



**LITTLE RIVER BAND OF OTTAWA INDIANS
TRIBAL COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 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 March 24, 2021. Following are the minutes of that meeting.

Recorder DiPiazza: Mr. Speaker, the recorder is on.

Speaker Pete: Thank you very much Gary. Welcome to Tribal Council's regular scheduled meeting for March 24, 2021, at 10 a.m. via ZOOM. Gary, would you do an opening prayer please?

I. Opening Prayer

Creator, look after us as we go through these days, look after us all. Extend your loving arms and hands to help heal the ones afflicted by this dilemma and this pandemic going on. Heal them, make them well. Look after our first responders as they're out, especially with the fire out there by High Bridge, Tippy Dam area hopefully it's out today after this rain. Look after the frontline employees that are helping us and serving us, make sure you tip them well. That being said just everybody have a pleasant day and be nice to everybody. That being said, miigwetch, miigwetch, miigwetch.

II. General Business

A. Call to Order

R. Pete: Okay thank you Gary. On to General Business, we're calling this meeting to order at 10:01. Gary do a roll call.

B. Roll Call

Roll Call #1

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

Quorum established.

G. DiPiazza: Nine are present, we have a quorum at 10:02 a.m.

Staff Present: Jason Cross, Family Services & Members Assistance Director; Noelle Cross, Elder Meal Program Administrator

Others Present: Sara Agosa 4478, Nikki Nelson 0421, Susan Thull 3727, Ryan Champagne, Sandy Mezeske 018

C. Approval of Agenda

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24TH WITH THE FOLLOWING
ADD UNDER BUDGET MODIFICATION, B.2 APPROVAL
OF BUDGET MODIFICATION AMENDING THE
CAREGIVER SUPPORT BUDGET, PROGRAM #4352-000
IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,000; by G. DiPiazza; supported by D.
Lonn.**

R. Pete: I got approval for the Agenda from Gary, I got support from Diane, is there any further discussion, is anyone going to abstain? Gary take a roll call.

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)

G. DiPiazza: Nine in favor, the Agenda for Wednesday March 24, 2021, has been approved.

D. Tribal Council Minutes

**MOTION TO ACCEPT THE TRIBAL COUNCIL MINUTES
1-20-21 TO BE SHELVED;** by D. Lonn; supported by D. Corey.

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

Roll Call #3

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

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

G. DiPiazza: Nine in favor, Tribal Council minutes for 1-20-21 have been accepted.

III. Continuing Business

A. Grant & Contracts

B. Budget Modifications

- 1. Acceptance of contract funds from the Department of Health and Human Services-Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and approving a modification to the Operating Budget MB-2021- in the amount of \$15,572.**

Jason Cross: This is a round two of funding for LIHEAP program. We typically get this every year, it's usually about this amount. We're just asking Tribal Council to accept the funds and place them in our budget.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT RESOLUTION #21-0324-077
ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRACT FUNDS FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES-
LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE
PROGRAM(LIHEAP) AND APPROVING A
MODIFICATION TO THE OPERATING BUDGET MB-
2021-12 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$15,572;** by D. Lonn; supported
by D. Corey.

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

Roll Call #4

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

Motion carried (9-0-0-0)

G. DiPiazza: Nine in favor, Resolution #21-0324-077 has passed.

2. Approval of Budget Modification MB-2021-; Amending the Caregiver Support Budget, Program #4352-000 in the amount of \$7,000.

N. Cross: This is just a simple budget modification moving 7000 from our Client Service line to the Capital Outlay line so that I may purchase a freezer.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT RESOLUTION #21-0324-078
APPROVAL OF BUDGET MODIFICATION MB2021-13;
AMENDING THE CAREGIVER SUPPORT BUDGET,
PROGRAM #4352-000 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,000; by D.
Lonn; supported by D. Corey**

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

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, Resolution #21-0324-078 has been approved.

C. Approval of Budgeted Expenditure

IV. Old Business

- A. Health Commission - February 2021 has been submitted.**

V. New Business

- A. Repeal of Ordinance #15-100-088 Unified Legal Department Act of 2015 as is found to be Unconstitutional in nature.**

C. Champagne: I said on Monday there's too many items in this ordinance that is unconstitutional. The changes that were made added the things that the court said was unconstitutional because you added to the ordinance. I just think we solve our problems as we come across them, so that is the reason I brought it forward, thank you.

