



**LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS
TRIBAL COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2021
LITTLE RIVER BAND
VIA ZOOM
GOVERNMENT CENTER**

**OPEN SESSION
MINUTES**

The Little River Band of Ottawa Indians held a meeting at the Little River Band Government Center on February 24, 2021. Following are the minutes of that meeting.

Speaker Pete: Welcome everyone to Wednesday, February 24, 2021, 10:00 a.m. Tribal Council Meeting via Zoom. Gary if you would be so inclined would you please do our opening prayer? Thank you.

I. Opening Prayer

Creator, look after us as we go through these days. Keep us in your loving arms and heart. Look after all the ones that have been afflicted with this virus. Make them strong. Let our prayers go out to these people that are afflicted. Lend a hand where you can help somebody up and out when they need it. Look after the ones that are the front-line employees that are serving you, whether it's food, or gas, or a soda someplace. And look after all our first responders that are out there also having to deal with this. That being said, Miigwetch, Miigwetch, Miigwetch.

II. General Business

A. Call to Order

Okay thank you Gary. Just to get a couple reminders here before we start opening this up, we have a number of phone numbers on here and I don't have no names assigned to them. So, if you have your hand up and you're going to speak, you're going to be required to say your Tribal name, your Tribal ID, before you'll be recognized. And once again, we're not going to go through the rules that we've established a few weeks ago and that's how it's

going to be again. So, this is General Business and I'm calling it to order at 10:01. Gary would you please do a roll call.

The regularly scheduled Tribal Council meeting was called to order at 10:01 a.m.

B. Roll Call

Roll Call #1

S. Lewis	Present	R. Wittenberg	Present	S. Crampton	Present
G. DiPiazza	Present	D. Lonn	Present	D. Corey	Absent
T. Guenthardt	Present	C. Champagne	Present	R. Pete	Present

Quorum established.

Recorder DiPiazza: Nine are present, we have a quorum at 10:01.

Staff Present: Brandy Martin, Emergency Management Team Leader; Bradley Pringle, Comptroller

Others Present: Ogema Larry Romanelli, Susan Thull 3727, Sara Agosa 4478, Jessica Steinberg 0148, Sandy Mezeske 0018, Michael Burmeister 0945, Chelsea Densmore 3225, Connie Waitner 022, Israel Stone 1735, Robert McCaslin 0748,

C. Approval of Agenda

R. Pete: Okay, I got a motion from Gary, I got support from Diane is there any further discussion, does anyone going to abstain? Gary, do a roll call.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH, WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS: UNDER NEW BUSINESS, B IS MOVED TO SECOND OPEN, CLOSED SESSION #5 IS AN ADD, UNDER SECOND OPEN ITEM B FROM FIRST OPEN MOVED TO B IN SECOND OPEN; by G. DiPiazza; supported D. Lonn

Roll Call #2

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	T. Guenthardt	Yes
C. Champagne	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

Recorder DiPiazza: Nine in favor the agenda for Wednesday, February 24th, 2021, has been approved.

D. Tribal Council Minutes None Submitted

S. Thull: I was just wondering if you could please tell us what item was added to closed #5

R. Pete: I thought that we did it. All right it's, Approving Tribal Ogema's Execution of Owner's Representative Agreement with Cherette Group, LLC.

III. Continuing Business

A. Grant & Contracts

B. Budget Modifications

1. Approval of Supplemental Appropriation 2021-02, 1st QTR to Replenish the Strategic Gaming Budget in the amount of \$1,250,000

R. Pete: I guess right now there are three of us that's on the Shoreline Committee the Ogema, Sandra Lewis, and myself so I guess what I'm going to be doing, is trying to get the answers for this for you. First of all, there's questions being asked, what are these funds being appropriated for? These funds are being appropriated for our Muskegon Casino project. What are the intended outcomes? The intended outcome, that I'm reading right from this, is that is that we're going to get our Muskegon Casino, we are very close to getting that Muskegon Casino, we're in negotiations with the governor right now. I think the hardest part that has been done is we've gotten through the federal government. That's got us, we spent a lot of time with the federal government as a matter of fact when I was on that committee, and Joe Riley was the Speaker here, and I was even told that it would never get through Cason and Cason is the one that signed off for us to get this approval. This will affect a lot of people in Muskegon, we'll have jobs available, we'll have about approximately a thousand jobs available to the Muskegon area and for our Tribal members, which I think we have about 700 people total living there. And they will be able to apply for jobs. So, our Tribal members down there, this will be done for the next Seven Generations and they're going to be doing it down there. So, is there any other questions on there that I could possibly answer?

S. Agosa: I do have several questions and I would like to ask respectfully that I am able to ask my questions and that all of Council is patient and willing to listen and answer questions about this. I just want to emphasize this is a huge project for the tribe to take on and I'm really hoping that we move forward with wisdom and make sure that we move

cautiously, using data research and knowledge, in order to make the best decisions for our members. So, on Monday, I brought up a concern with the supplemental appropriation and wanted more information and asked the comptroller, Brad, if at all possible, we could get more information about the accounting side. From what I gathered from some work sessions, and I'd like this to be clarified, that 25 million was put aside for this project. And I started looking for the resolutions and couldn't find anything, although our website is very archaic and it's hard to search things. So, in the work sessions it's been brought up that there has been 25 million devoted to this project and I am very concerned and would like to see the accounting side. Not only what was budgeted, but what was also spent. There're two sides to a coin when it comes to accounting, what was budgeted and also our expenditures, what was spent, and from my knowledge we've never been given any type of explanation, nothing to see on this money. Also, too I requested a project plan, written in stone, something to access and actually look at, so I was unable to find that on the website as well. So, I would like more information about this project, how much money has been spent already, an audit, and I would like to see that we get that information first, before any more funds are devoted to this project. In fact, it's been brought up that we just spent over a million dollars around 55 days ago, so how does that tie in with this new supplemental? Is this to pay for current services or retroactively? We never got an answer about that either. Those are my questions, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay, well first of all we didn't spend 25 million dollars, it's less than 25 million dollars that we spent. I do have the numbers in front me actually, Brad doesn't take any orders from, of what to do, from Tribal members, those orders are directed by me. When you first brought this up by me, I said you may do an audit on this thing and so pretty soon today they're going to be released and they're going to be released to Tribal Council so if you want to get something from Tribal Council ask one of your counselors or they're going to be released in closed session first for anything that's done. And it wasn't done for 23 million, there wasn't one million that was appropriated 55 days ago. I do not remember anything like that that was appropriated 55 days ago. In addition, we are this far on and it's going to be for the Muskegon project and why on earth is so many casinos down there fighting us with every single thing that they've got. Every dollar we have ever spent to get this thing through the federal government and the state government, we've been spent 10 times that amount trying to stop us, at least. And you know what, it's because they don't want us to have that there. Well, we have found out that we have every right to be there, our land has been taken into trust by the federal government and we are now going to go on to perceive the state. We have the Shoreline Committee which I was voted to represent from Council, that was about four years ago when I came on Council, and before that I was a representative out of the Manistee Casino and the places that are trying to stop us for everything that we've got over there. We spent this kind of money, we bought the land, it was approved down there by Tribal Council, the Shoreline Committee was voted on long before I came on. And we have been stewards with our money down there and spending it and every single thing that we've got on here, it's on here right now for this budget to replenish the Strategic Gaming Budget. There are three

representatives that are voting representatives on the Shoreline Committee. It's the Ogema, it's myself, and its Councilor Lewis, and we all recommended unanimously to get this thing going so it was on there from the committee. And that's probably about what I'm going to answer and another thing I'm not going to have Brad release this thing in open session until it's released in closed session to the Council. I hope I answered your questions, and I probably didn't.

S. Agosa: I have more questions but...

R. Pete: Go ahead because we're starting a five-minute timer on these questions.

S. Agosa: First of all, I just want to state that just because we have other casinos who are trying to dissuade this project or don't want it to go through, doesn't mean that the members don't have a right to know full accounting and the audit side down to every last penny. That is our right and whatever procedure needs to be followed in order to get that information to the members that's fine, however, we do have a right to know how our money is being used. How it's been used and properly managed, that's something that with any company, any government, always has a project plan in place clearly laid out, especially when you're talking about this amount of money. So, I was not able to find anything on the website, like I said before and I will follow up. I would like to know; I'd like to see the trail of the resolutions related to this project. And I still have not heard, yes or no, do we actually have a project plan for this project? Even though we're following steps, we should still have a project plan in place with the financials. So, another issue I have is the taxes. From what I understand, from the agenda review, we put a certain amount of acres into trust, however we own more land, and it was stated that we will have to pay taxes on that other land. So, I also asked Brad, and I'm asking Tribal Council to supply us with how much we're going to have to spend on taxes for that property that was not put into trust? Which is actually more acreage than what was put into trust, so that's my comment. Thank you.

R. Pete: If that's the questions you're asking, Brad will release that thing and once I said in Closed Session. He's not going to release this in public until he releases it in Closed Session and then you'll be able to see everything.

S. Crampton: All right, thank you. Well, I don't share the Speaker's opinion. I don't think that it's a done deal, in fact we're, it is not a done deal. Nobody can tell you that we're getting that casino right now, because we had an agreeable Governor in Granholm, we had agreeable Governor in Snyder, [unmuted phone interruption] okay back to what I was saying is I don't think that we have a done deal, we're far from a done deal. We have a very divided house down there and the question has to go before the state legislature not the governor. The governor signs it and can be agreeable to sign it after the legislature is done. But we are far, the easiest part was getting it through the Interior. We knew exactly what was going to happen there, it was laid out before we started. The real battle is with the state, so no, this is not guaranteed and to keep selling it like this is going to be jobs for this million dollars it's not accurate. I would like to see a repayment plan to the tribe

because, yes, it is about 25 million and we need to see an itemized list of how that money was expended. Who has signing authority, because last time I checked there was only three people had signing authority? So, I want to know who's got signing authority? Where this is all going to? Because on Monday I heard that, from the Ogema and Speaker, this was to clean up bills that were due. Well, if that's the case, send us the copy of the bill and we'll pay it. But to rubber stamp and give away this amount of money at this time without the proper documentation, I can't vote for that. I thought we were going to wait for the audit to come out and then move on this when we had accurate information. Moving a million dollars without the information that is needed or should be required, is absolutely unprofessional. Thank you.

C. Champagne: I think Shannon pretty much covered what I was going to ask about and talk about because looking at the documentation it doesn't really show what that money was going to be used for. I understand it was, some people seen what it was going to be used for, but I didn't get anything that showed that. So, I couldn't vote for something like this without the documentation either, thank you.

L. Romanelli: Thank you, I believe the documentation was sent to Tribal Council from Brad, the numbers. Also, we have had some questions in auditing or asking for information from Tribal Counselor Crampton, which was done fairly recently. I'm not sure why that's not being shared with Sara. I don't believe in sharing it, but if she's asking, she should be asking counsel. We've never portrayed that this is a done deal. We are very far in the process and to say it was a lay-up at the federal level is absolutely incorrect. Matter of fact, Shannon has stated other times that we had the wrong people pushing this and we had other people that were saying that it was never going to happen. So that was a big plus for us, and we are going to the state. We understand completely where we're going and why we're going there, and we know what point we're at here. So, I'm not sure why it's being clouded by some of these things if they don't want to vote for it, they absolutely don't have to but some of this information is not correct. I've never said it was a done deal. I do think it's in a good place and I get concerned when I hear elected officials, of our tribe, questioning every point along the way that we do it. I think counselor, we haven't heard from Counselor Lewis either, and I think she could get on and help us explain this as to why we're going forward and other counselors are welcome to do so as well, thank you.

S. Lewis: I understand what everybody's saying here, you know there's also confidentiality that we have to adhere to. I'm just going to say, if you start running in a race, don't just stop, when you step away from the finish line and then just stop and stand there. I think that you know all the efforts that have been put into this over the years is something that's going to be solid for our future. All these concerns that people have, yes, they should be addressed and as Ron stated all the financials will come out. Everybody has on Council, has been sent all the information. So, I just see we're working towards, like what was said with Seven Generations and once people are allowed to get out of the house, nobody's going to come back in the house, they're all going to want to be out and

about. We're so close to the finish line. I believe in it, that it is going to be really good for our people. Okay, I'm done.

S. Crampton: Well, I just wanted to point out at the start of this meeting when we started to ask the questions, the Speaker, I'm writing it down here, that he asked for the information from Brad and Brad would be turning it over to Council, that would be Council's decision to turn over to the membership. Then the Ogema got on and said the information was provided to counsel he doesn't know why it's being held up. What is it, get your stories together before you guys do this, because that was a just contradict.... wait excuse me.

R. Pete: No, it's good. Go ahead you're in the queue, Shannon.

S. Crampton: Thank you that was a direct contradiction, now, trying to paint it up as this is going to stop the Muskegon project is absolutely false. Being fiduciary responsible is what you're supposed to be. And we all support the project, everybody's supported it. It started way before Mr. Romanelli took office, it's been supported all along. We want to be responsible, there's no reason you can't get the information before this is up for the vote, the nefarious, thing that looks suspicious is when you try to do it without putting the information forth. That's what makes it look [inaudible], thank you.

G. DiPiazza: I was going to say I, you know, I'm in support of the thing ever since I've been here. And to get it through the feds was probably the hardest part. Again, it's not over, it's not a done deal, but you know, you got to spend money to make money. I can't open a business with 20 bucks in my pocket, well I suppose you can. Depends what you're doing. You can sell suites on the back of your car, I guess for that. But actually, open the business and make money, you got to spend money, lots. Machinery is not cheap, stuff's not cheap, so that's all I'm going to say about it.

**MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #21-0224-049 APPROVAL
OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION 2021-02, 1ST QTR TO
REPLENISH THE STRATEGIC GAMING BUDGET IN THE
AMOUNT OF \$1,250,000; by D. Lonn; supported T. Guenthardt.**

R. Pete: I got a motion on the floor from Diane, I got Tom supporting, is there any further discussion?

S. Agosa: I also feel as though we as members are receiving mixed messages about this process and back to the analogy about the race for me personally just because I want the research, the project plan, the reporting, and documentation, does not mean that I'm opposed to this project, in fact I think it's a good project to consider and explore. However using the right business strategies and making sure that we have the documentation, even with the analogy of running a race, when you run a race there's still

preparation, even when you're running, you know how many miles you're going to run, the speed, your time, you have the right shoes on, and then when you get over the finish line, also too, you know exactly where you're at in the race, if you won or not. So that analogy is a really good one, but what I'm interested in is the specifics, the details, which I don't think we should overlook. We should absolutely know where we're at with the accounting side and I also don't agree, I don't think that information should be confidential, at least the audit should be forthcoming to the members. Again, I understand we have to put money towards this project however this is not a table at a fair. We're talking about large sums of money at all times and Council definitely should be advocating for us and some are, to make sure that everything is in order, and we know exactly where we're at. So again, I'd like to say, please vote no on this item at this time, thank you.

S. Thull: At the end of the year, the year-end balance was 1 million dollars as of 12-31 and so now you're asking for another million and a quarter so I'm assuming that that money is gone from the end of December. And so, that was the 55 days that Sara was referring to, because there was a balance as of December 31st, so what I'm wanting is an accounting. I think that if you group it as far as, lobbyists, donations, taxes, you know, you're not giving out any proprietary information, but the membership should know where this money is being spent. And I'm wondering are we still making donations to Bike Time, are we still sponsoring a golf outing, I saw that we did that last year, so you know I'm interested in what we are spending our money on and if it's really necessary at this point. Seeing that we are limited in what in the amount of money that we have. You know, we have to make sure that we're using it wisely, so I think that the membership deserves to know this, and we've never been given this information. You know this has been going on for years, I believe in trust, trusting my elected officials but I want to verify, you know, I'm not just going to take everything blindly too. I think that you should be open to some critiques if we if your members can say you know we think that you would be better off spending here. I don't think that you know our people don't have anything to offer, I think that we have a wide range of people membership I think we can offer some advice and I think that you should be receptive to that. I would like to know just what kind of a plans you're thinking about starting off. If we get the go-ahead on all of this, is it going to start out small and then add on, or are you planning on going real big right from the get-go? So, I think there's a lot of questions that the members would like answered. That's all I have to say, thank you so much.

S. Crampton: Okay, well I wanted to explain to the membership that you can look at the process in the Interior. The Interior process and submitting it to the Interior, is a ministerial process. There's language that says the Interior shall, shall take land into trust. So, if there's any leader that's saying that that's confused, and it was a gamble, and that's where the risk was, they don't understand what they're doing, and they probably shouldn't be operating this money. Now the gamble on the other side with the state is, there is no language that says they shall take that land into trust for gaming. That's where the gamble is, so if you got people saying that the gambles at the federal level, they don't understand

the process and that's another point that they shouldn't be handling this money. This is not, can anyone in the Shoreline Task Force right here, right now, in front of the membership explain the reporting requirements for this money? And who has signing authority? And what are the requirements reporting to the tribe? And is there a repayment plan? Because that's a lot of money, that's over half the money we have in our coffers. It shocked me how people around here talk about millions of dollars if I talk about 20, I get nervous. This is a lot of money and there is no plan. I want to see a plan; I want it itemized. We were told on Monday this was for bills that have already been incurred. Bring us the bills, we'll pay them, but to give you a million dollars in a blank check, uh-uh. And this was, this plan, like I said I learned about the Muskegon Casino in 2005, 2005. That was before anybody else was even elected. So, this isn't somebody's little pet project, and we need to be really accountable to membership. I hear all this talk about transparency, but then when the rubber meets the road, this is the answer that we get, thank you.

T. Guenthardt: I'll call the question.

R. Pete: Okay I have tommy just called the question so Gary, do a roll call.

Roll Call #3

S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes	D. Lonn	Yes
D. Corey	Yes	T. Guenthardt	Yes	C.Champagne	No
R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes	R. Wittenberg	No

Motion carried (6-3-0-0)

G. DiPiazia: Six in favor three against, Resolution 21-0224-049 is passed.

C. Approval of Budgeted Expenditure

IV. Old Business

A. Binojeeuk Commission Report January 2021

R. Pete: That moves us onto Old Business, Binojeeuk Commission Report, January 2021, has been submitted.

V. New Business

A. Removing Ethics Ordinance #14-100-10

R. Pete: It has been reported on here Tribal Court has ruled the ordinance unconstitutional. Posting on the web hurts individual reputations and Ethics Ordinance was used for political reasons. What the Court order says is that the ethics that was passed by Tribal Council and I don't believe, what year was that passed here Gary, do you recall? Because that was long before I was on Council, that was over four years ago, 2015 the ethics report was unconstitutional that's why it's being overturned it's unconstitutional, 2014. Okay so I have on here Cindy Champagne. You've got the floor Cindy

C. Champagne: Yes, I'm sorry since we talked about this in the past and, since we did get a Court order saying that it was unconstitutional, and the Ethics Ordinance has cost Council members money, that has been taken forward on the Ethics Ordinance. I think that since it's ruled unconstitutional, that we need to put it forward and have it removed. somewhere down the line if the new Council wants to put another Ethics Ordinance together that's fine, but this one just doesn't do the job, thank you.

D. Lonn: I'd like to make motion to postpone this so we can have a work session on it.

**MOTION TO POSTPONE REMOVING ETHICS ORDINANCE
#14-100-10 IN ORDER TO HOLD A WORK SESSION; by D. Lonn;
supported by T. Guenthardt**

R. Pete: Okay I got a motion to postpone this. We're going to have a work session on it. Okay so I got a motion from Diane, I got support from Tom, okay is there any further discussions?

G. DiPiazza: Well, we just got this resolution yesterday. There's some problems with it. I've already sent you an email about it. How it's written, you want to destroy official records except, you know, what I'm reading I don't, I'm okay with re removing the ethics ordinance off the books but to go in and destroy official records, because the way it's reading, that I, that we got to go in and erase certain portions of the videos. Maybe alter the minutes, or anything that may have to deal with this since conception. They've already been removed off the website, that happened last Wednesday. Nobody asked me if they've already been removed, but they've already been removed. Again, as far as the reports or what the findings or whatever you want to say like I said I'm not opposed to removing it but with the criteria's you have in there it's going to create an awful lot of other dilemmas. Also, that ruling is going to put some, you know, open up a whole different matrix because when you're saying Tribal Council can't delegate any of their authority on certain things, it's going to be interesting, okay yeah, I'm done.

S. Agosa: My comment is that I agree with the Court's decision, and I feel that this Ethics Ordinance should be removed. Doing research on my own and just asking

questions in a prior meeting how this ordinance benefits members and even looking at the ethics complaints themselves. I just could not verify that it's doing anything for the membership and also too, I have concerns that it was tying up Counselors in complaints and used laterally instead of how it was intended for members to have a redress. So, I'm at peace with the Court's decision and I do agree that it should be removed. Thank you.

L. Romanelli: Thank you. Well, there's, yeah, there's a couple questions I have concerns with, first off, on the agenda it says the Ethics Ordinance was used for political reasons. I object to that, that's an opinion of the motion maker or the person that put it on here I'm assuming. I think that should be taken off. I also don't believe that any prior filings or minutes should be, the information should be removed, this order did not excuse the reasons for the filings of the Ethics Ordinance. What it said was that the Ethics Ordinance itself, violated the Constitution, that's what it said, and you know, and we understand why because in the ruling it also said that the Ethics Ordinance violated the Constitution which was created by the Tribal Council themselves. So, it was the method, it wasn't the actual reason for the filing that were excused, so I think there's no reason to remove everything else. I do agree that we should do away with the Ethics Ordinance as it is, obviously, because it's unconstitutional. Thank you.

S. Lewis: Yeah, I'm just, I'm wondering that because it is unethical or that it goes against the ordinance, are people that put their own personal finances in, are they going to be reimbursed?

R. Pete: Okay, that's not in this ordinance at all. I have no idea if you're asking me that doesn't address any of this thing in this ordinance whatsoever, Sandy, I'm sorry that's all I know.

S. Lewis: Yeah, and just my thoughts, I feel that they should be reimbursed because. I'm done, thank you.

C. Champagne: Yes Ron, thank you. I know Mr. Romanelli doesn't like the wording of the Ethics Ordinance, but the reason that that wording was put in there, it's not just my personal opinion, but when you go after four people on Council, or three people on Council, and there's other people that sits on that Council, that has a lot more absenteeism than the three of us had, and you go after three of us, how can that not be political? I'm sorry, but that's my viewpoint and I will stand by that, because I look at all the facts. I have not filed an Ethic Ordinance against anyone and there's quite a few that I could have, because of the things that was done to me, while sitting on this Council by almost everyone from the Ogema down. So yes, I haven't filed it because I thought it was unconstitutional and so I'm following the constitution and the reason I brought this forward, is I don't think any other counselor, whether the ones currently sitting, or any coming on, should be subject to this kind of behavior. It has taken away a lot of our time just to defend ourselves against frivolous claims, when we could have been writing laws that we're supposed to be doing, to protect the tribe, to help the tribe. So, you know, I say that what I wrote is one government of the tribe and it can be voted up, it can be

voted down, but I don't see why it would be voted down since it has, it has hurt a number of people. Thank you.

S. Crampton: Okay well, I was one of the Council members that won the case that ends this. That yes, it is being used inappropriately and most of the filings, if you go and look, were filed by the Ogema. The determination I got from the Court, I'm sorry, but it said right on there, that it's not applicable to Council members. And that's where it's unconstitutional, what had happened was when you have an Ethics Ordinance it's made for the underlings, the employees, the members so they have recourse against the leadership. It's not made for the leadership, to go and then start headhunting on each other, and that's where it's found to be unconstitutional and improperly used. Now I want the membership to understand, when we have a ruling on the Oversight Task Force that says it's unconstitutional, the Ogema and the Speaker run right out and let's get rid of it now. Same thing goes on here. Watch what's happening, it's not consistent, it's not, it's a game and I don't appreciate the game, because no matter what you do, you can have another work session, it's still declared unconstitutional. What we have to do is go to one of the 500 other tribes in the United States and seek out the best ethics ordinance that they have. The one that works the most proficiently. Why reinvent the wheel? The one we have is horrendous, horrendous, and it just leaves room for more abuse. Just members, take a look at what happened with the Oversight Task Force and that ruling, and who was arguing, 'oh that needs to be gone now' now who's not wanting to do it? Thank you.

L. Romanelli: The problem is, and it says the Court finds that they cannot, the Tribal Council cannot, delegate powers to a subordinate body that is specifically tasked with the constitution, therein lies the problem. This was written by the Tribal Council and is found to be unconstitutional, and it also says that the Council gives itself cannot transfer powers and here we go again. And I take exception to always, Counselor Crampton always saying games, these aren't games, this is serious matters, and he continually goes down that road. I believe in this filing; it says Cindy Champagne as a political petitioner versus the Ethics Board and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians Tribal Council, so the spin is there all the time. It gets frustrating because of the way the Ethics Court is, or the Ethics Ordinance is written. It needs to be retracted. Those costs that everybody has put in, including myself, should be then paid probably by the tribe or the Tribal Council because it was poorly written and though again a lot of people have spent a lot of time on this including some attorney fees and I think the people that were put on the ethics boards should be reimbursed for their hours and it probably should come from the legislative branch who wrote the ruling. Thank you.

J. Steinberg: Just a couple of things I was looking at the declaration, the declaratory judgment, it is dated 2/16. So, and while I can appreciate Counselor Champagne bringing forward her resolution, the law has been really declared invalidated on that date, so there's no opportunity to bring forward an ethics complaint under that ordinance. It's invalidated on the date of the declaratory judgment so just by that ruling you know,

it's null and void. I think the other portion of this, however, as I read through the judgment, there are things, oh and I do, there is the portion that talks about the delegation of power. it didn't diminish the delegation of power authority of the Council it just redirected it back to what the Council's actual authorities really are, so, I think that that did clear that portion up. But I want to bring to everyone's attention, that there are other ethics standards that the tribe is held to, and you might find those in some of your federal awards, in some of your grants documents, in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Compact, and the IHS Compact Agreement, because all of those things will have, well not the same ethical standards that were written into our law, ethical actions that the tribe is saying we've agreed to follow. So, I would caution and advise that perhaps as an effort of the legislative branch, you go back and reread some of those documents and awards and see what types of things you may be bound to adhere to, such as campaign finance law, you might be bound to nepotism clauses, you might be bound to transparency clauses, and you're going to want to know that, because those are ethical standards and things that do have real consequences, when it comes to the federal finances that we receive. So that was my only comment, this law as far as I'm concerned as a citizen, on that February 16th date no longer applies so that was my only comment.

