

The Central State Hospital Local Redevelopment Authority met in regular session on Tuesday, January 28 at 5:00 PM in The Lawrence Building.

Members present were Chairman McMullen, Dr. Nelson, Dr. Stephens, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Roberson, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Peters.

Chairman McMullen called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM and made opening remarks recognizing guests and asking those who choose to please introduce themselves.

Mr. Roessing introduced himself and proceeded to state “a point of order” and questioned whether the board was operating with a quorum.

Chairman McMullen indicated there is a quorum present and informed Mr. Roessing that he was out of order and to please have a seat. Chairman McMullen had to threaten to call law enforcement. Chairman McMullen asked Mr. Jones to provide an update on CSHLRA financial report.

Chairman moved to the amendment of the bylaws stating in the board packets there was a document in each packet regarding a resolution with an attachment of resolution R-2501-01. This is a notice of the proposed changes to the amendment that was emailed prior to the meeting which is required by the bylaws that we must provide 10-day notice and must be received by all board members. He also included the actual email that was sent out to all board members. Chairman stated there is only one minor change we are requesting in the bylaws which was provided as well. Chairman read the current bylaws to the board and attendees.

Dr. Nelson asked if the origin of the resolution comes from interim Chairman McMullen. Chairman McMullen responded yes.

Dr. Nelson responded that when you have issues with transparency and trust, removing guardrails, meaning moving from two signatures to one can be problematic.

Chairman McMullen responded that Dr. Nelson’s statement is a fair statement other than when the board votes a particular action/transaction, it votes in a public session, the transparency of what is being voted on has been made public so there is no hiding of that, the resolution is available. The only this that happens after which is closing the deal that the board has voted for.

Dr. Nelson stated that the previous executive director was asking for more transparency, meaning more time to investigate the deals and transactions that were happening here. Dr. Nelson went on to say if you have guardrails in place and you have someone whose job is to provide us with advice or their expert opinion on certain deals and transactions by removing their authority to assert their opinion or increase transparency, it is problematic. If anything, we should double down on transparency and maybe require a third person, but removing signatures or someone who could provide us with an opposing opinion could be problematic

Mr. Peters responded that the board authorizes the decisions in a public setting and if the board has voted upon a decision to be made then I don't see why there would be any kind of action in place to roadblock the board. If a decision is made without the board's authority, in my opinion I think that is problematic but, in this case, that is not the case if the board has voted and has implemented the power of the board in the vote then it needs to be executed.

Chairman McMullen stated there were actions that were questioned, and the Executive Director had the right to do so. She brought the actions back to the board and there was a reconsideration of those transactions by this board a second time. The ED can ask for reconsideration, and it was voted on a second time all transparent.

Dr. Nelson responded that she is fully aware and remembers this action. Dr. Nelson went on to state if she did not have the authority to sign and it was only one person, i.e. the chairperson to sign how would she have been able to bring that back to the board for reconsideration if it was already signed and the process was already moving along.

Mr. McMullen responded that this is the last step in the process. This is at the attorney's office, closing the transaction. These are not all the other things in between there. So that issue was not raised before we brought those actions back to the board and reconsidered all those actions. She did not have to exercise anything but requested us to do it if my memory serves correctly. And it was a motion and second that we reconsider what was on the table in that setting. Just so the issue of transparency, by the time it gets to the closing attorney, all the guardrails have been met.

Dr. Nelson recalled Chairmen McMullen's previous statement saying he himself stated the reason why this bylaw was in place was because of previous issues.

McMullen responded that those issues were never brought to the board from his understanding.

Dr. Nelson asked how they would know those issues will not arise again or exist in continuation.

Mr. Jones stated each deal, when it is specific to real estate, should have the resolution in detail attached to what the specific property it is and should be accompanied by the contract for the attorney at closing. For each real estate deal will hold its own specific resolution. I think there were some closed in the past that did not have specific resolutions.

Dr. Nelson stated she stated there may have been certain things that a previous Executive Director felt should have been presented to the board and was not. What guardrails are in place for that.

McMullen responded, "JAIL." Chairman went on to state he was not trying to be facetious but if anyone is supposed to bring a real estate deal to the board for the board's approval and take it to an attorney without the board's approval and try to get it sold without having come to the board then then they have put themselves in a situation.

Mr. Peters stated he does not think no one can put the most powerful person in the room as the Executive Director, every board member has been appointed and if you're going to solely rely on that additional signature, that person becomes the most powerful person in the room by not executing the deal.