S. Agosa: I support the repeal of this ordinance. While attending meetings and following issues, I feel the ULD has failed to meet expectations. In the last work session, I did bring a list of issues. I also have concerns that one of the attorneys in the ULD is also associated with another law firm online. And I would like to remind our leadership that you have taken an oath of office to do what's best for the tribe and not individuals even if they are potentially related to you. So, in this instance I do support this repeal, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay Sara just for part of your comments there, I'm going to just make this comment. I take extreme umbrage of you addressing Tribal Council that way and finding out that we're going to take into consideration anybody that works for us, and I do not have anybody in Unified Legal working for us.

N. Nelson: I just had a couple questions if maybe Miss Champagne could explain exactly what is unconstitutional about the Ordinance. Maybe she could just go down the list of things that she's referring to so that the membership has a better understanding. And I'd also like to know, just because this is being voted on, if there is an attorney on standby, ready for tomorrow morning in case this passes. Thank you.

S. Crampton: Well, I don't want to start a fight. I just want to make sure that the rules are applied evenly because I was accosted basically on Monday, by a relative of yours, Mr. Speaker. So, when you're talking about a member, I agree with the statement you made to Sara Agosa, but I want to see it evenly applied throughout this meeting and not let it lack at a certain point to attack other Council members. Thank you.

R. Pete: Okay what I'm going to assure you; I am not going to allow anybody, anybody, to attack anybody else, no matter who they're from, or where they're from, or what family that's going to be on here. I will immediately ask the Speaker to put them on mute right now.

S. Agosa: I just want to comment to Mr. Pete's comments about where I'm coming from in my perspective. We had a long discussion on Monday during agenda review about this topic. And it did lead into personal reasons why the ULD should not be repealed.

Questions such as what will these individuals do for jobs? And even alluded to that it's mean, it's mean to repeal the ULD. And my standpoint is the application of fairness across the board, and I have had some serious issues with the ULD and service, even as a member. And my understanding is that the ULD, one of its main responsibilities, is to mitigate infighting. And even when there have been disagreements between Council yeah, I have even asked for the ULD to give their opinion or weigh in and I've just heard silence, so that's just one instance. So, my comment really is just to remind everyone, including Council, that you've taken an oath of office to do what's best for business operations in our Tribe, and that even when it's difficult and we have to make difficult decisions, that your responsibility is to membership not just local citizens but the entire membership so that's my comment, thank you.

L. Romanelli: Thank you I want to note that from my understanding this is written out in the Agenda as the Unified Legal Department Act of 2015 is ruled unconstitutional and it's stated in a couple different places. That is not my understanding by any means. Read from the Court Records, the Court has taken great care to meticulously review the ULD Act including the severability provision in the article 204 of the ULD Act. To only rule void the provisions that are not consistent with the constitution as discussed in this opinion while not ruling void the entire ULD Act nor the existence of the ULD. That's my understanding so to me this is an incorrect statement and it's a little, it concerns me because this is a matter of record that is on the Tribal Agenda. And it's much like the last time with the Ethics Board, that said that it was used for political purposes. There's no basis for either one of those statements from what I understand so just to be clear I don't believe that the total Act was found to be unconstitutional. Secondly, I do believe that some of the concerns that were contained within the Court were addressed previously. So, I think that's it, thank you.

G. DiPiazza: Just a couple things for clarification, I did screen share Pope's order that's right at the bottom of it, if people want to read it. I know if you're calling in you can't, but for clarification I'm going to, I did a little research and technically you know when this order was done in 18 January we had a work session on the ULD 7-3-2018, 8-6-2018, 8-14-2018, 8-28-2018, amendments were posted 9-5 of 18. Follow up work session was 10-22-18 and 1-29-19. Amendments adopted that took care of some of these holes in the boat were adopted on 2-6-2019. And then in 2020 we had a work session which was on 5-26-20 and 6-8-20. So, it's not like these have not been addressed. And my other question being, I've got Consent Decree tomorrow so do we tell them sorry we're done no more 1836 whatever. I don't know or just follow their lead. That's just one of my questions but yeah what do we do tomorrow? What do we do tomorrow, if this is gone, what do we do tomorrow? What's the plan? I don't know, I haven't heard.

S. Crampton: Well first, let me start by saying that I share some of those concerns about what would happen after, so it's probably more prudent to propose to keep this on the Agenda and have the answers by next week but I do not believe that the ULD is a good

fit right now. I think Council needs its own attorney, its own in-house attorney, that would mitigate some of the expenditures that going to national firms like Big Fire for services it could be rendered at a much cheaper rate in-house. What I don't understand is bringing up past things as some kind of example, because that doesn't prohibit any Counsel in the future from changing anything. So, I don't understand the reference other than trying to get people to believe something that's not true. But I do think that we need to really look at the validity of what happens next. No if this is gone tomorrow, we don't follow the consensus. So, members don't be worried, that will not happen. Even if there was no attorney for Little River right now, we have no fissure. Anyway, that's reality, we need an in-house attorney that would be, my concern we can appoint or get a special one in between in the interim so I would propose that maybe this be postponed until next week until that could be settled, thank you.