S. Agosa: I just wanted to respond about some of the other comments made. First of all, I do agree that the way that this Ethics Ordinance was being used could be construed as retaliatory and political. I do agree with that simply from looking at the ethics complaints. What really struck, what I focused on was that the ethics complaints were made about Tribal Council's attendance, which honestly, I think is pretty petty in all honesty, especially with all the other serious projects they could be working on. I, just for me, that's not significant enough to file an ethics complaint. So, in light of this I absolutely do support reimbursement for anyone who has been negatively affected by the way that this ordinance has been used. So, I do support that and also too in terms of the way the legislation was written, my question is really, why didn't the attorneys ensure that this ethics complaint, this ordinance, actually did meet all the standards of our constitution? I just don't understand, yes Council does write legislation, but also to, the attorney should be fully on board and as a backup make sure that everything that is written is in compliance with all other laws. That's my comment, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay thank you sir, now it's my turn. Well, I just heard, and I don't, I'm not usually going to call things out, especially because I only got two more months here to sit through this for the next two months, is that I just heard that that Counselor Crampton called out the Ogema and I, on something that's almost laughable, saying that we jump right through with each other and go through this thing. I really don't know why it was being called up, but at the end of the day is I'm really not sure what the thing is that I and the Ogema, are doing together. I mean at this point, you know, what's thought of me or given to me I personally don't care. It's not that I don't care because in a short couple of months, my wife and I are going to be going down south and we're just going to be on our own. So, at that point I'm going to go ahead and turn this over to Sandy Mezeske. And by the way, when Tribal Council, through our other attorneys, they sued Gary and I

for, we were just voting for posting the Board of Directors Act, only for posting for a 30-day public comment period. I was served to go to Court for that too, and it cost us money. We had to pay money to split the attorney, so maybe then, we're entitled to do that too. Yeah, I'm done, I'm going to Sandy Mezeske next.

S. Mezeske: I have done some research too online of other tribes that have terrific ordinances for the ethics and that you know a lot of them are titled different, but research is good because there's some really good ones out there. I believe that you as a Council as a whole, were working on this, months ago and I believe it was up for public comment okay for you to revisit the ethics ordinance. I personally, you know, this is the way I feel and I'm always going to feel this way, you had a complaint made against you, legit complaints, you didn't like the ruling okay. So now we take it to Court, okay that's fine. Reimbursement, oh heck no, oh no, no, no, that, that's just wrong. Because you, and I was going to mention that you and Gary wound up in Court, nobody paid your attorney fees you know. That's just wrong to reimburse, having one, two work sessions a week for the last six months, come on, you could be working. I mean this Zoom is working great, why not have more work sessions to work on that. I mean I agree with Diane, you know you postpone it take, it off, start working on it as a whole, you can zoom, you can work on this with an attorney in the room, you know. But reimbursement, no, because that's telling everybody, hey let's go way back because I didn't like this, I didn't like that, so therefore you know we're going to reimburse you, no. You know what's over and it's done and as Jessica said you know, null and void as of February 16th. I'm done.

G. DiPiazza: Yeah, I'm going to say that back on the 16th when that happened, we removed the any of the findings off the website. My biggest problem is I'll repeat it again all public posting of ethics complaints it's better or not or not shall be removed from postings and records pertaining to such ethics complaints shall be destroyed, shall be destroyed. I'm not saying that remove this I'm okay with removing, it's the wording. I got this yesterday, you submitted your agenda request when, it was, I don't even know, but you never had a resolution to accompany it until yesterday. So, was it written hastily, I have no idea, but to destroy records, official records, that's where I'm having the problem? I emailed you about it, Cindy, and I didn't get any response other than, yes go ahead and do that. Well, you're going to have to probably, I'm not destroying records, there ain't no way in hi-de-ho, so if you want to remove that out of your resolution, I'd feel better about the whole scenario, because I if you want to remove the rest of that, that ordinance, I'm okay with it. That's the only problem I'm having, is destroying official records, so I don't know where you want to go with it.

S. Crampton: Okay thank you. Well, I would like to say that no, I don't support reimbursement, I was the only person, the only elected official who represented themselves because of my knowledge of the law. Okay, I don't support reimbursement from this point on and I don't support the Recorder or the Ogema or the Speaker giving analogies of a third branch's decision. We don't say what's unconstitutional, the Court does. The third body, the Court, said this is unconstitutional. There's no question for you

to have in close, there's nothing for you to do, if you understood your position. We don't have anything to do with this now. Now for what you can't understand about removing those papers, since it's been declared unconstitutional and you no longer have plausible deniability, those people that you are putting those papers out on can turn around and sue the tribe. That's why they need to come down. Now there's a bigger problem with this ordinance and I pointed out in Court, it's the fact that you have a policy, half of its policy, half its Court, it doesn't work. The government portion where you create the body, and you tell them they only have to go as far as the preponderance of evidence. Then you made the Court the Appellate body, when you go to Court you have to have beyond a reasonable doubt, they don't jive, it won't work. Thank you.

S. Agosa: I just wanted to respond respectfully Mr. Speaker about your comments that soon you'll be heading down south or retiring, and I do understand that you're starting a new chapter in your life very soon; however, I just want to remind everyone sitting in these work sessions and Tribal Council meetings that I think the next generation is lost in our discussions and the issues brought up. That this tribe has existed for thousands if not millions of years and we will continue to exist. We fought through so much already in the past, this pandemic is just the tip of the iceberg for our people, so I just want us to stay focused. That even if there's retirements or whatever people are doing, that we still have the next generation to be responsible for it every day does matter, our decisions matter, and that we just stay focused on that. Thank you.

R. Pete: Okay and thank you very much because that's why I'm more than willing to hand off my share to the next generation. Thank you very much. Cindy.

C. Champagne: Yes, first of all, I'm going to address what Jessica said in regard to me bringing forward this resolution. The reason I brought the resolution forward is because I know that it would continue to be used, even though the Court has declared it unconstitutional. If it's not removed from our books, it would continue to be used. I've seen it since the short time I've been there, I've seen things being used that shouldn't be used. So, I wanted to make sure this wasn't used anymore, so that's why I brought it forward. I realized that the Court's decision should have nullified it, however, that's not how it always works around here. The second thing is, I just want to clarify, I did not ask for any money. Yes, I paid a lawyer and stuff, but I didn't ask for money and I'm not asking for it now. I'm just saying that I don't want any other individual to go through what I went through since I've been on this Council. So, people can say what they want, I don't really care but I'm trying to look out for the benefit of our Tribal members who come on board. I'm trying to look out for our Tribal members who put us in these seats to look at the benefit of the tribe and try to write laws that will protect them and will benefit them and that's what I'm looking out for. So, I still want to leave this on there because I think it's worth it. I think we have to follow what the Court says and let's just get it over with, instead of arguing about it.

R. Pete: Okay thank you. I've exhausted the queue thank you, um but I still have a motion and support to postpone this, correct? Yes, okay, so I've seen no more hands, so Gary, do a roll call.

Roll Call #4

G. DiPiazza	Yes	D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	C. Champagne	No	R. Pete	Yes
S. Lewis	No	R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No

Motion carried (5-4-0-0)

G. DiPiazza: Oh no, [inaudible] then I would have had to destroy the records. Five in favor, four against, that item has been postponed. When would you like a work session on that?

R. Pete: As soon as possible. Okay Cindy, I'm sorry, Cindy, it's up to you

S. Crampton: I think Shannon wanted to say something, let him say it and then I'll answer.

S. Crampton: Yeah, I had a point of order.

R. Pete: Sorry Shannon, go ahead.

S. Crampton: I have a point of order, if you can control him, Speaker. His wrong analogy does not apply, there's no records being destroyed, and for him to keep saying that after that, I mean come on let's just knock it off. He's misleading the membership listen, he's misleading the membership and it shouldn't be allowed to happen. He has no law degree. He doesn't even know what he's talking about.

D. Lonn: It's right in the papers.

G. DiPiazza: It's right there, it says shall be destroyed. Can you see that on your screen?

S. Crampton: Yes. It doesn't, do you know that has no meaning? It has no meaning other than it shall be destroyed. It's unconstitutional, do you understand what that means?

G. DiPiazza: Oh yes, I do

S. Crampton: Evidently not, evidently not.

G. Dipiazza: Can we move on everybody?

S. Crampton: If you can be quiet, I want the point of order from the Speaker. Please, Mr. Speaker, can you control him?

R. Pete: I am controlling him, now go ahead, I said.

S. Crampton: Okay, oh my god, are you done with that and the noises now? Alright please, just keep them to the minimum. I know it's like a kindergarten but please.

R. Pete: I'm trying Shannon, okay please.

S. Crampton: All right thank you Speaker thank you, yes Oh my god, I just want to make the point of order. If we just keep the point of order and keep him quiet, get the medication or something, but just keep him quiet, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay Shannon, are you okay, are you done?

S. Crampton: Yes, I'm done.

R. Pete: All right just a minute, thank you. No, we're moving on.

G. DiPiazza: No, I want in the queue. I want to say, are all you Tribal members okay with this kind of talk? Are you okay with that because I'm asking? I'm asking you Tribal members, I got 37 of them on here, are you okay with that?

M. Burmeister: Mr. Speaker? I'd like in the queue please, this is Michael.

G. DiPiazza: Because I'm not okay with that.

R. Pete: Just a minute, I'm not done with Gary yet, go ahead.

G. DiPiazza: I try to be as decent as possible with the things I got to deal with, especially this rhetoric about, oh my god he needs medication, really dude? It's, are you members okay with that? I'm asking you that, there's 37 of you on here.

L. Romanelli: I'm willing to answer....

[inaudible] G. DiPiazza, L. Romanelli, D. Lonn, S. Crampton: were all talking over each other.

G. DiPiazza: You're all okay with that?

D. Lonn: No, I'm not.

S. Crampton: He's supposed to be talking to the Speaker not the members.

G. DiPiazza: Well, I'm talking to the members, I'm done. Thank you.

R. Pete: Okay first of all now I got a bunch of hands up and I don't even know where it's at. So, I'm just going to start making a queue, wait a minute Michael Burmeister, was first, I think. Michael.

C. Champagne: Hey Ron, this is Cindy, I thought you had me in the queue as to, and I let Shannon go first.

R. Pete: Oh, I did, you're right, I forgot all about it, Cindy. Go ahead.

C. Champagne: Okay, I didn't want to postpone it, I voted not to, however, since it was voted to have it postponed, I'd like it to be put on a work session tomorrow, or as soon as possible. I think it's important that we get this, get this passed, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay thank you Cindy I just said that we're going to push for that tomorrow, okay? All right now I'm going to start again and I'm going to try to make some sense of this and somebody just give me, first of all I'm going to go with Michael Burmeister.

M. Burmeister: I'm not happy with any of this rhetoric, people should just say what they have to say, without interference and without any name calling, references to anything but the business at hand. You're elected officials, people elected you not to argue, but to do what's best for the tribe. That's all I have to say Mr. Speaker, thank you.

J. Steinberg: Mr. Speaker I'm not sure how commentary when another Speaker or another counselors speaking is helpful to debate. And I would really like to see Mr. Speaker that, debate in an open forum is respectful, debate in an open forum is forthright. And I think it's really necessary Mr. Speaker, for you to ask your fellow Council members, to please understand that their role is to debate the matter at hand, not to provide commentary that detracts from the debate. I was listening to the whole thing, I hear it in my headphones, and really it spiraled downhill when we started getting noises from inside the room. So, I think Mr. Speaker please try to make sure that we stay focused on an open fruitful debate. Thank you.

R. Pete: Jessica, I'm going to go off a queue a minute, because I would like to answer you. About three, four weeks ago, I started this upfront, and I said the rules that we had. I was complimented with one of the most respectful Council meetings that we had had in a long time. And trust me, I'm doing everything I can, other than getting duct tape and putting it over people's mouths, so that maybe I can get some, because look it, I don't agree with what everybody says, but I respect the fact that they have the right to say it. I don't, there's a lot of things on Council that we don't agree on and especially with a couple of other Councilors that are different from my point of view. But I do respect that they have a chance to say it. And they have a chance to say without the commentary, without the other thing in the background and so, that we don't get into one of these things that are going back and forth and people that are listening to on our zoom meeting. And thank you very much for stating that. At the next Council meeting that we have, I'm going to clearly state the rules again before we get the Council meeting started. And thank you for offering me that.

C. Densmore: I couldn't agree more with Jessica. I think that it's so important to try and stay on task and just really try to not devolve into the chaotic nonsense. And the biggest thing that I just wanted to bring up is, we had multiple work sessions and so many discussions and a resolution brought to the floor, trying to help Grace manage the minutes and all of that and you guys, like yelling over each other and fighting amongst yourselves and the chaotic stuff back and forth is just so unhelpful to that. So, we had all of these discussions talking about how we're going to help Grace and how we're going to

do this and how we're going to try and maintain decorum, which you know up until today, has been much better over the past few weeks, thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I mean really, if that's such a big priority too we should make sure and be trying to keep some of this stuff to the minimum. I would absolutely hate for zoom to once again, become this controversial topic, where you guys are talking about limiting or doing anything like that, because at the end of the day, like this is so important and just trying to keep that decorum amongst yourselves, is really important as well. I am done, thank you.

C. Waitner: My only commentary on this is that it bothers me to hear disrespect going back and forth with our Counselors. I don't believe you guys should always see eye to eye and I believe that things are always, should be debatable but when it comes to open session debates, let's work with the kind of the buck stops. It should go on behind the scenes because it's okay to agree to disagree, I'm all for that. As far as the Ethic Ordinance, I don't know how many complaints were filed, I don't know who sat on them and I guess in my opinion it really doesn't matter. But I do believe membership has the right to be heard, and I don't like the reference to there's no reasoning or rationale, again that depends on a Tribal citizen not counsel to make those decisions. I don't like the idea of any records being destroyed only because it is a part of our history. Whether it be good or bad, it's things that we learn from, so please take that into consideration. And I agree with Jessica, there's all kinds of references out there, go out there and pick apart what they have, and bring it back and make the best possible for our tribe. Because I don't think this is a debatable situation, I just think it's very logical that we have something in place that our citizens can go to. Thank you.

