians that has never left the land, worked the land and got distribution on his 80 acre tract. Robert and Ina Jackson are Maidu Indians who came on an unoccupied 80 acre tract next to Fred Taylor and they worked the land and built it to health and filed for distribution. Kate Archuleta stated her and her non-Indian husband built a cabin on 20 acres but that she didn't live there but wanted the land. Well Seems Fred Taylor, Robert Jackson and Ina Jackson did most the work for the distribution as well as to care for the land. Kate just came and said hey he is my step dad and I want some land to. BIA even can show that Kate was a distributee in error as documentation shows she didn't live on land, so according to records she got land for a non-Indian.

I pray that a resolution comes and we all can move forward as a Tribe and pick up the Broken Pieces and build our Tribe even stronger and better. I know my family is not the only one that has been picked on over the years but for those families that have or have been threatened, I hope you see that Ina Jackson Descendants are in the right and that we should have never been reclassified as well as Ina should have never been removed from our Constitution. She is more of a woman than Kate Archuleta was and did a lot more for Mooretown Rancheria than just sit by and try to steal land. Grandmother Ina Jackson worked that land and died on that land.

I thank you for your time and will continue to pray for our Tribe and all of our family while we all continue to find a resolution to this long dispute.