C. Champagne: I normally wouldn't do this but my son, Ryan, came in and its Open Session. He asked if he could talk at this so that's why I put my hand up. Here he is.

R. Champagne: Is it okay Ron that I asked a question or no.

R. Champagne: I'm not able to have internet connectivity I'm just wondering if I can speak if I can ask a question.

R. Pete: Okay, so okay, what I'm going to do is because I got to go and order it was still really queue. Ryan, I'm going to put you in the queue, okay?

R. Champagne: Thank you, I have two laptops together with screech.

R. Pete: I will put you in the queue all right?

**MOTION TO REPEAL OF ORDINANCE #15-100-088,
UNIFIED LEGAL DEPARTMENT ACT OF 2015 HAS BEEN
FOUND TO BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN NATURE,
RESOLUTION #21-0324-079; by D. Lonn; supported by G.
DiPiazza.**

C. Champagne: I wasn't done talking when Diane jumped in.

R. Pete: Okay you relinquished it to Ryan, that's why I said I thought you were done.

C. Champagne: Okay I did, to Ryan. I did the same thing that Connie Waitner has done for Israel Stone, over and over, and you allowed Israel to speak.

R. Pete: Okay just a moment, I've got a motion from Diane, I got support from Gary, is there any further discussion?

C. Champagne: Yes, I wanted to have the points made and that's that Ryan said he can't get on his computer with [inaudible] and Connie has always put Israel in, you've always let Israel talk in her place, and I wasn't asking the question, Ryan wanted to ask it. I guess I'd like some fairness here. So, Diane jumps in right away and wants to repeal this Act. That's all well and good, but I think the membership has a right to hear everything in there. Yes, the whole ULD was not considered declared unconstitutional however there's so many items in this Ordinance that is still unconstitutional. And the fact that Gary keeps saying it was revised, yes it was revised, it expanded the unconstitutionality of the Ordinance that the court had declared unconstitutional. They just expanded it, so that doesn't make it constitutional, so that is why I wanted to get this cleared up, thank you.

R. Champagne: [*reception was extremely poor*] From my understanding, being that I was a party to that Court action right, you have all the records on that, and it was a Nelson and Dave Corey versus Election Board handled quite a few years ago. ULD attempted to, on behalf of the tribe who is the tribe is basically questioned on filing amicus out of character for them to [inaudible] the courts kind of recognized that by saying, wow that's pretty remarkable why you're intervening on an Election Board matter, and you're not represented [inaudible] you know who already representing the Legislature? Are you representing the Executive? They said we represented everybody is the tribe that's what our Ordinance says. So, they opened the door by filing this amicus to intervene on an Election Board. So when I bring this up, it's really interesting because with your amendments you get to your result your Ordinance or regulations on this they expanded on the very essence of the court rule that was unconstitutional by putting it into your regulation did not make it constitutional because it still said the ULD cannot represent everybody equally those facets, other parts, remain they're only striking those down but there's nothing left to use once go through that and strike it down. And so, it comes to the question of like, what do you do for in-house Council? Well, the Executive has an in-house Council, I had the pleasure of talking with him. The Judiciary has an in-house Counselor also. The Election Board even has, not that they're the fourth branch but they're kind of like a semi-quasi branch, they have in-house Counsel. So, the only one who does not have in-house counsel is Tribal Counsel and so it really makes a difference. Specifically in your Ordinance it mentions that there shall be no in-house counsel for any of the branches. Now that was the one for the reach to help prevent lawsuits from inner Tribal disputes that go through Resolution process. Which you can look, and you can clearly see those inner Tribal disputes and they are not being resolved according to the Ordinance. The Ordinance has so many flaws not being applied to, not being followed and it's unconstitutional. I have to say I'm strongly in support of [inaudible] this Ordinance because it was just poorly written much [inaudible]. I thank Council Member DiPiazza, for his great review, unfortunately you should probably put in your attorney's notes. Who was doing the review? Was it the ULD, who have self-serving interests? Obviously, they can't go review their own Ordinance. So, this would have been a prior example to use outside Counsel to bring in if this should be repealed it's definitely within

the right of any Council member to ask for review appeal. As a citizen I think it was bad legislation and I think that Council deserves to have in-house Council, executives have in-house Council. Or you take them all away completely. And if you guys want to represent actions and sue each other, then you as an individual should represent yourself, like a citizen, when you violate our house's rights so and I referenced the fourteen pieces of executive side Mr. Romanelli that prevailed on for violating my constitutional rights and the multiple ones on the Council so that's not a *[inaudible]* statement from the founder so Thank you for your time, I appreciate it. I hope you do the right thing for the people and not for a specific person like I may really like this attorney I don't want to remember nothing prevents you from hiring that attorney, I believe.