S. Crampton: Well just from sitting here in the last 10 minutes it's easy to see why this tribe is easily confused. And I would just like to point out that we had a vote on Councilor Champaign's item. At the end of that vote, the Speaker started making comments about his opinion of the vote that had just ended, which is against the rules and procedures. I called for a point of order, and when I called for the point of order, the Recorder and Mrs. Lonn started making noises. So, you can clarify this as an argument all you want and try to spin it out, you see that only exacerbates the problems at Little River, you have to identify the root cause and correct it. I made a point of word to the Speaker, my point of order, if it would have been heard and not interrupted by the Speaker and Miss Lonn is, you should have thrown them out. You keep saying these rules and enforcing them on others but when it comes to Mrs. Lonn, Tommy, Diane, Dave the whole group, the both of you, they're allowed to make all kinds of noises and it's never enforced. So, my point of order was just

T. Guenthardt: [inaudible]

R. Pete: Come on Tommy, please.

T. Guenthardt: He can eat my s---.

S. Crampton: He just said "He can eat my s---", that's on record you know what he's been calling our female members mother f-----. What is it, what is it with this group? What is it with you? Where, how were you raised, Mr. Guenthardt?

D. Corey: Shannon if you're a professional you can just ignore it and let's just move on with business children.

S. Crampton: It's not children, hey listen, I'm in the queue. I'm in the queue. I have a point of order, it's not children. Children is what you're trying to do. The point of order was that the Recorder started this. He should have been stopped by the Speaker, he continually violates the law, if he wants this to be serious enforce it equally. There's no argument. It was a point of order, and you couldn't even, I couldn't even get it out, for the comments coming out of that room. Now, that's not an argument, that's just against procedure. Thank you.

D. Lonn: You know I sat in on many, many...

G. DiPiazza: Don't even go there.

D. Lonn: meetings over the time...

G. DiPiazza: Don't even go there....

D. Lonn: be quiet, over the time um I've been here, as well as before this, and yes there is disrespect here and, but the name calling is horrible here. And I'm getting a little tired of it, being told that I don't know what I'm doing and all this other stuff, because it isn't just me, he's saying that or they are saying it, it's everybody. So, I really think you're right it's got to stop. Thank you.

VI. Concluding Business

A. Next Meeting Date is Wednesday, March 3, 2021

B. Ogema Weekly Status and Business Update

L. Romanelli: Thank you after all that conversation I think I'm good for this week. I don't know if Brandy's on. If she wants to give an update on the Covid that's fine, otherwise I'm good to go.

B. Martin: We have an upcoming vaccination clinic in Muskegon next Wednesday and Thursday, the 3rd and 4th, in Norton Shores at our new clinic building. So, if anybody is in the Muskegon area and they would like to send in their pre-registration forms for to get appointments for that the clinic is taking those. So, I guess just spread the word.

D. Lonn: On that note Brandy, thank you for all the work you've done. I did hear today that at least the state I think, and the federal are lowering it so that 16-year old's and

above can now get that shot, so is that our tribe going to do the same, or what's our next step as far as age group?

B. Martin: So, either Pfizer or Moderna was not tested or was only tested the lowest age was 16 so it would be dependent on which vaccination you're getting. Now, as the newer vaccines come online and if they are available for younger than that, then most definitely they can be vaccinated for those people or as the testing moves forward that would be something that would open up to children as well. But right now, there's nothing that's really been tested on children. So, I do,

D. Lonn: Excuse me I meant 16 and above.

R. Pete: That's what she was saying.

B. Martin: I would believe it, there is either the Pfizer or Moderna, one of them is for 16 and up so it would be dependent on which one we have in house and which one that benefits. I did have another point to share and in the White House call for Tribal Nations last week they did share that 13.4 percent of tribes are ahead of all the states on receiving their first dose and they are on par with the states on administering the second dose. So, tribes are doing an excellent job getting vaccination out to their Tribal members.

S. Agosa: I have a few questions and I hope that I'll be given enough time to get responses. First of all, I just want to say that I read on CNN that they're projecting that the pandemic will impact the next few winters and I just wanted a response from Larry and Brandy if we're starting to make projections and when Tribal members will know how long potentially this pandemic will last. That's my first question but I have others, thank you.

L. Romanelli: Okay, I've been watching the whole information on CNN and other places and obviously they don't have a clear understanding of where, when, and how this pandemic is going to continue. So, no, we have no clear directions other than watching and trying to adjust to whatever information is out there from my perspective. I don't know if Brandy wants to answer as well, but yeah, we're looking at it.

R. Pete: It's just locally but the Mercy Hospital in Muskegon as of a few weeks ago there were up to 161 Covid patients in their hospital. As of yesterday, they are now down to zero. They have no Covid patients in the hospital whatsoever and that's where we live and that's the area that has been affected a lot and now, they're down to nothing in their hospital. So, you know what, there's a lot of things that are out there on CNN and all the other stuff. I just pay attention to what's going on with ourselves.

B. Martin: I will also comment on Ms. Agosa's question. I think Covid is an ever-changing thing, and everybody is kind of you know, taking in the data that is being collected and adjusting accordingly and you know that's, I think at this point that's all we can do. Manistee also has no patients in our hospital right now and our numbers are doing really well and we're trending downward. But with the new variants coming online you

know; this is going to be an ongoing thing for a while until we reach herd immunity and that's anywhere between you know 75 to 85 percent of people receiving the vaccine. So, we just have to continue doing our mitigation efforts and encouraging people to get the vaccine if they're so inclined, that's the way we're going to make it through this. This could end up to be something similar to the flu where it reoccurs every year. We just don't have enough information at this point but as for the tribe we definitely are staying on top of it, and we will adjust accordingly as we go forward.

S. Agosa: I just wanted to respond to referencing Muskegon. Although I know some of our Tribal members do live in that area, I just want to remind Council that many of our members live outside the nine-county. So, I don't think that Muskegon should necessarily be the template by which we monitor everything that's going on in the world, both in Michigan and nationally like maybe reference more than just one area. I think that referencing Muskegon having zero cases might give the members false hope or even misinformation, so I'd like more data on that, not just one area, that's my comment. My second comment is, in terms of Covid funding, will the members receive any more direct payments, Covid funding, is it coming down the pike? Have you heard anything, that's my question, but I have others too? Thank you.

R. Pete: Okay so we're going to move on into legislative affairs after this and save that for public comment. And the question is about Muskegon, I never said that Muskegon was a template, what I did say is that it's reported all over the news down there that Muskegon has no Covid patients, and the other hospitals are dropping immensely down there. So that's the only thing I reported on, it's not by any case a barometer it's just a very good situation that they don't have any Covid patients. I have had not heard anything more about more Covid funding coming so that we can get Tribal members other stimulus checks.

C. Legislative Affairs Update

G. DiPiazza: Just so everybody knows Brian Newland was just appointed to the Deputy Secretary for the Interior. He is a former Council Chair at Bay Mills Indian Community, so that's exciting that we've got another native in that mix and he's very, very sharp, so I think I'm looking forward to some exciting things. I'm sad we're going to lose him off our consent decree because then he's no longer going to be there. The other thing I tell people also, along with getting your vaccine, you know many, many years ago, we had cures for everything that's out in the environment. A lot of these cures and a lot of these things, a lot of us still know and still practice. I was taught a long time ago about some cures with some common medicines by my great aunt and she is the one that, she never spoke any English, she only knew Anishinaabe. So, keep that in mind, when you're in doubt look to, look to your world, look to the Creator, because that's going to help you. If you need assistance. I'd be more than glad to share but somebody needs to share with me too and ask. That being said, I'm all set.

S. Crampton: I just want to say that the nomination for Deb Haaland is really heating up and any support that tribes can get out there, the membership can call other congressmen other senators it doesn't matter if they're from your state or not, they still listen to you. When I go out to Washington, I rack all the doors it doesn't matter just from Michigan I just don't talk to who's ever in their office, but you can call them yourself. Right now, I'd focus on Joe Manchin, he's the linchpin right now and he seems to be steering towards big business. We want this, we want our land back in the hands of our people, this is what this means, it's huge. So, you can make calls any congressman any senator it doesn't matter where they're at. Thank you.

J. Steinberg: Thanks Mr. Speaker, I was just echoing what Counselor Crampton just said. Miss Haaland's second hearing began this morning at 10 o'clock. She is really getting questioned very, very hard by mining and oil interests. The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will ultimately determine whether or not her nomination even gets out of committees and that group of senators is listed at [ussenate.gov](https://www.usenate.gov). So, if you'd like just, you know, take some time today, look at that list, shoot them an email. It's all free, you can do that let them know you support her appointment, because she really is getting opposition from some very powerful lobbying organizations. So, we want this nomination out of committee to get it to the floor so she can be confirmed, so thank you.

D. Public Comment Period

C. Densmore: I actually just had a question for the Ogema. I didn't want to interrupt earlier; I know that last week he had mentioned that he was having a meeting with the casino and potentially discussing whether or not they were looking at in the future opening up anymore or changing any restrictions. I was just wondering if he had any sort of updates as to if the casino is changing anything related to their capacity or if and when the government center is looking at opening up a little bit more. Thank you.

L. Romanelli: Yes, I did have the meeting, we did talk about possible reopening to a greater degree. We're now at approximately 25% we're looking at going, moving towards 50%. There are a few things that may be a hang up there, one is financially if we have additional monies whereas we may need to put in extra plastic protectors between the machines, which could cost a significant amount of money. There's also a question within the gaming commission I think, on that issue where we're looking at other gaming facilities to see what they're doing. So, the hope is that we can reopen and the sooner the better for me, because I think we're now in a phase where we're in competition with the others that are within our area, and I think we need to kind of open that up. I also had a meeting regarding the government center and reopening that a little bit more as well. As you know, we now have it by appointment. But I'm thinking about within the next two to four weeks opening it more than it has been. Because of the numbers in the area going down and the need to conduct business in both sides we're looking at trying to reopen more within the next month if we can.

S. Agosa, I just want to make a comment that I feel as though when it's Larry's turn to update the members that it's quickly moved through and kind of glossed over, and I was not able to ask very pertinent questions, so I'd appreciate Mr. Speaker to slow down and allow us to ask all the questions that we really want to. So, this question is to Larry and it's regarding the management of the casino. I'd appreciate a more in-depth update every week I don't feel members should really have to always ask things like what meetings you're attending, key issues, any conferences, or trainings you've been attending, even remotely and even Tribal relations. So, I'd like to see those subjects explained more fully every week. My understanding is you are managing the casino right now, independently by yourself from what I've gathered. So especially now if we are going to make changes to the casino and how many customers we allow in the doors, definitely would like more information every week.

L. Romanelli: Well for my part I gloss over it because some of the questions are the same questions over and over again and we've given as much information as we can and it's about the management of the casino and why I'm there. I try to give updates as I can. Most of these meetings, a lot of these meetings, are in closed session right now, we have other things going on, so while I do try to give information, I limit it for a number of reasons. As far as trainings and whatever, I'm not sure where she was going with that, so I don't know how to answer. I think that anytime we go on travel and there has been very little lately by either our staff or by myself or by Tribal Council there's usually reports that come back. But uh, I'm not sure where she was going with that. Thank you.

S. Crampton: Okay thank you, um, I want to change it up a little bit, I'm very disturbed as a Native American man, I'm very, very disturbed. If one of us says something wrong it gets blown out of proportion 'did you see that he said something about meditation,' 'he said something about eyebrows' we have a Council Member who refers to female members as mother f-----, today he just told everybody, in front of everybody, that another Council Member can eat his s---. When the minutes come out, it'll probably be recorded as inaudible, and none of his family members will say anything about it on Facebook. That is a disgrace in Indian Country. I have never ever seen a Council or a tribe that would accept that. This is deplorable. I am outraged, that is, no, I'm disgusted. I don't want to set with that trash. Anybody who accepts this right now when you say anything's acceptable, Mr. Speaker I'm talking to you, because I'm supposed to address this. We need to bring this guy up on charges. The Ogema files ethics complaints when people miss a meeting than says nothing about this kind of behavior. This is what's wrong with this tribe. Thank you.

C. Densmore: Not to change the conversation but I was just raising my hand to make sure everybody was aware that the Cultural Committee was having its second open meeting today at 2:00 so if you are able or interested and would like to give us some suggestions and be part of the conversation as to some of the teachings that we're going to try and be focusing on for the spring and all of that I have posted the agenda all over Facebook and I'll have the agenda available today and the meeting id I'll say that as well. It is 839-3567-

8736 and the passcode is 1836. We would love anyone that is able to attend. Thank you so much.

J. Steinberg: Hi, Mr. Speaker, if I could, in this public comment time, I'd like to offer up a very short prayer for the healing of our community because I think that we're pretty fractured. Couldn't agree more with Counselor Crampton as far as deplorable language and you know there are mechanisms that we can deal with that but one of the ways we absolutely can deal with that is to pray for each other. So, Mr. Speaker if you'd let me, please, [prayer in Anishinaabemowin] my prayer asked that the Creator would bring us all the medicine to heal ourselves and that it would help us to live and walk in a good way and live a good life. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that's all I have.

Unidentified: Aho

Unidentified: Miigwetch.

S. Agosa: Sorry I'm losing my voice, I just want to say thank you very much for that prayer and in our native tongue, that was just so refreshing and healing and very much needed, so thank you Jessica for doing that. I just want to say that that was going to be one of my suggestions also along the lines of returning to our grandfather's wisdom is just having more talking circles if Tribal Council would be willing to set those up. Kind of like a work session once a week or twice a week and just talk the stuff out, why not? I think that would be a great way just to get to know each other and alleviate the stress so that's my comment about that. But also, too I wanted to return back to what Larry was saying about trainings. That was just a suggestion, I just gave suggestions of things I would like updates on not necessarily that you'd be taking a training every week but that would be a topic I'd be interested in knowing about and just having more explanations. You know we do manage a multi-million-dollar casino and government so Larry I think there's always something that can be said and an explanation every week even if some of the topics are repetitive it's still worthwhile for me as a member and why I come to these meetings. So, I have another question about BetRivers, but do you want me to get back in the queue Mr. Speaker?

