

**Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System
Minutes of the Legislative Committee Meeting
December 17, 2025**

The Legislative Committee of the Municipal Police Employees' Retirement System held a meeting on Wednesday, December 17, 2025, at the system's office at 7722 Office Park Boulevard in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Asst. Chief Jason DiMarco (Chair) at 9:07 a.m.

II. Roll Call

Members Present

Chief Edwin Bergeron, Jr.
Major Raymond Burkart, Jr.
Asst. Chief Jason DiMarco, Chairman
Lt. (Retired) Chad King
Chief Beth Westlake

Members Absent

Major (Retired) Kelly Gibson

Others Present

Representative Tony Bacala, MPERS Board member
Lt. Tyrone Warren, MPERS Board member
Mr. Julius Roberson, State Treasurer Designee
Chief Christopher Wilrye, MPERS Board member
Mr. Benjamin Huxen II, MPERS Executive Director and General Counsel
Ms. Taylor Camp, MPERS Chief Financial Officer
Ms. Melissa Frazier, MPERS Benefits Administrator
Ms. Emily Thurston, MPERS System Analyst
Mr. Greg Curran - Curran Actuarial Consulting, Actuary
Mr. Tyler Brannan - Curran Actuarial Consulting, PhD, Senior Actuarial Analyst
Mr. David Barnes - NEPC, Investment Consultant
Ms. Sheri Morris - Daigle, Fisse, & Kessenich
Ms. Laura Gail Sullivan, Attorney
Ms. Adrienne Bordelon, OSE
Mr. Jeffrey Hamilton, DHM
Ms. Michelle Cunningham, DHM
Ms. Ria Frazier
Ms. Christie Ziadeh, MPERS Benefits Analyst (remote)
Ms. Sarah Daniel, MPERS Accounts Analyst (remote)
Ms. Karen Correll, MPERS Membership Analyst (remote)
Ms. Erin Estilette, Curran Actuarial Consulting (remote)

III. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

IV. Approval of the August 20, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Motion by Chief Beth Westlake, second by Chief Edwin Bergeron, Jr., to approve the minutes of the meeting held August 20, 2025. Without objection, the motion carried.

V. New Business

A. Recommendation to the Board Regarding Proposed Legislation for the 2026 Regular Legislative Session (Action Item)

Mr. Huxen reminded the Committee that they previously decided they were not going to do anything on partial dissolution this year. He stated that Firefighters would be proposing changes and because MPERS deals with some of the same employers and some of the same issues, that it may be best for MPERS to make similar changes.

Mr. Huxen stated there was a proposed change in legislation regarding future valuations that would shift from a single-year snapshot to a two-year average and delay payment starts by one year. This would offer municipalities more time to improve their numbers. Mr. Huxen explained that this legislation would include provisions that prevent municipalities with lawsuits against MPERS or municipalities with unpaid contributions from benefiting from this new law. Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Curran both commented on the proposed change and answered questions from the Committee.

Ms. Sullivan, who works with the Firefighters' Retirement System (FRS) as well, discussed the changes they were considering. They have not made any changes yet but are having fluid discussions. Ms. Sullivan stated that the provisions have been worked up specifically for MPERS as FRS does not have a lot of partial dissolutions or lawsuits. It has been included for MPERS to protect the system and not cause any issues with litigation.

There were discussions around whether a rolling two-year average or a longer period, such as five years, would be beneficial to employers and the retirement system. Mr. Curran explained to the Committee some of the details of what he has been able to study at this point, and Ms. Sullivan spoke on the law portion. Both stated the goal is to be fair to employers and to make sure employers don't unfairly share risk with others. Mr. Curran stated these changes won't necessarily always work in the favor of employers and that is why they will take this new perceived law, apply it retroactively with all the data, and analyze the results. Ms. Sullivan noted that what they are out to draft is not about catching fewer employees, it's about making sure to catch the employers that are intentionally reducing permanently the number in their police department. Mr.

Curran stated that they are moving in the direction of potentially addressing the issue of the spike, with a belief in giving employers fractional relief for bringing people back, which is a good thing.

Ms. Sullivan stated that the Committee needs to set the policy. The only reason this has been brought up for Committee review is because there is an extremely high chance that FRS will have a bill of some kind. Ms. Sullivan stated that currently, the dissolution laws for the two systems are nearly identical. If one changes and the other does not, MPERS and/or FRS will have employees who will look at each system and compare the fairness of each to their individual situation. Ms. Sullivan noted that if both laws stay similar it's easier for employers to understand. If there is one set of rules about whether a dissolution or partial dissolution occurs, it keeps both Boards mostly removed from criticism. She explained that the averaging changes being discussed are prospective only. They have looked at two years and have gone as far as five years. She stated this would be phased in with the first year being a two-year average, then a three-year average, then a four, and then a five-year average. Ms. Sullivan noted the direction they have it to not change something that has already been put on paper. In answer to a question from Chief Westlake, Ms. Sullivan stated that FRS and MPERS are the only two systems to her knowledge that have this idea of partial dissolution. Other systems have different kinds of laws about what happens when employers begin to reduce employees covered by that system, but those laws are substantially different from this law, which was started at MPERS and adopted by FRS.

