

Susan White stated no, it was a recommendation that has to go through budget process to be discussed.

Linda Dallas asked if it will be discussed or do they just have to assume your going to tell us?

Susan White stated the Trust Committee isn't responsible to come up with the funding, we answered the directive. We are considering options of funding.

Removal Law Amendments

Trish King stated on page 44 is the resolution for adoption of the amendment to the Removal Law as directed by GTC. The amendment includes the following grounds for removal, this will take a 2/3 majority vote. The language is "failure to implement or demonstrate progress toward the implementation of a directive by GTC which was issues by passage of a motion or adopted resolution of GTC." No public hearing comments were submitted. It is here for adoption by a 2/3 majority vote.

Sherrole Benton asked what is the list of qualifications for removal?

Trish King stated we are only talking about the language directed by GTC.

Madelyn Genskow stated this stemmed from a Nov. 15, 2008 GTC meeting due to Business Committee ignoring many GTC directives and resolutions. That is why she came forth with recommendation to make a change in the law that Business Committee could be removed for that purpose of not carrying out GTC directives. According to this, you'd need to get 50 signatures of each Business Committee person you'd want removed; it would go to the Appeals Commission, not GTC. She didn't know if GTC was comfortable with that. The recreation center has been shelved.

Action: Motion by Patty Hoeft to adopt resolution 7-06-09-A Amendment to Removal Law, seconded by Ed Delgado.

Discussion:

Trish King stated the resolution addresses only one amendment as directed by GTC. The process Madelyn is referring to was adopted by GTC in 2006. Tonight were making an amendment only to the policy. The actual components of the rest of the law have not been noticed to be addressed.

Linda Dallas was concerned about the removal law in its entirety. Felt certain sections are unconstitutional.

Jo Anne House stated Article 3 of the Constitution identifies that "GTC may at its discretion may remove any official on the Business Committee by a 2/3 majority vote at any regular or special meeting of the GTC pursuant to a duly adopted ordinance. Such ordinance shall fix the specific causes for removal and ensure the rights of the accused are protected, including his receiving in writing a statement of the charges against him and assurance on sufficient notice thereof, where

he shall be afforded every opportunity to speak in his own defense.” GTC adopted the Removal Ordinance in 2006. It was adopted in requirements of the Constitution.

Linda Dallas asked if we are just ignoring the constitution.

Ed Delgado stated the Removal Law was adopted by GTC.

Linda Dallas stated we still have to abide by the Constitution.

Ed Delgado stated GTC can change the Removal Law.

Bernie Stevens thought it simple of what was being asked. He heard that there was failure to act. He didn't hear anyone state what constituted failure. Are we setting a certain amount of time? If you read those resolutions, did they state you had two weeks, six months, five years as a governing body to act? On the other hand, maybe we should give the new committee a chance before we start talking about just removing some people here. Seriously, let's just do a little thinking. I'm not one for saying your not moving fast enough. He asked the Business Committee to address some of these resolutions, pick one and show us that you worked together and got it done. This is what happens, we don't see things moving and get a little restless. I'm not one for saying get fifty signature and want someone out of office. We need to give them time to act on these resolutions.

Rick Hill understood that the Secretary is preparing a report on these actions. We inherited a lot of this and are at least trying to prepare a report to GTC on what is realistic, affordable, what's realistic of the laundry list of what needed to be done in the past, try to bring some order to it.

Patty Hoefft stated that the Tribal Secretary's office is compiling resolutions from 1994 forward. We expect to deliver a status report at the Annual meeting of 2010. For the future we are trying to use technology to create a resource, a place for GTC to look at and monitor the progress of your government. It takes time to catch up.

Justine Wheelock didn't see the need to personally pass this, it wasn't really going to change anything.

Patty Hoefft stated we're not approving the process on how to remove an official, that process has already been adopted by GTC. Tonight, you're just adopting another reason to call for a removal.

Lois Powless was concerned about the implementation, direction this will have on how far back you are going with all those directives, there are so many. That is not stated. Is the new Business Committee going to be responsible for those directives made at a different time?

Rick Hill stated that is a good question. To inherit all that is an awesome task. What we're trying to do tonight is just trying to be responsible.

Lois Powless stated if you're comfortable with being responsible with all the past directives and if you don't accomplish them, then they can remove you. I'm not comfortable with that.

Rick Hill stated it was the wishes of the GTC. It's not his first choice, but you have to follow orders. It's a simple solution to a complicated problem because you have years and years of requests. It's not realistic to address all of them and be subject to removal thereafter. It's not appropriate. We are addressing what was approved at last GTC.

Privileged Question

Madelyn Genskow asked if the people voted to approve this amendment. If the Business Committee cannot meet certain requirements, can't they bring that back to GTC to change that?

Rick Hill stated that's up to interpretation due to no definitions or subject matter or realistic scope of what can be accomplished. It is left open to interpretation.

Madelyn Genskow called for the question.

Rick Hill reminded GTC that this statement identifies a broad definition as to what that really means. If you're not comfortable with that, you need to think that through.

Action: Motion by Patty Hoefft to adopt resolution 7-06-09-A Amendment to Removal Law, seconded by Ed Delgado. Hand Count: 821 votes cast For: 93, Against: 679, Abstained: 48. 515 votes were needed for a 2/3 majority. Motion failed.

Unfinished Business:

Higher Education Scholarship cost study results and recommendations

Brandon Stevens stated a GTC petition was presented Aug. 16, 2008 to increase the Higher Education Scholarship. The petitioner cited many reasons to increase funding. The petition failed by only 11 votes. He gave a history of the meeting and the motion made at that meeting.

The recommendations are to 1.) Continue to monitor the program with reports from the Higher Education to the General Manager and Business Committee to ensure the funding parallels the education costs. 2. No change in tribal contribution amount up to \$20,000.00 academic year for this fiscal year cycle. That means we keep the funding until this fiscal year ends, then we'll make the recommendations in next years budget. 3.) To be included in the agenda of the GTC budget meeting for consideration of the FY2010 budget. A. Student funding will be a formula base to address the additional cost of going to school which requires changing the room and board allowance to formula base. B. A proposed tier funding to begin FY2010 which includes the Baccalaureate degree at \$20,000.00 per year, Masters Degree at \$25,000.00 per year and a Doctorate Degree up to \$30,000.00 and then C. Develop a Higher Education Endowment for future generations that is self-perpetuating.

A financial impact, legal analysis and statement of effect will be forthcoming at the budget meeting. On a side note, the Business Committee will look at the policies of Higher Education to make sure they are in alignment with the GTC resolution.