S. Mezeske: Jessica thank you for that, I'm sitting here at home and I'm pretty teary-eyed, I really am, I'm heartbroken. I'm heartbroken for this tribe. When you say deplorable, this has been deplorable since last January. Anybody can go back and listen and read and the comments and its agitation. Somebody says something it pushes a button and then lots will speak, this has been out of control for a year now, okay 13 months. 13 months that we have seen a Council that cannot get along, they just don't get along. I am going to say this, this is the worst Council we've ever had in our history. I don't know what it's going to be like, I mean you guys haven't been in the same room for over a year and it continues, and it continues and I'm just sick. I am just sick, that nine people can't sit in a room and get along without calling names you know you know criminal charges give me a break I'm an 'inbred', I'm a 'kindergartner', I'm an 'idiot', I'm a 'Beverly hillbillies', how many charges do you want? This is ridiculous and every time we turn around, oh my

gosh criminal charges, good god, oh another case in Court. We spend more time in Court than we do getting along. I am just heartbroken, I am just heartbroken, and I'm done.

D. Lonn: Larry in regards to Aki are we going to maybe try to open so the Elders can go there for lunch, or no?

L. Romanelli: Right now, it doesn't look like it's going to happen through February and possibly not March. We're looking at April first as a possible date to start doing elder meals inside Aki again for their protection but yes that's where we're hoping to get to. The other issue with Aki, is trying to do weddings and graduations and stuff, I don't believe that's going to be happening even in April, because we have the social distancing etc., why take extra chances. But for the Elders meals to be served inside, yes, the tentative is looking at April first but we have so many things to look at but yeah thanks for asking.

D. Lonn: I have another comment. I want to apologize to Sandy, I don't, I don't think this is the worst, there's five of us that work really well together. But you're right, I'm tired of being called names, I'm tired of being told I don't know nothing, and yes it does bother me because, that's the way I was treated when I was a kid and I'm 70 years old. I'm trying very hard, we are here to make the best of it, but there are some personalities that just won't get along with the rest of us.

S. Crampton: Thank you, Speaker. I can appreciate all the trying to turn this around and spread it out to the bad counsel but no, if you go back and look at the minutes that Sandy referenced in the start point, what happened was, members were being attacked by five Council members when they asked questions. When I started to fight back for the members and say that's not right, then you got all this complaint, look he's doing this, he's doing that, no, the reality is you just had a Council Member that told somebody they could eat their s--- in front of everybody. You can't make that go away, you can't, you can't make an excuse. The same Council member refers to female members of counsel as mother f-----. No there's no equation, there's no excuse. You can try all you want, that's how it went. This is the worst Council. And since the last election, there's been more problems, people don't understand their position, you've got members that come in here and think they can just, whoever's talking, they can just start talking right away, that nothing's enforced on them, it's fostered, it's built up, it's reinforced that certain members can talk and others can't, now this is a charade. All you who are really intellectual out there, pay attention to this. We have a Council member that refers to female members as mother f----- and just told everybody, in front of everybody here, another Council member they can eat their s--- without any fear of reprisal or any kind of enforcement. Now once again, I would like to say that the Ogema has filed these ethic complaints and thought these were so egregious, nothing today. Just the smart members be aware, thank you.

C. Waitner: I'm here Ron, thank you. Israel just walked into my office, and he wants to speak. I want to reiterate; I'm not giving my time up. Israel's computer kind of took a rest

so to speak so, he walked into my office. So, he would like to speak, and I raised my hand for him to speak not myself. Thank you.

R. Pete: If Connie is not in the queue, go ahead Israel.

I. Stone: Thank you and I just wanted to comment, for me to sit on one of these meetings and actually audibly hear an elder crying is heartbreaking. And we look back through this tribe's history and the many battles and challenges we face, not just in present time, but for hundreds of years to get to a destination. And right now, I hear Shannon's points on people saying things, but quite honestly, I will say back to that, I've heard it from almost every Council member. And it's easy to point the finger at somebody else but there's that time in life and every day that we need to reflect upon ourselves. And take a look at ourselves in the mirror and ask ourselves what are we contributing to the betterment of the tribe? Or what are we contributing to the harm of the tribe? And I would argue that regardless of who's saying what, it's harmful, it's hurtful, it needs to stop. We've been asking this for several meetings now, to please stop this kind of behavior. If somebody truly did make the statements that Shannon is saying somebody made, shame on you, shame on you. But again, it's about reflecting and taking a look at yourself and saying how can I make a difference? And how can I make a change? And I think the one thing we lose in all this is, Council seats are not positions of power. You guys were elected to serve the people's interests, all of the people, regardless of what area you represent. Constitutionally, you have a responsibility to represent every member of this tribe. And if tearing each other down and saying the kind of comments we hear week after week, is your vision of representing the tribe, that's scary, that's scary. You guys are better than that and I say that all the time, but I actually believe that you're better than that. And I believe you're capable of much more than what you're doing right now. But if we keep going down this path that we're going down right now, you can be certain that this tribe won't have a legacy to leave, because we're going to tear it down. Thank you.

L. Romanelli: Okay thank you, and I'm speaking as a Tribal member not as the Ogema necessarily. I think this happens almost every meeting where there's some agitation that goes on and it escalates from there. In this case I believe it was when somebody interrupted or thought they were interrupted and said, 'give somebody their medication' and from there and talked about 'kindergarten' and 'oh my god' and 'underlings' and it just continued to escalate. It happens the same time almost every time, and I get frustrated as well. If there was something that was said about a female, as Counselor Crampton is stating, I didn't hear it. And I know there was at one point, there were some questions that it wasn't being recorded properly or whatever the case is. If somebody truly believes that was said, yes that's inexcusable. But it's also the duty of those people that heard it or know they heard it, to take action. You have an obligation to address it. And from my understanding, it apparently hasn't been addressed, other than just bringing it up at every meeting. Address it if it happened, you know the same thing with the 'tractor pullers' and 'hillbillies' and the 'inbred' and stuff, those are unacceptable, and we know where they come from, and nobody wants to admit it or go wherever that is. You know

this happens and I got to say you hear from people that are running for office more they get more vocal at just before election times and I believe that's partly what happens. The Ogema did not file all the ethics charges, matter of fact the one that was ruled out from the Court initially, I believe, was not one from me so Councilor Crampton is absolutely wrong with that. So, I think we need to get over a lot of the stuff that keeps happening you know. And as a Tribal member, I'm disappointed in this and I've been here 14 years as well in my position as Ogema. And I'm just disgusted by it, by the way this just deteriorates every time. I do think it's time for Tribal Counselors to get back in the office if for no other reason than for the morale of the employees of the resort and of the government. Because if it's safe enough for them to come into the offices, it should be safe enough for our elected officials and I'm done. Thank you.

S. Agosa: I just want to respond that I think a lot of the conflict could be alleviated by including all members in decision making and ensuring money is managed properly that we're 100 percent confident in our leaders decisions especially financially....okay excuse me, anyway sorry about that, so back to what I was saying, I just feel that a lot of conflict could be alleviated if all members are included in decision making especially outlying members and that we have assurance our money is managed properly at all times with 100 transparency and integrity and also communicating regularly so that's my comment on that topic. But I do have a question about BetRivers, I just wanted to know the percentage that we'll receive from BetRivers. Jessica Steinberg posted an article about gaming profits, online gaming profits, which have been pretty successful so far according to this article and I would just like to express I feel that we should get at least 60 percent of the profits from any online gaming especially if the company is using our Tribal seal so I don't know what percentage we are getting but I hope it's high enough to make it very worth it for our members, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay, first of all I would have to pull that contract again, but I can assure you that all the Tribal Council voted on that thing in closed session, and they all voted for BetRivers and that was a company that was recommended to us.

C. Champagne: Yes, I'm sorry, I guess I want to just clarify a couple of things. Shannon's not lying about what he said, that one of the counselor members called another female counselor. The female counselor that they're referring to is me, and yes, I did hear it. No, I haven't filed charges because, like I said I was trying to go according to the constitution, and there's no sense in costing the tribe more money by filing stuff like this. I just hope that people get more professional and start acting it in addressing what Israel said about he heard all Council members refer to people negatively. Israel if I've ever done that, you let me know, because that's not my way. I try to be respectful to my fellow Council members and to our Tribal members. If I'm ever disrespectful, I want to know about it because that is not my way. So, I wanted to clarify those two things.

S. Crampton: Well first I just want to correct the Ogema's statement I didn't say he filed all the complaints I said the majority. But he constantly keeps trying to redirect my

statement so just be aware of that write down what I say then watch what he adds afterwards that's a common trick that he pulls. But I want to get back to if the members that I've talked to and you protect me thank you, you're catching on really good. The members can see that the family when one of the family members is caught, like Mr. Guenthardt, doing what he did there's this 'oh, all of Council, all of Council, everybody, everybody, everybody's to blame'. No, it's one Council member, grow up, man up, it's not that hard to do. Real men do it every day. Thank you.

L. Romanelli: Okay, I'm just responding to Counselor Champagne saying that she's not rude. Just on the work session earlier this week, I asked her to respond to a question which I, as a Tribal member also, has a right to ask and some of my counselors. And she said she doesn't have to answer, the counselors don't have to answer the Tribal Ogema, that's rude. Recently she questioned my ethnicity again in an open, in a situation, so I disagree with that so, she's not exempt. Thank you.

R. Pete: Okay I got a motion from Tom to close the first open and I got support from Diane. I got a motion from Tom, I got support from Diane is there any further discussion?

S. Crampton: Thank you, well I think this back in July 31st of I think 2013 or 14 Sandy Mezeske called the question with regarding closing the membership meeting and it was on my birthday, sorry July 31st, 2013. And nothing was said, I called the question, and the Ogema blew a fit in how this was against [inaudible], go back and read what he wrote. Since then, there's been two motions to call a question without a word from the Ogema. My belief is that this is going to be another attempt to end this because it's all going sideways for Mr. Guenthardt, so please I hope that's wrong because I'd like to hear what the members have to say on this issue, this is a big issue. This really happened you guys. You can't just blaze it away, it really happened, it was brazened, it was disrespectful, and no Mrs. Champagne is probably the only Council member that I've served with since 2015 that when you make a swear word, when you say something, she physically gets uncomfortable. You can see her rend her hands and her eyes move downward, I've never seen that before, so to call her into question like this is totally wrong and absolutely false. Thank you.

C. Champagne: Okay in regard to Larry Romanelli's comment that I had questioned his ethnicity, yes it was in closed session for the ethics but since that's been ruled unconstitutional, I guess I'd be safe in saying why I questioned it. He brought me up on ethics and my question was, you're bringing me up on ethics, do you really have the right to do that. Why I question whether he had the right to do that or not, I wouldn't have brought this up, but Mr. Romanelli brought it up so, I'm just clarifying, why I did it is, you swore under oath in State Court that you were not a Tribal person. That you were Italian so if you're swearing under oath that you're not Tribal then I have a right to question whether you have the right to bring me up on ethics. Yes, I know you're the Ogema which you stress, that wasn't my question my thing was do you have the right as a Tribal person since you swore you weren't Tribal and that is why I did that. So, if you

call me disrespectful for that, that was defending myself and yes, I did say that I didn't have to answer to you in regards to what I posted. You were asking as the Ogema, you weren't asking as a Tribal member and no, I do not report to you, I report to our citizens. And if they told me to answer that or ask me that question, I would gladly have answered so those are my responses to the Ogema. Thank you.

S. Mezeske: I'm going to [inaudible] Mr. Crampton. He wants Tom Guenthardt to man up, he should man up too, thank you.

R. McCaslin: Aanii, Boozhoo, *Watcha*. I just want to, you know, I only have one vote out here and out there in this land, and I'm privileged to have that vote or two votes. And I sit back, and yesterday, I watched the hearing and I seen all these corporations hammer a beautiful spirit person. And in reflection of that, right as we reflect on that, I just wanted to acknowledge this weekend. I'll be heading to the National State Park in New Jersey, and we'll be doing a *mana do we waku win* ceremony there for the first massacre in the country. And I just wanted to give thanks to those prior Ogema's the real Ogema's, not the *Ogumakan* and the *wabinus* and that chief that stood there and took the first battle for the people that happened that night with the Dutch. and it all takes a course because there's certain permits that we need to draw and that. And I just wanted to say Chi Miigwetch. I just see this all these all these Anishinaabe people here that have different views and different constituents. Maybe we all the same constituents, but maybe we're all part of the whole. We don't understand that yet, but better days are coming. And this weekend is going to be nice and two ceremonies actually, we'll be doing one in Connecticut also. These are some trying times and one nation walking together and I feel strongly about that, and I keep strong in that faith. That's all I wanted to mirror image because now we got the technology to bring this to a better level. Better level of seeing you and acknowledging that. Okay that's all I have. Baamaapii.

S. Crampton: Thank you Speaker. I just want to say, well thank you Robert for that, and I just want members to really realize what's going on. I mean, thank you all right for what you've been texting. You're getting it, but you need to watch what's going on. None of the family members are going to condemn one of their own, the Ogema won't either. That was the most atrocious thing that happened in any, you can go back and look in the minutes, in any open session, not a word, not a word. But they're going to try and divert the blame and equalize out some way that it's, not possible. But you see that and I'm just gracious for the members becoming aware of how this goes. There's no real accountability. If it's one of them is caught, nothing happens, spread it out, everybody's at fault, everybody's in play. But if someone says something far less, they get crucified if they're not from the family. This is beyond ridiculous. All that has to happen is, he has to be accountable for what he did. Thank you.