N. Nelson: I think it's just; I think it's very clear that this was a hastily made decision. There's no, before thought, or after thought, given to this Resolution. That doesn't necessarily mean that the ULD doesn't need to be looked at or even possibly dissolved, as this is asking. But what I would like to see from my leadership is more thought put into what is going to be affected by this action that I'm taking. And what I don't see is those steps made to assure that this Resolution, that this piece of legislation, is what's in the best interest of the people. Because right now, you're putting forth a piece of legislation that has no plan for afterwards. So, you are directly putting the Tribal membership in harm's way because you are taking away all the legal resources you have right now. If you were going to go back to the drawing board and you were to perhaps put a posting for an in-house attorney if that's what you wanted to do. And you looked at it and it financially made more sense and then you put a plan in place. To then present this legislation, I would be much more comfortable with my leadership. But to put a piece of legislation in place, with no plan at all as how you're going to execute it is, is just very irresponsible, honestly. So, I just really hope that my leadership sees this and votes accordingly, thank you.

D. Lonn: Mr. Speaker, I call the question.

R. Pete: Okay I have a motion on the floor, I have support for it, I have Diane Lonn calling the question. Gary, please do a roll call.

C. Champagne: Ron, could Diane say what her motion is again?

Recorder DiPiazza started the roll call. Dave Corey

D. Corey: Hey, could Diane say what her motion is again so everybody...

D. Lonn: Okay I will read the motion Dave. To repeal of Ordinance #15-100-088 Unified Legal Department Act of 2015 as found to be unconstitutional in nature Resolution #21-0324-079

R. Pete: Okay Gary proceed.

Roll Call #6

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

Motion [*in dispute*]

G. DiPiazza: Five in favor, [*D. Corey said: {Mister} at the same time as the Recorder said: {Four} and then paused.*] four against ... [*D. Corey interrupted: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker I'm changing my vote.*]

Order was disrupted with Councilors Corey, Champagne, Pete, Crampton, Lonn, DiPiazza, along with member R. Champagne all talking over each other.

C. Champagne: You can't change your vote once [R. Pete: Yes, he can] you voted.

R. Pete: Yes, he can, it wasn't read yet, he can change his vote, go ahead Dave.

C. Champagne: No. He can't just change his vote

D. Corey: I'm voting no.

C. Champagne: No, he can't change his vote.

D. Corey: Mr. Speaker I'm changing my vote.

D. Corey: I'm voting no Gary.

G. DiPiazza: Thank you Dave. Four in favor, five against, Resolution #21-0324-079 is [*inaudible*]

S. Crampton: Mr. Speaker, I'm changing my vote.

R. Champagne: Mr. Speaker you're violating your own rules. Mr. Corey cannot change his vote.

D. Lonn: Yes, he can...

R. Pete: He can to change his vote.

R. Champagne: it went through, and the roll call was made. He understood it, you can always go back to this matter in another Resolution.

R. Pete [shouting]: You know what you're interrupting right now. Okay put Ryan on mute.

Order restored.

G. DiPiazza: I can't she's, he's going under Cindy Champagne's government computer.

D. Lonn: He shouldn't be.

R. Pete: I've had this happen before and people have changed their votes on something and before he even read the thing so now on top of that we're going to change his vote and Dave thank you it was no. So, what was the final count, Gary?

G. DiPiazza: I read it once, but I'll do it again, four in favor, five against Resolution #21-0324-079 has failed.

S. Crampton: That was highly illegal. I asked to change my vote right when he did, the Recorder did not allow me, he allowed Mr. Corey to, he did not allow me. The motion, the procedure for reconsideration, was not followed. Mr. Corey asked for clarification before the vote, the vote was recorded, and was going to be read, it is done. It was five to four, you illegally changed the vote.

[D. Corey: No, no, I had, I was confused on the question.]

S. Crampton: You're not in the queue, you're not in the queue, you're supposed to leave like Ryan. *[D. Corey interrupted: I thought it was a different question.]* Mr. Speaker please make him leave, he's not the Speaker.

