

Osage Shareholders Assoc. discussion forum response to 98.16.214.234;

1. *Non -Shareholders could vote on any amendment which Congress presents...*

Yes, they can, and that has been their right since 2006. These amendments do nothing to change that fact. It's a noose that Chief Jim Gray and the 31st Council put around our necks, and if you want to change that, good luck. These proposed amendments are a way for the Shareholders to possibly stay in the game with the cards we were dealt. Also, Congress can do what ever they want, but once these amendments are passed, Congress will no longer have the authority to do ANYTHING, including making laws or rules, which effects the Minerals Estate in any way. Nor will they be able to tax the production, the proceeds of that production, nor the sales or transportation of that production. And, the "one man control" over Minerals operations now in effect will be lifted from the shoulders of the Minerals Council. No longer will the MC need to be concerned about making decisions that can be negated at the whim of "one man." I just can't understand how any Shareholder could oppose that.

2. *Bank accounts, moved money around without resolutions, consent,accounts with no MC as signatories.*

A bank account was moved without MC authority. No loss occurred, but it affirms that it was at least possible, and it still is. One MC member says they were not signatory to accounts for a period of time. Another says they were always signatory, but so was the Chief and the Treasurer. I never heard that pay checks or other payments were ever late because of not being signatory, so I guess you would need to attend a Council meeting and ask all 8 of them at once that question. Why would any Shareholder want this situation to continue?

3. *These Amendments still do not remedy the issue of us not having the privilege of electing our own Chief.*

Correct---Thank Jim Gray and the 31st Council for that, too. But, do we really need a second Chief for the Osages? I really have no opinion, but so far, a "Chairman" of the Minerals Council has worked just fine. At least there can be no confusion about "which Chief" you might be unhappy with at a given moment.

4. *Had it not been for the insightfulness of our past Chiefs and leaders....we would not have a ME and we would not have had a Settlement for the HPP AND Mismanagement.....*

I am continually amazed by stories of the insight and wisdom flowing from some of these old gentlemen. Some could not read or write or even speak English, but they set a course for us that we still follow today. And I do recall hearing stories about one or two that said that "the oil would not be a good thing for our people." So, there were opposing schools of thought, even then. Maybe there's still hope for us.

5. *It appears if the MC is set on changing the structure of the make up of Council and Chief they are infringing on the rights of the Shareholders. It is not their decision to make.*

The MC is not changing the structure of anything. The structure was changed in 2006. The proposed amendments simply change some of the rules within that structure to better support the stated intent of that new structure. This will probably be the last chance to do this for a long time.

6. *These Amendments DO NOT mention a Chief....but Gale n continues to tell us what is going to happen to that position - he will assume those powers as Chairman - the very chair which he was suppose to give up sometime ago and has refused to do so.*

I don't recall Galen telling us anything about what was going to happen to the position of Chief. Maybe I missed something. He did inform us that the Chairman of the Minerals Council was responsible for signing all Council

approved documents like leases, etc, on behalf of the Council. When these amendments are passed, the Minerals Council will be vested with the same powers formerly vested in the old Tribal Council. The Chair can only follow the wishes of the Council. When he does not follow their wishes, they can remove him as Chair. The old Tribal Council had similar powers, but they certainly could not remove the Chief. They could by-pass him and probably did on occasion, but he was still Chief.

Galen was not “supposed to” vacate the Chair as you state. That position is up for review once each year, and open to review anytime they wish, to determine if the Council is happy with their choice. Apparently they were. He did say in a meeting that there were still things needed done that he would like to see through to finalization, therefore he did not wish to resign the Chair.

7. *.....this is why we are in the mess that we are in...*

We have been in this mess since 2006, nearly 6 ½ years. We’ve wanted out of it ever since, but it has taken all 6 ½ of those years to get the first of the corrections to the mess to the people. Now we have an opportunity to start fixing some of the problems. Let’s take advantage of that opportunity while we can. Digging in your heels and screaming “no” to every solution that’s offered is not a good plan. Solutions that have no risk what-so-ever should not be discarded in such a cavalier manner. They are few and far between. Let’s all get behind these amendments and vote YES on August 13.

Ray McClain, Osage Shareholder