G. DiPiazza: Yeah, I just wanted to say I apologized for earlier. I'm over 60 years old. I should know better than to take that bait, because then you end up with a hook in the line and I want to apologize for everybody, I should know better and take that bait. I hear it's

always somebody else's fault, I'm taking responsibility. I want to hear it from the other take responsibility. People send me stuff off nosebook all the time and some of the things that are said by our own Council people against Council people. I know that's a bait in the tuck and that's okay. And you know what? I know better, but I'm going to leave you with this [*Anishinaabemowin – un-transcribed*]. And take that to heart, because when I when I burn this medicine the Creator he'll come and see, and he watches. That day on that 20th, when it was called for a smudging of the Mayors of America, something spectacular happened that day and guess what, you can watch it materialize. But you, a lot of people aren't ready for that, they're not ready to hear that. They're not ready to see that. And when you have evidence that it materializes and it's there, a turtle materialized itself, an ancient, very ancient one. And guess what, he showed himself right here, right over here showing. So, because they're here to protect us when you rely on your medicines. And again, I'll take responsibility, because that's what everybody wants here. People to take responsibility for their actions but I don't see that a whole lot. And I will, I'll apologize for taking that bait and that'll be the last time I take that bait because yeah, we're going to do it.

S. Crampton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well to restate my point here, there was no bait. There was a vote, and then the Recorder started to say things on his opinion after the vote. I asked for a point of order and could not even speak for him interrupting. So, there was no bait, it doesn't matter how many times you say that you can't change what really happened, thank you.

R. Wittenberg 0927: On Tribal Council and talking as a member. I hear many others do that though even though I'm sitting on Council, I'm still a Council Member. I turn around and I want to say, we talk about a Talking Circle, and I can say at the end here, this has been most constructive. I looked down here and we got roughly 31 people on here and we've been talking more and not coming back on one another. The shameful part about that is we always bring up Seven Generations, but we don't even use none of our teachings, along with the Seven Generations. We turn around and I, personally think and feel, that we were brought up in the shaganaas way and that's the only way we did we know, and we turned around and put us that war on Tribal Council. Our Grandfathers said, 'don't forget where we come from, we learn their ways, but don't forget where we came from'. And that's what we need, you got the Seven Grandfather Teaching, we all know what they mean but I was told by my teacher that if you're out of sync of one you're out of sync of them all. What part don't we understand? I'm no different, I turn around and it starts with me first thing in the morning. Yes, we do let things get out of hand, but then like Gary there, he just stood up to the plate. I personally was flabbergasted and ashamed to have one person disrespect a woman, with the woman all of us if it weren't for them, we would not be here. And if you disrespect one woman, you disrespect all women and that includes your wife, your girlfriend, the person, the woman sitting next to you. That's what it means but we have our shaganaas way, oh no, that's not concerning my woman no you disrespect one you, disrespected them all and I just want to say miigwetch for all this and that people at the end here blowing up yes a Talking Circle

would be good even though I was told and it's been a while back and that's just here on zoom where we're coming back and forth we're even in our sessions when we were sitting at the table, roundtable there the same thing happened there. It's not just only on Zoom so it goes way back even before, I heard of different things of what went on before I even come to the round table, so no we're not going to change things in a day but that we can turn around and use that against us and try to make good things happen. Miigwetch, I'm done.

R. Pete: Okay I still have a motion on the floor, and I got support.

R. Pete: Gary if there's no further things, please do a roll call.

The purpose of closed session is to discuss business matters considered privileged or confidential involving consideration of bids/contracts, pending legal issues, and/or personnel matters.

MOTION TO CLOSE FIRST OPEN SESSION; by T. Guenthardt;
supported by D. Lonn.

Roll Call #5

D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	T. Guenthardt	Yes
C. Champagne	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes
R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

G. DiPiazza: Nine in favor, we've adjourned first open at 12:21.

VIII. Open Session

Gary DiPiazza: Mr. Speaker the Recorder's on.

R. Pete: Okay Diane made that Motion, I need support. Okay thank you, Sandy, I've got a Motion from Diane, I got support from Sandy. Is there any further discussion, is anybody going to abstain? Gary, do a Roll Call.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO SECOND OPEN; by D. Lonn; supported
by S. Lewis.

Roll Call #6

D. Corey	Absent	T. Guenthardt	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes	R. Wittenberg	Yes
S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes	D. Lonn	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

G. DiPiazza: Eight in favor one absent, we're in second open at 3:07.

A. Items moved from Closed to Open Session

MOTION TO MOVE ALL THE ITEMS FROM 2020 CLOSED SESSION, EXCEPT FOR THESE RESOLUTIONS WILL STAY IN CLOSE AND NEED FURTHER REVIEW; RESOLUTION 20-0205-047, RESOLUTION 20-0205-048, RESOLUTION 20-0219-066, RESOLUTION 20-0617-177, RESOLUTION 20-0617-178, RESOLUTION 20-0812-223, RESOLUTION 20-1118-337, RESOLUTION 20-1125-344, RESOLUTION 20-1202-353, RESOLUTION 20-1209-361, AND THEN TODAY'S RESOLUTION, MOVE RESOLUTION 21-0224-050, 051, 055 RESOLUTION, MOTION, AND ROLL CALL, ALSO RESOLUTION 21-0224-052 RESOLUTION, MOTION, AND ROLL CALL, AND RESOLUTION 21-0224-053, 054 MOTION, AND ROLL CALL ONLY; by G. DiPiazza; supported by D. Lonn.

R. Pete: Okay is that it, Gary? Okay, I got a Motion on the floor from Gary, I got support from Diane, is there any further discussion, is anyone going to abstain? Gary, do a Roll Call please.

Roll Call #7

T. Guenthardt	Yes	C. Champagne	Yes	R. Pete	Yes
S. Lewis	Yes	R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes
G. DiPiazza	Yes	D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

G. DiPiazza: 8 in favor, 1 absent. Anyways the items on the list, other than the items I read out the numbers, will be moved from closed to open.

The following items were moved from Closed to Open Session.

**MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #10-0623-214 APPROVAL FOR THE
OGEMA TO EXECUTE, AND PERFORM A MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING FOR A PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENT FOR
MUSKEGON CASINO PROJECT**

Roll Call #

S. Mezeske	Yes	P. Ruiter	Yes	J.M. Sam	Absent
L. Sprague	Absent	C. Champman	Yes	S. Parsons	Yes
B. Whiteloon	Yes	V. Johnson	Yes	L. Beccaria	Yes

Motion carried (7-0-0-2)

**MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0102-008, APPROVING CONTRACT
BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND EVERI GAMES INC. AND 2020
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR SLOT MACHINE PURCHASES; by Lonn; supported by
Lewis.**

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C. Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

**MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0102-009, APPROVING CONTRACT
BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND HANNA & ASSOCIATES FOR
2020; by Lewis; supported by Lonn.**

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C. Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

**MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0108-013, APPROVING CONTRACT
BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF**

MICHIGAN RENEWING ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CONTRACT FOR 2020; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Absent
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0108-014, APPROVAL OF LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS TRIBAL GOVERNMENT; by Lonn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-6

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Absent
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0115-021, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT, A WHOLLY OWNED AND OPERATED ENTERPRISE OF THE LITTLE BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS AND LAKESHORE CONSTRUCTION TO ADD ENTRANCE WITH VESTIBLE TO THE RIVER ROCK SPORTS BAR AND APPROVAL OF THE 2020 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0122-028, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND KLK DESIGN AND 2020 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR HOTEL RENOVATION; by Lonn; supported by Lewis.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Absent	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (7-0-0-2)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0122-029, APPROVING THE TRIBAL OGEMA TO SUBMIT THE ATTACHED LETTER TO GOVERNOR WHITMER TO REQUEST THE INCLUSION OF INTERNET GAMING AND SPORTS BETTING IN THE TRIBE'S COMPACT WITH THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, LETTER #2; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0205-045, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND DATA FINANCIAL, INC. AND 2020 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR PURCHASE OF GAMING CHAIRS; by Lonn; supported by Wittenberg.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Absent	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0212-054, RATIFICATION OF DATAWORKS PLUS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0219-067, RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT TO CONTRACTS FOR SATE LOBBYING SERVICES WITH SCOFES ASSOCIATES CONSULTING, INC.; by Lonn; supported by Wittenberg.

Roll Call #C-10

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-1-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0226-073, GRANTING LIMITED WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY OF A SPECIALTY DESIGNATED MERCHANT RETAIL LICENSE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN FOR THE LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT TO BE USED IN THE LITTLE RIVER TRADING POST;

Roll Call #

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Absent
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0311-092, LETTER OF ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC FOR ATTORNEY SERVICES; by Lonn; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0311-093, LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT 2020 REFORECAST BUDGET; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0311-094, APPROVING EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR RETAIL SPORTS BETTING TECHNOLOGY; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0326-097, APPROVING TRIBAL OGEA'S EXECUTION OF ENGAGEMENT WITH PLANTE & MORAN PLC; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-2

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0415-105, ACCEPTANCE OF LITTLE RIVER CAINO RESORT FY2019 FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES FROM RUBINBROWN, LLP; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0422-108, APPROVING AMENDMENTS AND DEFERRAL OF PAYMENT TO LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS TRIBAL GOVERNMENT; by Lonn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-2

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0506-126, RATIFICATION OF EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT WITH CHERYL LOUBERT, PHYSICIN FOR HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT; by DiPiazza; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-2

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (7-2-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0513-137, APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN COPPER 5 MANAGEMENT LLC AND LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT; by Lonn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (5-4-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0513-138, APPROVAL OF PURCHASE AGREEMENT OF LIQUOR LICENSE; by Lonn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (7-2-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0527-160, APPROVING THE FY 2020 RESORT REFORECAST BUDGETS; by DiPiazza; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Absent	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0603-163, APPROVING AMENDMENTS AND DEFERRAL OF PAYMENT TO LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS TRIBAL GOVERNMENT; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0603-164, APPROVING DEFERRAL OF PAYMENT TO LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS TRIBAL GOVERNMENT; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	Yes

T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes
---------------	-----	---------	-----	----------	-----

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0603-165, APPROVAL OF RETAIL LICENSE AND PERMIT APPLICATION BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS FOR THE BEAR LAKE HIGHLANDS GOLF COURSE; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (7-1-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0603-166, APPROVAL OF LIMITED WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY IN CONNECTION WITH RETAIL LICENSE & PERMIT APPLICATION BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS FOR THE BEAR LAKE HIGHLANDS GOLF COURSE; by DiPiazza; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-6

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (7-1-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0617-174, APPROVING THE LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT CONDITIONAL LICENSE APPLICATION AND APPLICATION FOR AND TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN LIQUOR LICENSE FOR THE LITTLE RIVER TRADING POST FROM THE LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS TO THE LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT; by Guenthardt; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-9

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
---------------	----	-------------	----	-------------	-----

D. Lonn	Absent	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion failed (4-4-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0617-179, APPROVING TRIBAL OGEMA'S EXECUTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT WITH CHERYL LOUBERT

Motion carried (5-3-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0617-180, APPROVING TRIBAL OGEMA'S EXECUTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT WITH ELISE MCGOWAN-CUELLAR

Motion carried (5-3-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0617-182, APPROVING TRIBAL OGEMA'S EXECUTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT WITH REBECCA LIEBING; by Corey; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-10

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Absent	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (5-3-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0617-184, EXECUTION OF EMPLOYMENT AMENDMENT CONTRACT WITH STEVEN WHEELER; by Corey; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-12

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Absent	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (5-3-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0624-193, AUTHORIZING REBECCA LIEBING TO SUBMIT A LETTER OF OBJECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL TO NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION; by Guenthardt; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0716-203, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND TRIBAL FIRST FOR PROPERTY/LIABILITY INSURANCE COVERAGE; by DiPiazza; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-2

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0805-216, APPROVING MOTOR FUEL RETAIL OUTLET LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE & RURAL DEVELOPMENT; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-6

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0812-220, RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT FOR STATE LOBBYING SERVICES WITH SCOFES ASSOCIATE'S CONSULTING, INC.; by Lonn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Absent	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0812-221, RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT FOR FEDERAL LOBBYING SERVICES WITH SCOFES ASSOCIATES CONSULTING, INC.; by Lonn; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Absent	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0820-228, REAPPROVAL OF THE MOA WITH EGLE FOR AIR QUALITY MONITORING COOPERATION SERVICES; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0826-238, ACCEPTANCE OF THE LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS 2019 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SINGLE AUDIT AND THE INDEPENDENT AUDITORS REPORT; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
---------------	-----	-------------	-----	-------------	-----

D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0909-250, ACCEPTANCE & RATIFICATION OF THE LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT – ELECTION BOARD COMPLIANCE AUDIT; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-7

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Absent
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0930-279, RATIFICATION OF SYNECTICS SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE AND REMOTE SUPPORT AGREEMENT; by Guenthardt; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Absent	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Absent
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (7-0-0-2)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-0930-281, APPROVING THE FY 2021 RESORT OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BUDGET; by Guenthardt; supported by Corey.

