AGENDA

Municipal Pensions Oversight Board

Meeting of the Board Members

June 18, 2026

301 Eagle Mountain Road, Second Floor, Suite 251, Charleston, WV 25311

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes of Meeting on March 19, 2026

III. Old Business
- A. Compliance Review Updates
  1. Recalculation Updates
     a. Charleston Fire
  2. Ongoing Reviews
     a. Grafton Police and Fire
     b. Weston Police and Fire
     c. Welch Police
- B. Bolton
  1. Correction of Survivor Benefits Project
     a. South Charleston Firemen's Pension Request
     b. Bluefield Firemen's Pension COLA Issues
  2. Experience Study 2026
  3. City of Fairmont Fire Department DROP Request
- C. Legislation
  1. SB717

IV. New Business
- A. P-Card Expenditures – March, April and May 2026
- B. Legal
  1. Martinsburg Police Pension
- C. Personnel
  1. Across-the-Board Salary Increase July 1, 2026
- D. Executive Director's Report

V. Public Comments
- A. Safety Meeting
  1. Drive safely on your return to work or home today.

VI. Adjournment

*Next Board Meeting is September 17, 2026, at 1:00 PM

MUNICIPAL PENSIONS OVERSIGHT BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
June 18, 2026
1:00 P.M.

The Municipal Pensions Oversight Board (MPOB) met on March 19, 2026, at 1:00 P.M. The meeting was held at 301 Eagle Mountain Rd. Suite 251, Charleston WV 25311. Mr. Steve Neddo welcomes everyone and calls the meeting to order. Matthew Pauley calls the Roll.

Roll Call - Attendees:

Board Members:

Travis Blosser - Absent

Jeffrey Fleck – Present Virtual

David Lanham -Absent

Sarah Long - Present

Jason Matthews, Vice Chairman -Present Virtual

Steve Neddo — Chairman - Present

Michael Payne - Present virtual

Tom Pearcy - Present virtual

Craig Slaughter - Present

General Counsel:

Anthony Eates, Deputy Attorney General - Present

Staff:

Dave Lemmon, Deputy Director - Present

Matthew Pauley, Chief Financial Officer - Present

Blair Taylor, Executive Director - Present

Janet Warren, Administrative Assistant - Absent

Guest:

Jordan McClane, Consulting Actuary Bolton - Present

Alan Torroella, Consulting Actuary Bolton – Present Virtual

Minute taker:
Matthew Pauley

Mr. Neddo states the MPOB does have a quorum.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Matthew calls the roll.

II. Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes for the MPOB meeting for March 19, 2026, were presented for approval.

Motion to approve the minutes as presented; Moved by Mr. Jason Matthews; Seconded by Mr. Craig Slaughter, passed unanimously.

RESOLVED; The minutes for March 19, 2026, meetings for the Municipal Oversight Board Meeting minutes are approved as presented.

III. Old Business

A. Compliance Review Updates

1. Recalculation Update

a. Charleston Fire

Mr. Taylor presenting

MPOB staff meet with Suttle and Stalnaker by Google Meet and also held an in-person meeting. They believe they are close to finishing the recalculations of Charleston Fire. Mr. Les Smith has been brought in to review Suttle and Stalnaker's results. Prior to having the results from Suttle and Stalnaker, staff asked Mr. Chad Jones, the previous pension secretary for detailed payroll data. The data was broken down from PDF to pliable data. MPOB picked certain retiree members, survivors, and disabilitant members from Charleston fire to review. As Suttle and Stalnaker has completed their work on certain individuals, they shared their results with the MPOB. Mr. Les Smith, Mr. Taylor and Ms. Warren have been doing a review of their results. MPOB can match Suttle and Stalnaker's results in all the test subjects reviewed to date. Suttle and Stalnaker continues to review several disability calculations and regular retirement calculations. The MPOB may ask Suttle and Stalnaker for the payroll data for one or more of these individuals as well before finalizing the MPOB's review of the firm's work.

B. Ongoing Reviews

a. Grafton Police and Fire

Mr. Pauley is presenting.