R. Pete: Just a moment, go ahead Shannon.

S. Crampton: You told me the rules are going to be applied evenly. That doesn't mean that you take orders from Diane.

D. Lonn: I didn't say anything.

R. Pete: Okay just a minute. Let him finally finish.

S. Crampton: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Because you said at the beginning of that, this is what I was worried about at the beginning. Now no more cat calls, stay on mute, and mind your manners, I'm in the queue. I'm not talking to you, Speaker, I'm talking to everybody else. Okay no, I asked for the same for the same thing that Mr. Corey did, the Recorder, it's on tape, I don't really want to argue because it's there. Now the procedure for reconsideration was not followed, no, that was illegal I was not given the same consideration as another Council member. This is personal, this is not professional, now I am done, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

D. Corey: I do have a right to change my vote, because I was not, I was not under the assumption of what we were voting on. I thought we were calling the question to vote, that's what I thought we were voting on. And so, that's what, that's why I changed my vote to no. I do not agree with the motion to repel the Ordinance.

R. Pete: Thank you Dave. I believe that that's it for this queue. Now I do have this, and I checked with this, one more time I'm going to, I'm going to give it to you right now Shannon and then I'm going to be in the queue and I'm going to finish. Go ahead.

C. Champagne: Ron before you move on could you get legal review on this? I want a legal review on this.

R. Pete: I'm going to have ULD give me a legal review and I will have it by tomorrow morning, thank you.

S. Crampton: Okay, am I in the queue now?

R. Pete: Yes, you are and then I'm going to have the last word on this because I have to do something. So go ahead.

S. Crampton: Okay well, I wanted to just say that no, that was inaccurate Mr. Corey just said. The minutes will reflect that he asked Mrs. Lonn to repeat her motion, she repeated her motion, she did not say the word repeal at all, except for in the title. He's no confusion, she told him exactly. He asked for clarification, she read it to him, so no, there was no confusion. And like I said, I would ask for the same consideration he said he wanted to change his vote it was given, I said right when before anything was said after that I said I want to change my vote as well. The Recorder, the minutes will show, then just ignored me, and said the vote that he wanted it to be. So, my rights were violated, the procedure for reconsideration was violated, and this is highly illegal, thank you.

R. Pete: Okay we're moving on and I'm going to at this point, I'm going to call for a recess until 12 noon, for recess right now, and before we move on to concluding business. So, I will see you all at 12 o'clock, thank you.

Recess

G. DiPiazza: Mr. Speaker, the Recorder is on.

R. Pete: Thank you very much. Gary, please do a Roll Call.

Roll Call #7

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

No Quorum

G. DiPiazza: Five are present, four our absent; we do not have a quorum sir.

R. Pete: Okay Mr. Recorder I agree we don't have a quorum anymore.

R. Pete: Dave go ahead.

D. Corey: I don't, we can't conduct any business, so I got my hand down.

G. DiPiazza: Well, I was just going to inform everybody after going back and looking at the video and I had quite a few eyes on replaying of that video. There was nothing done outside of Robert's rules whatsoever. Because I did not call, I did not call the results and David stopped it as soon as I had said five in favor, when he wanted to change his vote, that's in Robert's rules.

S. Agosa: I wanted to address the Town Hall meeting this weekend. I would just like to convey that I was very disappointed with the presentation, including the censoring of information. Okay well I just want to say that I do have the right to request information and I did not appreciate the way that Larry and some other Counselors actually tried to humiliate and degrade me for this request. Especially when there has been a number of instances of misbehavior by some of the Counselors, egregious instances and they have never been criticized or chastised on our website or in an open meeting, including the numerous IT issues we've had for the last year, which we continue to experience. So, I feel this meeting was clearly meant as a self-promotion and again did not appreciate that even within the meeting my comments were censored, and I would like to request the Tribal Council that no Tribal funds are used to pay for this meeting even out of the Ogema's budget. Thank you.

R. Pete: Okay Sara that's the final word. We're leaving this meeting, so everybody have a good day.

S. Mezeske: Ron Wittenberg is on the call.

G. DiPiazza: He didn't respond. I called his name three times.

S. Mezeske: But he's showing up, he's showing up.

G. DiPiazza: I can't help it, that doesn't mean you're here. If you're in person in the lodge, you know what, everybody sounded like Charlie Brown's teacher today. Most, most I can't understand. I don't even know what to think about somebody using our governmental computer. I don't agree with that.

R. Pete: Look, this meeting is done.

Council Meeting ended due to lack of quorum.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan Thull
Temp. Transcribing Asst.



Gary Di Piazza
Tribal Council Recorder