Roll Call #C-7

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Absent	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Absent
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (4-3-0-2)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1021-302, APPROVING RETAILER LICENSE AND PERMIT APPLICATION BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1021-303, GRANTING LIMITED WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY IN CONNECTION WITH ACQUISITION OF A SPECIALLY DESIGNATED MERCHANT LICENSE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN FROM THE LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1029-304, APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE TO PURCHASE BUILDING IN THE MUSKEGON AREA FOR HEALTH SERVICE CENTER OF MUSKEGON-BUILDING ONE

Motion carried (5-3-0-1) *No roll call available.*

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1029-305, APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE TO PURCHASE BUILDING IN MUSKEGON AREA: HEALTH SERVICE CENTER OF MUSKEGON: BUILDING TWO

Motion carried (5-3-0-1) *No roll call available.*

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1029-306, APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE FOR COVID TRANSPORTATION VEHICLES FOR PATIENTS/STAFF/PHARMACY

Motion carried (7-1-1-0) *No roll call available.*

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1029-307, APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE FOR COVID CHEST RAY MACHINERY AND ASSESSMENT: GENERAL RADIOGRAPHIC SYSTEM...

Motion carried (7-1-1-0) *No roll call available.*

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1029-308, APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE FOR COVID EXTERNAL EXAMINATION MOBILE VEHICLE/OUTSIDE FACILITY FOR NURSES/PHYSICIANS AND PATIENTS

Motion carried (5-4-0-0) *No roll call available.*

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1107-320, RATIFICATION OF A BUSINESS ASSOCIATE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NGLC AND NORTHWEST MICHIGAN HEALTH SERVICES INCORPORATED; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1107-321, CONTRACT WITH VAN DYKEN MECHANICAL, INC. FOR PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF HVAC SYSTEM TO BE FUNDED BY CARES ACT COVID-19 GRANT PROGRAM; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-6

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (5-4-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1116-327, CONTRACT BETWEEN LRCR AND FIRST NONPROFIT FOR ADMINISTRATION OF RESORT'S UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FUNDING AND COST CONTROL PROGRAM; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-2

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (6-3-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1118-336, APPROVAL OF ENGAGEMENT LETTER WITH RUBINBROWN, LLP TO PERFORM AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES OF THE LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT FOR YEAR-ENDED DECEMBER 2021; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-7

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1118-338, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LRCR AND KKK DESIGN AND 2020 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE APPROVAL TO RENOVATE 31 LRCR HOTEL ROOMS; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-10

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
---------------	----	-------------	-----	-------------	-----

D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (7-2-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1125-345, APPROVAL OF EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT FOR PROSECUTOR AND CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	No

Motion carried (5-4-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1209-359, RATIFICATION OF 2021 VSP VISION BENEFIT RENEWAL CONTRACT; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1209-360, RATIFICATION OF 2021 DELTA DENTAL RENEWAL CONTRACT; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-365, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF

MICHIGAN TO PROVIDE THE RESORT WITH HEALTH CARE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FOR 2021; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-366, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND EVERI FOR CARES GIVING MODULE; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-4

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-367, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND EVERI PAYMENTS INC. FOR CHECK WARRANTY SERVICES; by Corey; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-368, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND EVERI PAYMENTS INC. FOR ATM SERVICES AND CASH ACCESS SERVICES ADDENDUM; by Guenthardt; supported by Corey

Roll Call #C-6

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes

T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes
---------------	-----	---------	-----	----------	-----

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-369, APPROVING THE FUNDING FOR THE LOYALTY PROGRAM KIOSK SOFTWARE AND APPLICATION TO REPLACE THE MGT; by Corey; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-7

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-370, APPROVAL OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT TO PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF 130 TON INTELPAK ROOFTOP UNIT HVAC; by Corey; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-8

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-371, APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH DENNIS, GARTLAND AND NIERGARTH CPA FIRM; by Corey; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-9

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-372, RATIFICATION FOR TRADITIONAL HEALTH SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIVE AMERICAN OF MORNING STAR; by Corey; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-10

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-1-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1216-373, ACCEPTANCE OF THE LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT FOR CONFIDENTIALITY AUDIT 2020; by Corey; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-11

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #20-1222-375, APPROVING CONTRACT BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND GRAND TRAVERSE REFRIGERATION INC. AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR FOOD COURT PROJECT. *No further information.*

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #21-0217-043, APPROVING PERMIT APPLICATION FOR PART 91 SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL BETWEEN LITTLE RIVER CASINO RESORT AND THE COUNTY OF MANISTEE, MICHIGAN

Roll Call #

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE RATIFICATION OF WEST MICHIGAN INSTRUMENT CONTRACT, RESOLUTION #21-0224-050; by Lonn; supported by Lewis.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO RATIFY, RATIFICATION OF MOU BETWEEN MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE LRBOI TO PROVIDE TUTORING SERVICES, RESOLUTION #21-0224-051; by Lonn; supported by Guenthardt.

Roll Call #C-3

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #21-0224-055, ACCEPT THE AUDIT REPORT; by Lewis; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-9

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	Yes
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (8-0-0-1)

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #21-0224-052, APPROVAL OF MASTER SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH ELEVATE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERS; by Guenthardt; supported by Lonn.

Roll Call #C-5

R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonn	Yes	D. Corey	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes

T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes
---------------	-----	---------	-----	----------	-----

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

MOTION FOR RATIFICATION OF THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES WITH HBG DESIGN, INC., RESOLUTION #21-0224-053; by Lonnn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-7

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonnn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (5-3-0-1)

MOTION TO SUPPORT RESOLUTION #21-0224-054, APPROVING TRIBAL OGEMA'S EXECUTION OF OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE AGREEMENT WITH CHERETTE GROUP, LLC; by Lonnn; supported by DiPiazza.

Roll Call #C-8

R. Wittenberg	No	S. Crampton	No	G. DiPiazza	Yes
D. Lonnn	Yes	D. Corey	Absent	C.Champagne	No
T. Guenthardt	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes

Motion carried (5-3-0-1)

This concludes the items moved from Closed to Open Session.

B. Move Legal Documents for a Lawyer to Open Session Along with All Documents.

MOTION TO MOVE LEGAL DOCUMENTS FROM BIG FIRE FOR THE LAWYER TO OPEN SESSION, ALONG WITH ALL THE DOCUMENTS; by D. Lonnn; supported by C. Champagne.

R. Pete: Okay I got the Motion from Diane, I got support from Cindy, is there any further discussion, anyone going to abstain?

S. Crampton: Well, I just, when I seen the legal documentation, what do you mean legal documentation? This was all supposed to be straightening out a billing situation. We have a Court case on the 26th, has any of that been vetted with Big Fire on the release of the documentation? Because all you should be releasing is the billing statements to the Ogema and the Council so the members can see what's spent. Legal strategy should not be brought up in any case.

R. Pete: Okay right now, I believe that's all we're releasing is the bills that came in, is that correct?

B. Pringle: I haven't seen the Resolution; I don't know for sure who wrote this. So, I mean, I can't answer that, I never seen it.

R. Pete: That was written by Cindy Champagne. I don't know who wrote that so that then she did.

C. Champagne: It was it was for the billings and the statements for Big Fire it came up in one of our meetings and that's why it's on the table.

R. Pete: Okay so that's really what the, there was a little bit of discussion on this, that's really what it should have said in the dock, in the thing here, it should have been specifically referenced that Big Fire. Okay, at this point those are the ones that are going to be released. I don't believe there's any legal strategy or anything that's going to be going on, it's going to be the bills.

S. Crampton: I support that wholeheartedly, I just want to make sure that no legal strategy, nothing detrimental was done to Big Fire's case, I just want to make sure.

R. Pete: Okay that's what I understand, okay Larry you got the floor.

L. Romanelli: Yeah, I thought that was what it was going to be too. That we said we want to be transparent so that everything except for any strategy would be disclosed. That meant the invoices, the statements, and the mee..., I thought, with the meetings possibly too, that had to do with it. And once this is released, where would I find it?

R. Pete: Well, I think it's going to be released, how are we releasing this?

D. Lonn: This is very poorly written.

R. Pete: Yeah, I'm only reading what I was given on this now in the very beginning yes, I want to be transparent. I'm the one and I stood up for it and said I'm the one that made the mistake and placed the Big Fire documents in closed session. I should never have done that, that was my mistake okay. So, what I'm trying to do is just get this corrected, for these things to be corrected and release them. This is what was written down there by Cindy. I didn't write this to release these things like this. So that's all I hope is that it's a Big Fire billing. Right, it was eight invoices from Big Fire and where would you get, where would they be released at? I don't know where they're going to be released, does anybody?

G. DiPiazza: They will probably end up on the website along with the Resolution that was done.

S. Crampton: Well, if you look at the Resolutions for the Ogema's expenditures, they're all online Resolution so you'd probably find these in the Resolutions too. That's where they correctly go would be the Resolution to accept it and pay it would be on the Resolution. I just don't I don't know I don't know why where there would be any whether it would be anywhere else. There's nothing to hide, the reason that they're in, like Mr. Pete said, it was a mistake by the Speaker nobody else. There was nothing nefarious they should have been open in the first place, but I think you'd find them in the Resolutions, thank you.

S. Mezeske: I believe I'm the one that's been questioning these to begin with, not the whole membership. I asked for the invoices to be released with documentation. At the same time, I also asked for the Resolution, for minutes, for a Roll Call vote on how Tribal Council sent this over to the Appellate Court. How did it get there, where's the Resolution, where's the amended contract for Big Fires, how did it get over to Tribal Court? If this got over to Tribal Court on a willy-nilly, then that 71,000 was not authorized whatsoever it's expended funds that was not authorized by a Council so, I'm done. If anybody can answer that.

S. Crampton: Yes, I can Speaker, can I get in the queue?

S. Crampton: Well as it turns out the meeting, you're talking about was not even charged for, the Speaker had that removed, so there's really nothing, no documentation to it at all anymore. But to answer that question. So, I don't think that releasing billing to the membership because you've concocted a story about something nefarious because it was put in closed, it constitutes any kind of reality and people should be really speaking up about this before this goes any further. Because you know what she's trying to do and you know it's not true so there's no spin, all the bills can be found, the meeting you're trying to say was nefarious wasn't even billed to us, so it's not even included. So that's your answer thank you.

S. Mezeske: Well, I'm not sure where Mr. Crampton thinks I'm going with this. All I know it was 71,000 almost 72,000 dollars that got expended for what? For this to go over to the Appellate Court. Where's the roll call, where's the vote, where's the minutes, how did it get over there? Ron you're the Speaker answer this; how did it get over?

R. Pete: Hey I can't have that answer for you right now, I got to have a couple days to get into this thing. Okay?

S. Mezeske: That's fine, thank you.

S. Crampton: Thank you, what I wanted to say is, if you just listen to what Mrs. Mezeske just said, she wants to know about the \$71,000. One more time, the connection she's trying to make, the Speaker knows this, because he's the one that did it, he can answer her

right now. That's not included in the billing, absolutely not, there's nothing we need to look for, the Speaker's the one that did it. Thank you.

L. Romanelli: Yeah, I think part of the confusion might be there was an amount of money and which you agreed to as a Speaker wasn't done appropriately through a meeting, and I think that amount of money was taken out. I don't believe that's what Sandy Mezeske is asking for. I think she's asking about all eight invoices and how they got there, and you know, to show the meetings that reflected the approval of those invoices. I believe that's what she was asking.

S. Mezeske: Correct Ron, what Larry said.

R. Pete: I got to go back and do this. I got to get back to them okay because this is the thing that you're talking about. When way back in the beginning, when you and I were both kicked out of the meeting. Frankly, we were asked to leave, no one kicked me out we were asked to leave out of that meeting because we're the ones that testified on the other side when I was just coming on this case I testified for the other side and so and that's from that point a lot of these meetings and I didn't get involved until I actually got sued. So, at any rate there isn't much more I can tell you about it.

S. Crampton: Thank you, um yeah, I mean I've said it three times I guess nobody wants to buy it, they should have been paid all along. The bills were sent from Mrs. Bowers, which is underneath the Recorder, they came from purchasing this has all been tracked. Why are we still trying to spin this? Everybody knows the Recorder should have paid them as they came in. It didn't happen, he will sit there and spin and tell you everything. Just release that stuff so that the members can see, it only comes to one conclusion. You can try and build up all the stuff you want to build, you can try and make this as much of a sad story and something nefarious as you want, but just release the information, its right there, it just says it. It should have been paid as they came in, but the Speaker didn't, or the, I'm sorry not Speaker, the Recorder didn't know what he's supposed to do, then it rolled up into one big bill. The Speaker was trying to take care of it and did mistakenly, mistakenly put it in Closed and then everybody thought there was something nefarious about it and now we got the Ogema trying to paint it up that way. It's not anything like that at all and this is the fourth time I've [inaudible] but release the information so we can get a fifth time, thank you.

S. Mezeske: So, this \$71,000 has nothing to do with the Appellate case?

S. Crampton: No, the Speaker knows that.

S. Mezeske: Okay so there was a meeting there was a meeting okay so[interrupted]

S. Crampton: Oh, listen wait. Speaker is she going to keep going and trying to do something else.

S. Mezeske: Mr. Crampton I am speaking. Ron and Gary were kicked out of the meeting that leaves Tommy, Diane, Cindy, Ron, Sandy, and you, Shannon, and Dave Corey.

Okay, so past Council experience, you had to have a Speaker and a Recorder in order for that to get over to Appellate Court. Okay did you have a Resolution? There was never one in close that I know of I went back to the agendas. Was it discussed by a Council as a whole, to get it over to the appellate level, was there? Can any Council member answer that without any kind of retaliation?

[S. Mezeske, S. Crampton, and D. Lonn, began talking over each other]

D. Lonn: No

S. Mezeske: You can't answer that, Diane?

S. Crampton: Yes, I can Mr. Speaker.

D. Lonn: There wasn't.

S. Crampton: That's a lie.

S. Mezeske: There wasn't what?

D. Lonn: A resolution.

S. Mezeske: Okay, was there a meeting?

D. Lonn: If you want to call it because Tommy left and then I left, so it wasn't even a quorum there.

S. Crampton: Oh my gosh, Speaker can I get in the queue?

S. Mezeske: So, it was four Council members that decided in a willy-nilly vote to get it over to the appellate level and that's how the \$71,000 is coming about because somebody said,

S. Crampton: That's a lie.

S. Mezeske: Yes, I know Shannon, oh my god.

S. Crampton: You just heard that it wasn't charged. They just told you, it wasn't charged but you keep trying to spin it back to the story. What didn't you understand about it wasn't with \$71,000, what don't you understand about that?

