

Exhibit D

Copies of public Facebook statements made by Alderman Steve Tillis following the May 5, 2026 Board vote declining to correct the official records associated with the May 17, 2022 Recess Meeting. In the statements, Tillis discussed:

- concerns regarding changing prior Board minutes and records,
- potential investigations and taxpayer expense associated with correcting the records,
- and acknowledgment that “there has been much misappropriated documents” related to the issue.



Steve Tillis

Here is my full response-

Sure and thanks for reaching out to hear why I voted the way I did

First, I have reviewed the information and audio recording you published.

My vote the other night was not about avoiding transparency, but about following the law. Based on guidance from the City Attorney and conversations with outside counsel, I had concerns that attempting to change records or minutes from a previous board could create additional legal issues and taxpayer expense for the City. This could have involved hiring outside counsel and investigators, with the investigation potentially extending from Ocean Springs to the state level.

Honestly, I do not see the ownership versus lease agreement changing at this point. The MDA has stated this is a lease arrangement and not ownership, and that the City needs to sign a lease by June 30 or potentially face paying back millions of dollars.

Additionally, if the City were to own and maintain the parking garage, estimates suggest it could cost taxpayers upward of \$100,000 annually, while leasing it would be only a fraction of that cost.

The other night when this matter was presented, I also felt there were personal disagreements involved regarding the City Attorney. I have previously been told there was a strong distrust of the City Attorney and his legal opinions with two of the board members. In my opinion, that creates challenges when trying to objectively evaluate the legal guidance being presented to the Board. My decision was based on the legal advice I received and what I believed was in the best interest of the taxpayers and the City moving forward.

In addition, a full investigation could potentially cost taxpayers upward of \$100,000, and in the end, I honestly do not believe the final outcome regarding the lease versus ownership issue would change.

This is a complicated matter involving previous administrations, State agreements, and legal interpretations. My focus remains on protecting taxpayers while moving the City forward.

Steve Tillis



Steve Tillis

E Brian Rose, the \$100,000 per year figure was based on if we had ownership. The first lease proposal we were presented with was estimated at \$75,000–\$80,000 annually, and the third proposal we are currently working on is only a fraction of the original \$100,000 figure.

Under ownership, taxpayers would have paid approximately \$1 million over 10 years for the parking garage. Right now, we are working toward an agreement that could save the citizens potentially \$600,000 over that same

10-year per. While, I would agree that there has been much misappropriated documents. This all appeared under a different administration and as alderman, we are making decisions we can with the cards we're dealt. If the sitting city attorney tells us we cannot change the minutes of a previous board. Then I have to listen to legal representation.