

**CHADD EVERONE, Im. Ph.D.**

2054 UNIVERSITY AVE.: P.O. Box 13512  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94712-4512  
TELE: 510-486-1314 E-MAIL: CAE@FIS.ORG

December 27, 2000

Silvia Burley  
Tele 209-834-0197 (0189)  
Fax 209-834-0318



This is a note to introduce myself and acknowledge our conversation.

As I mentioned, I, personally, do not have any financial or functional interest in the business affairs of your tribe. I am an associate of Bill Martin, who is involved in my Life-Extension Program and who is interested in my research efforts. I do, however, have some skill in negotiating unusual business situations. In the course of interacting with Bill, I have come to learn about his involvement with Yakima and the various "factions" in the situation; and yesterday, he requested that I attend a meeting with James Askew, the attorney for Yakima who will be representing his claim to the tribe before the BIA and federal court. One of the issues was to go over the suit by North American Sports Management (i.e., Ginsburg, Dietrich, et al.) to evaluate how that might impact the construction of Yakima's litigation. In the course of their discussions, it occurred to me that (irrespective of the merits of anyone's particular position) litigation will not resolved this situation in the near future and that if the various interests can not be resolved soon, then, because of time limitations, the prospect of any casino will be lost and all parties will injured in that regard. Further, because of the uncertainty about the legal chairmanship, the standing with the BIA might be jeopardized and therefore any federal income might be lost and any royalty for state gambling could be nullified. In other words, everyone is jeopardized by litigation and consequently it is worth it to try to come to a negotiated settlement.

All agreed, but none felt comfortable with call you. So, being the father of this great proposal, I fell to me to make the call; and that is what I did.

To answer your question about Bill Martin, he and Leroy Chapelle are business associates. I have know Bill for about 4 years, again largely in connection with my medical program. He has practiced as an electrical contractor in Contra Costa County for some 40 years. Leroy is a retired attorney. They are the ones who have talked directly with Brian Goldman and others at the BIA. To my knowledge, there are only three factions in this situation, which I list in the table below.

<b>The Three Factions</b>		
<b>Yakima Dixie, et al.</b>	<b>Silvia Burley, et al.</b>	<b>John Dietrich, et al.</b>
Bill Martin and Leroy	Tiger Burley and William	North American Sports

Chapelle, having an agreement with Yakima to develop a casino and having financed Yakima's legal expenses. Rocky and Melvin.	Pink	Management, Inc., Alan Ginsburg, Robert Dawson, and Harold Chesnin
The Bureau of Indian Affairs is a fourth faction; and the State of California would be a fifth.		

If you know of anyone else who has an interest or is involved, then let me know.

Perhaps this is naive on my part, but given the criticality of timing and the potential of everyone being seriously damaged, I believe that if there is to be a resolution in which all parties gain something, then everyone should put aside tactics and posturing and simply lay their cards on the table and, based upon the facts of the matter, see if a practical solution can be made. In any such negotiation, everything would be confidential and there would be no commitment, except in the case that an agreement resulted.

I think that it would be best if we proceeded in the following manner. First, you and Yakima should meet privately to reset your relationship on some kind of a talking basis. The initial meeting should not be long or involved - simply "hello, sorry that we are in such a difficult situation, let's try to find some kind of a workable solution" - short, simple, and putting aside any discussion about blame, fault, or merit. (Yakima could easily claim that you stole the tribe and you could easily claim that if you had not made your moves, then there would not be any tribe. But save all of that until after a workable agreement is finalized. Besides, if you cannot come to an agreement, then you can deal with all of that in court.) Second, I should evaluate each party's issues and positions and then relay that back and forth to all concerned. I would do that assessment individually without a group meeting. If there is some kind of a consensus about how to proceed, then I would formulate that into a *pro forma* agreement and each party would acknowledge concurrence. None of these transactions could be used in any court proceedings; thus, one's legal standing would not be affected. Once concurrence was gained, then a meeting would be held between all parties to read the agreement and sign it. In principle, this is fairly simple, but in implementation it will be complex. But it cannot get too complex, because, again, "time is of the essence".

Nice to meet you; hopefully, this business conflict can be resolved without resort to litigation.

Best wishes,

*Chadd*

Chadd Everone, Im., Ph.D.