S. Mezeske: So, it doesn't have anything to do with the appellate case is that what you're saying?

S. Crampton: You just said the \$71,000.

S. Mezeske: Absolutely, positively nothing to do with the appellate case and how it got there?

S. Crampton: You're talking the \$71,000 no, absolutely not. You've been told this, the Speakers told you this. The Speakers but listen Sandy you're [interrupted]

S. Mezeske: Big Fire did this for free. Big Fires did this for free to send it over to the Appellate Court?

S. Crampton: Just get to the story you want to do. You want to blame four people. Please just blame us. Just say something wicked, I mean just quit trying to fabricate things that you've been told that aren't true.

S. Mezeske: You know one thing is, I'm not as wicked as you, definitely. I will never, ever, be as wicked as you, never in my entire life.

S. Crampton: Speaker please, you were going to control

[inaudible] S. Mezeske was speaking over S. Crampton and R. Pete.

S. Crampton: Speaker I'm off the line, I'm sorry.

S. Mezeske: You've got a guilty mind, accept it.

L. Romanelli: Yeah, I think it kept going around I think, again. I'm trying to find out because there's other Tribal members that are asking the same thing. There appears to be eight different invoices for work that was done by Big Fire and all that they're asking for is what meetings, the meeting minutes, that shows that those invoices were justified. And I think Sandy's asking if it is for the appellate, the appeal. And it isn't just directed at the one meeting that you had you know talked about Speaker. I think this requires the multiple invoices in the multiple meetings and who was there and were they legitimate? If there's some you know, as Shannon says, trying to concoct the story. Why is it concocted when she's asking when a Tribal member is asking a clear question? She's asking for answers. They talk about being, you know, legitimate and open, yet now we're calling it concocted and calling somebody evil. It's like this is ridiculous so I think we know what the members are asking for, it just doesn't make sense. So, now Shannon says he's off the call, that's typical too, so thank you.

R. Pete: Before I call anybody else, I'm going to read this big fire invoice statement and I'm going to give you the dates and I'm going to give the amounts. I got 4-30-2020 it's for \$135 and I got 5-31-2020 that's for \$13,395.03 then I got 6-30-2020 that's for \$23,769.03 I got 7-31-2020 that's for \$12,782.95 and I got 8-30-2020 \$4,487.11 then I got 9-30-2020 that's for \$3,900.00, 10-31-2020 was \$5113.55, these will be released by the way, in 11-30 I got a invoice for \$12,023.75 this is a statement that total invoices came to \$75,606.42. I asked Bradley, who is our comptroller, because I said I refuse to pay for an invoice where they sued me.

B. Pringle: It's LR the case number on it, and the invoice is LRBOI-4, you'll see those in the invoices. Those are directly related to the correction.

R. Pete: Those are directly related to suing myself and the Recorder. And I said I'm not going to pay some firm that I'm supposed to be in charge of, as the Speaker, to sue me for \$3,907.50. So, Gary and I went out and hired our own attorney and got it kicked out of

Court. That's what's going to be released right now, other than that, I don't think I have anything more I'm going to say on that right now.

D. Lonn: Okay if there's \$3,900, if you guys didn't sign it, who signed to pay it?

R. Pete: Because there was only four in here at the time, because Dave Corey wasn't involved, and you and Tommy walked out of the meeting,

D. Lonn: Right.

R. Pete: and Gary and I weren't involved because there was only four there wasn't even a quorum. Is that correct?

D. Lonn: Right. Because I didn't talk to Big Fire late and got mad and told them that there was not a quorum and they agreed to do this.

R. Pete: other than that, I don't know, Gary he's first please

G. DiPiazza: No and I just want to say I keep getting accused and that's okay. I got broad shoulders, but somebody got me in this office trying to make sure things, the wheels on the bus stay on. Orb chart that somebody had posted and I'm sure everybody's seen that. It goes Tribal Council Speaker, Recorder, then it goes Recorder to my two admin, but can anybody answer what happens when you take the Speaker and the Recorder out of a situation? Anybody? Because it's constitutionally there's a dilemma when you ask the Speaker the Recorder to leave a meeting, that meeting's over. Or if you say they've got a conflict of interest and you're taking an invoice and bypassing the Speaker or the Recorder that had signature authority, what happens? I'm not accusing anybody of anything. I'm just saying let me take the Speaker and Recorder out and now we've got another big problem which was said, I didn't know what I was thinking or talking about and that's okay. I'm getting used to that, so I'm not going to be upset. But this Court ruling where it says Council cannot delegate their authority. So now folks what happens when the Speaker's not in here anymore, he walks out he's whatever, and the Recorder has to take over as the Speaker? Constitutionally I can't delegate a Recorder now, even though it's in the procedures and all that, it's going to get really sticky that's why we called a recess. I could have taken over but until I get clarification on this Court ruling, I don't know what to say other than, all I know is we were asked to leave a couple meetings and I don't know if that's some of the documentation people want released, which last week I pulled all kinds of cool stuff but is that, I don't know, if that's what you want to be released?

J. Steinberg: Hi Mr. Speaker sorry I was a little late to the party. I'm just going to walk my way through it here so please bear with me. So, the invoices were related to a lawsuit against the Speaker and the Recorder. Was there a Resolution that authorized, since you all act as a body, that authorized this lawsuit, that's the first question? And then I need to know, was there a Resolution appropriating the money, that's thing two? Because Council acts as a body, they act as a body and then they appropriate money to meet the expenses,

that they've acted as a body to create. And I think, some heartburn there, if there's no Resolution authorizing the legal action and there's no Resolution appropriating money to that end, what happens with that is, it becomes an audit finding. So why do I care if it's an audit finding? I care if it's an audit finding because we have a Bureau of Indian Affairs and an Indian Health Service Self-Governance compact agreement that requires and relies upon our ability to manage our funds and our affairs appropriately. So, and Gary, you kind of walk through the whole dynamic of not having a Speaker and Recorder and I appreciate that, but if there was no quorum, there was no way the action could have been approved, the Council couldn't approve it as a body. I know that however my comments are made, they'll get spun out at some point by somebody, but I have to go back to those budget appropriations ordinances, I have to go back to the authorities of the Council, and I have to go back to how Council acts as a body. You know you start connecting those dots, this whole thing becomes, I'm not going to say nefarious, what it becomes for me is it becomes a big fat audit finding that my government doesn't need to have, in a final audit report to the United States Government. So, I hope that we can settle out or do whatever needs to be done to troubleshoot and problem solve this, but in all honesty, it wouldn't be the first time, bills were paid that were late and that weren't appropriated for either. So, I guess if you would maybe just try to ensure and shore up those processes. Because the last thing we want is audit findings. We don't want that as a government, they have bad implications for many things that our government needs to have the ability to do. So, Mr. Speaker thank you, that's my commentary on this. You might want to take, you might want to call the quorum though, because I'm not sure you still have all your counselors on the line, just as a good idea.

R. Pete: Right now, I'm going to have Gary on the line and then I'm going to call to see about a vote, if I got a quorum.

G. DiPiazza: I'm not making excuses of any sorts when you take a Speaker and the Recorder out of proceedings you end up with the cluster. Because me and the Speaker were never notified of anything, nothing. You can go back and see out, you can have a look at all my emails, every email there is no email saying anything. You got to take care of this or was I cc on an email but for a pay out or anything, absolutely not. Because some said, me and the Speaker, had a conflict of interest. The only reason I didn't bring these pay apps forward, because when I talk about it, then I'm interfering with a case or something so. Actually, I'm thankful Cindy did it, but I'm not making excuses for anything but all I'm going to say is constitutionally, when you take us out of the mix, don't appoint Speaker or Recorder pro tem., what do you have? A great big cluster.

R. Pete: Okay, thank you, now I want to get a motion to move us out of the second open session. I'm sorry Larry you're in the queue, I forgot again, go ahead Larry.

L. Romanelli: Not a problem, yeah what Jessica was saying is absolutely what part of this is trying to get to. You don't want an audit finding when you're self-governed and that's part of the problem. We don't want an audit finding so we want to know that everything

was done according to Hoyle and there are some questions here that need to be answered to make sure that, that didn't happen. The question in part is that, were the meetings where these invoices were concocted or why we're being billed, were they legitimate meetings were they fully staffed etc., and was there a quorum and was there a Speaker or a Speaker pro tem., was there a Recorder and a Recorder pro tem.? And if we, if you're going to call a quorum call and these people have dropped off to the point you don't have a quorum, we have another problem again. These are serious things that are happening here and when people drop off, it's their duty to be on these calls and to vote and to be in these sessions and we already had one again that does not, that dropped off the call, said he was dropping off the call and if you have enough now that have dropped off the call that you don't have a quorum this tribe is in very serious, serious trouble. So, with that I'll end, thank you.

J. Steinberg: Thanks Mr. Speaker and just one more thing, in the Constitution and I'm glad that Recorder does bring this up, but in the Constitution, there is a process to declare and vote on a conflict of interest. Just because somebody jumps up and says you got a conflict of interest; you don't need to leave the room. There's a method to bring that to the floor and to ask for a vote of your peers to determine whether or not you have a conflict of interest, and it has to be done on the record. That's constitutionally required, it's in there, so I would just caution that going forward whenever someone chirps about there being a conflict of interest, require them to place a vote on the record to demonstrate your reason for having the conflict and that protects us all, it all matters. So just, you know, I'm going to forward this, this seems really kind of complex to me. And yes, I am very concerned about audit findings because it impacts not just federal dollars it impacts potentially how programs are administered, perhaps reassumption. And we don't want those kinds of things going forward, if we're looking at larger business ventures and financing either, because it all relates, so thank you.

L. Romanelli: Okay since my time in office, 14 years, and I'm not taking credit for it, but I can tell you that this tribe has had no serious audit findings. We've done, had a lot of audits and I think that our CFO who is Speaker, or is Steve Wheeler, and the whole group in our accounting office have done a wonderful job. And I'd rather not have that tainted at this time either, so thank you.

I. Stone: Thank you for your time. Couple questions, wasn't there a recent Court ruling where a justice ruled that hanging up on Tribal Council meetings was in violation of the meeting procedures?

G. DiPiazza: Yeah, but the Court also ruled we can't delegate our authorities

I. Stone: Okay I'm asking about people hanging up on the call.

G. DiPiazza: Oh, other than removal.

I. Stone: Okay, so let me take this another step, if we are doing business with a law firm these are educated lawyers and they're acting outside of the scope of the contract, and

they know and are familiar with the tribe's approval processes and they do work that was not authorized legally, according to our procedures here at the tribe. We probably weren't legally obligated to pay those folks for this work, so I do have concerns about why we move forward with payment, and I understand the whole, the money was owed and all that. But I would argue that it was authorized inappropriately, the next thing is, as it relates to the Constitution, this squarely falls into misappropriation of Tribal funds. In addition to that, I would take it a step further and say this was abuse of power, abuse of office, and authorizing expenditures for personal reasons here. I think that there are a lot of things that are wrong in this equation and if that's the case and any official of the tribe can obligate the tribe to funding, contractual funding, any kind of funding obligation outside of the processes that we have, like Larry said, we're in some serious, serious trouble here. I agree with what Jessica said as it relates to the audit findings, but I think it arises to a level even higher than that. Because we had a individual or group of individuals that were duly elected by the people, sworn in to uphold the Constitutional laws of the tribe, that violated the laws of the tribe. Where is the accountability at? Thank you for your time.

R. Pete: Let's do a Roll Call.

Roll Call #8

C. Champagne	Yes	R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes
R. Wittenberg	Yes	S. Crampton	Absent	D. Lonn	Yes
D. Corey	Absent	T. Guenthardt	Yes	G. DiPiazza	Abstain

Motion carried (6-0-1-2)

R. Pete: Can you tell me why you're abstaining?

G. DiPiazza: Because it's a direct relation to bringing my Recorder ability into question?

R. Pete: Okay that's good enough for me thank you.

G. DiPiazza: And plus, I'm not going to go into the cluster. Anyways one two three, 6 in favor, 1 abstention, and 2 absent, that Motion has passed and then eight invoices from Big Fire will be moved to open, under the Resolution, which I don't have a number, and it'll be placed on the website.

IX. Adjourn

MOTION TO END SECOND OPEN; by D. Lonn; supported by G. DiPiazza.

R. Pete: Okay I got Diane making the Motion to end second open, do I have support?
Okay is there any further discussion?

D. Lonn: I am going to put something on the Agenda for next week because I don't think this should stop. Something's got to, we got to discuss what we're going to do. If we're going to be in violation then guess what we got to, I don't know what to do, I don't know but I just something needs to be done.

R. Pete: Okay so for any rate we've got a Motion, we've got support, is there any further discussion? I see there's no further discussion, is there anybody going to abstain? Gary, do a Roll Call.

Roll Call #9

R. Pete	Yes	S. Lewis	Yes	R. Wittenberg	Yes
S. Crampton	Absent	G. DiPiazza	Yes	D. Lonn	Yes
D. Corey	Absent	T. Guenthardt	Yes	C.Champagne	Yes

Motion carried (7-0-0-2)

G. DiPiazza: Seven in favor, two absent, we have adjourned Second Open at 3:51.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan Thull
Temp. Transcribing Asst.



Gary Di Piazza
Tribal Council Recorder