Chairman McMullen stated anyone can vote against a transaction they don't agree to, and as I've always said you're going to win some and lose some. There will be deals we fight for and those that we oppose and then when the board does its will, whether we like it or not, it's our obligation to move forward with that deal.

Mr. Roberson made a motion to adopt resolution R2501-01 on the change of proposed bylaws from the existing language of 2 signatures and the chair, vice chair and executive director to one signature with vice chair/chair or the signature of the executive director.

Mr. Robinson 1st motion

Mr. Pittman 2nd motion

On aye: Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Pittman, Mr. Peters, Mr. McMullen.

No: Dr. Nelson

Abstained: Dr. Stevens

Chairman McMullen moved forward with stating he has decided to make comments. Mr. McMullen provided an at-length update of the Board's financial standing noting the successes during the past four years by reducing its debt and no longer having to utilize funds from the City or County. Mr. McMullen informed meeting attendees of a CSHLRA Insite Committee had been constructed to ensure public transparency. Mr. McMullen stated that we welcome an investigation by the Inspector General's office. If they do, we will ask that they investigate all transactions. Mr. McMullen went on to state he would not be irresponsible as an attorney, as he has a higher obligation. He believes that after a full investigation, this board will be exonerated. We believe that any hidden motives or recklessness will be revealed.

Chairman McMullen called for the updated real estate report.

Jones responded there are no updates to report to the board at this time.

Pitman thanks the Chairman for his statement

Chairman thanks the board.

Chairman stated there is a need for an executive session at 6:12PM.

Executive session

Jones 1st motion

Dr. Stephens 2nd motion

On aye; Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson, Dr. Stephens, Mr. Pittman, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Peters, Mr. McMullen

Motion to come out of executive session at 6:25 PM

Jones 1st motion

Dr. Stephens 2nd motion

On aye; Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson, Dr. Stephens, Mr. Pittman, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Peters, Mr. McMullen

Mr. McMullen informed the board of 2 items left for consideration. Mr. McMullen stated there is a need for a vote to employee Shondra Ashley as an administrative assistant.

Mr. Pitman 1st motion

Dr. Stephens 2nd motion

On aye; Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson, Dr. Stephens, Mr. Pittman, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Peters, Mr. McMullen

Robinson this is considered a permanent part time position

McMullen stated if she is hired, she can start in a couple of weeks

The last motion is the amendment to their original agreement to list the kitchen project with Fickling and Company.

Mr. Roberson asked is this an amendment on behalf of GIFC CSHLRA LLC

McMullen yes and that is to list the kitchen project on a 30-day floating continuous contract with a 10-day notice to terminate the listing.

Nelson asked is the 60 days applicable.

McMullen responded, "No, it is not."

Mr. Jones 1st motion

Mr. Pitman 2nd motion

On aye; Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson, Dr. Stephens, Mr. Pittman, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Peters, Mr. McMullen

McMullen signed an agreement at this time and opened the floor to discussion.

Mr. Ken Singh informed the Board of the length of time he had been on campus and expressed he understood the Board's frustration as he is not moving fast enough. Mr. Ken Singh went on to say he has requested blueprints all while continuing to clean the property. He stated the learning curve in the community has been great, but he has moved forward with completing smaller tasks. Mr. Ken Singh stated by March 2026 he plans to have an estimated 78 apartments, 54 studios and 16 one bedrooms and 5 two-bedroom apartments fully furnished units and available for the public.

Mr. Roessing referenced the sale of the apartments to Mr. Ken Singh. Mr. Roessing went on to provide his research on recent sales to Mr. Ken Singh stating he has apartments, Crittenton building, Binion building, and Men's prison building and that to date, Mr. Ken Singh is not paying taxes on the stated properties.

Mr. Jones questioned aren't their real estate transfer tax forms that attorneys have at closings for real estate closing

Mr. Roessing stated yes, the closing attorney is always the boards attorney.

Mr. Jones stated is it the closing attorney's responsibility to submit those.

Mr. Roessing stated the closing attorney is your attorney. The board has always required the board's attorney to close deals and thus this attorney did not file a PT61 form. Mary was paid \$125,000 a year and did not allow her to do anything.

Motion to adjourn meeting

Mr. Robinson 1st motion

Mr. Pitman 2nd motion

On aye: Mr. Jones, Mr. Robinson, Dr. Stephens, Mr. Pittman, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Peters, Mr. McMullen

6:41pm

Calvin McMullen, Chairman