Mr. Curran had to leave and let the Committee know that Mr. Brannan would step in for him. Mr. Brannan had completed all the analysis with Mr. Curran and would be able to answer the Committee's questions in his absence. Mr. Curran let the Committee know that if they desired any more studies to give him their thoughts and he would sit down with Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Huxen to go through numbers under the scenarios they would want tested.

Discussions continued regarding the timeline for when partial dissolution would be triggered and how long the municipalities have to hire more employees to get them back to the pre-dissolution number. Mr. Brannan explained the timing of when they see it in studies and when the reports are given to the Board, which leads to when payments would have to be made. Ms. Sullivan explained this further by stating that the municipalities currently effectively get three months, and if they don't hire someone else, a year later is when their payments start. Some concerns were raised by the Committee regarding this three-month timeframe with the smaller towns and the lack of hiring pool. Scenarios were discussed to develop a realistic timeframe or goal.

The challenges of smaller towns meeting new hiring demands were discussed, particularly when facing high recruitment hurdles and limited resources. The Committee discussed potential exemptions for departments with fewer than 15 officers from certain dissolution implications. The Committee asked when the decision had to be made to go along with FRS' decision. Ms. Sullivan stated

that FRS had not determined exactly what it was going to do yet and had one more meeting scheduled prior to the deadline to file the bill. MPERS' next meeting is scheduled after that deadline. The Committee agreed that they need to be consistent with FRS and have the same verbiage for the ease of all involved.

Ms. Sullivan pointed out that there may come a time when MPERS has done all it can do especially if there is no support from the entities that are truly getting the benefit. She stated that the MPERS Board has expended a lot of resources to make sure that everyone pays their fair share and to make sure that no employer walks away from retirees. Ms. Sullivan stated they are upholding their fiduciary duty by doing this. Lt. (Retired) King proposed that he, Mr. Huxen, Asst. Chief DiMarco, and Ms. Sullivan meet with LMA to let them know that partial dissolutions are a contentious hotspot, and to open discussions on what to do. Mr. Huxen agreed and stated they were planning to do this with legislation in general and stated having FRS involved as well. The issue of the deadline for advertising was brought up and the Committee agreed to authorize advertisement.

Motion by Lt. (Retired) Chad King, second by Chief Beth Westlake, to recommend that the Board authorize MPERS to advertise, author, and prefile two separate retirement bills for consideration during the 2026 Regular Session: (1) a bill to retain the existing MPERS subplan structure while increasing the accrual rate applicable to future service to three and one-third percent of average final compensation, to provide for the transfer into MPERS of certain employees who previously elected to remain in the Louisiana State Employees' Retirement System, and to authorize the Board, by rule, to retain and invest Deferred Retirement Option Plan account balances in-house, and to authorize members to purchase an upgrade of previously credited services at the member's sole actuarial cost; and (2) a bill to retain the existing MPERS subplan structure while increasing the accrual rate for the Non-hazardous duty subplan to three percent of average final compensation for future service, and otherwise include the LASERS transfer provisions, Deferred Retirement Option Plan asset-retention provisions, and prior-service purchase authorization described in item (1); and (3) to recommend that the Board authorize staff to coordinate with Representative Bacala as author, House staff, the Legislative Actuary, and the system actuary; to request and support preparation of the actuarial analysis necessary for the Legislative Auditor's actuarial note for each bill; and to take all actions necessary to support advertising, drafting, prefilng, and legislative consideration in connection with the 2026 Regular Session. Without objection, the motion carried.

The Committee then moved discussions to accrual rates. Mr. Huxen stated the issues with the differences between tiers and ways to approach this issue. He stated there were two separate bills out there. The first bill would bring everyone up to three and a third and the second bill would increase the Non-

hazardous from two and a half to three percent with some other components. These components would include the LASERS transfer provisions, DROP asset-retention provisions, and prior-service purchase authorization.

Motion by Chief Beth Westlake, second by Lt. (Retired) Chad King, to recommend that the Board authorize MPERS to proceed with legislation amending La. R.S. 11:2225.4 consistent with the draft presented, to authorize coordination with the Firefighters' Retirement System of Louisiana, to work with Representative Bacala and House staff on the draft, and to authorize staff to take all actions necessary to support drafting, actuarial review, introduction, and consideration of the legislation during the 2026 Regular Session. Without objection, the motion carried.

The last discussion dealt with employer education. Mr. Huxen stated that if any municipality had officers covered under Social Security they would be required to get education from MPERS on an annual basis, which would be free of charge. It could be provided virtually or in person. This education would be certified and penalties were discussed.

Motion by Lt. (Retired) Chad King, second by Chief Beth Westlake, to recommend that the Board of Trustees authorize staff to proceed with advertising, authoring, and prefilling proposed legislation requiring annual retirement education and board certification of compliance for certain municipalities employing municipal police officers whose officers are covered under the federal Social Security program, and to authorize staff to coordinate with Representative Bacala as author for consideration during the upcoming Regular Session. Without objection, the motion carried.


VI. Other Business
None


VII. Adjourn

Motion by Asst. Chief Jason DiMarco, second by Chief Beth Westlake, to adjourn the meeting at 10:27 a.m. Without objection, the motion carried.

The next meeting date is February 25, 2026.

To the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes accurately represent the actions taken at the meeting held December 17, 2025.


Asst. Chief Jason DiMarco
Legislative Committee Chairman


Ben Huxen
Executive Director and General Counsel