Mr. Pauley gives some background, at the September board meeting Mr. Pauley presented the findings to board. Those findings included that Grafton FD and PD boards were not meeting or holding annual elections. They did not vote annually to approve COLAs or collect certified tax returns for their non-duty members. In the December board meeting, Mr. Pauley reported that they catch up payments for the retirees and beneficiaries that had been incorrectly paid due to the calculations of COLAs. The city opted to pay back the overpayment. At the March meeting Mr. Pauley had reported that he had sent letters to the city and the board members, informing them of their duties and requirements under §8-22-24d (tax return submission). Since then, Grafton finance director has been provided with COLA calculators for their retirees and their survivors so that COLAs could be properly calculated for July 1, 2026. The MPOB has received tax returns for 2 non-duty members. The MPOB assisted Grafton with those recalculations, neither resulting in a reduction, and their COLAs were recalculated and those members were paid back the amounts that they were underpaid due to COLA miscalculations. Also note, on May 20, 2026, Mr. Pauley and Mr. Lemmon traveled to Grafton to attend the Fire and Police pension board meetings. They have a new City Manager who seems very active in making things correct. At that meeting, new board members were elected, procedures were adopted, board voted to approve actions that were already taken by the previous City Manager. The board voted to hold one pensioner in abeyance until his tax returns are submitted. The MPOB considers this review to be closed at this point but will continue to monitor and assist Grafton with that one outstanding non-duty disability.

b. Weston Police and Fire – The MPOB will start an official review of Weston Police and Fire.

Tom Pearcy joins the meeting by phone.

Mr. Taylor presenting

c. Welch Police – Mr. Taylor states that he has worked with Welch's board and secretary over the past few months. There is one person who initially had his pension calculated incorrectly. The Welch Board of Trustees then recalculated that individual after an attorney pointed out the mistake. That recalculation, which is still in place, also under calculated the member's pension. Through that recalculation, the Pension gave the member the back compensation due him based on the incorrect "recalculation". Later, someone at the Pension Board of Trustees recalculated the pension again, using the MPOB's WV Benefit Calculator and inserted a copy of this amount which the member should be receiving in the member's retirement record folder. Further adjustments in pay have not occurred. The Pension Secretary is aware of the issue that continues to exist. Mr. Taylor will attend a Pension Board meeting to show how the recalculation from the Benefit Calculator has not been implemented and assist with calculating the "new" amount that is due the member and what the member's monthly pension is to be going forward from July 1, 2026. Initially and during the second calculation, the Trustees of the Welch Policemen's Pension failed to include certain overtime and other remuneration the member received in the calculation of the pension based on their interpretation of WV Code §8-22-16(d)(1). Mr. Taylor indicated the review and corrections should be completed by September 2026.

C. Bolton

Mr. McClane Presenting

1. Correction of Survivor Benefits Project –

a. South Charleston Firemen's Pension Request- Mr. McClane states that they sent out letters to plans and spreadsheets 35 plans for the survivors' corrections. Bolton provided a letter stating that if any of the information appears incorrect to reach out and Bolton will work with those issues. Bolton has had about 6 plans to reach out with new data on payments differences. Bolton has done updates to Weirton Police, Princeton Fire, South Charleston Fire, Martinsburg Police, and Charleston Police. Charleston Police had great back up information for each person on the list. Charleston is reviewing and they have the information to give the new COLA amounts on July 1, 2026. MPOB still needs 7 certifications from police, and 5 from fire but that did not include Charleston police and Charleston fire are in the process of making recalculations on their plan. Mr. Taylor states that there is a letter in the board packet for the board to look at, that is the reason South Charleston fire has not been certified yet. Mr. Taylor believes over the next few months everyone will be fixed and receiving what they should be intended to receive. Mr. McClane states that Janet built a version of a Survivor calculator that this information can be inputted into to help the plans better keep their calculations for survivors' data corrected amounts going forward.

Mr. McClane moves to the City of Fairmont Fire Department DROP Request on the Agenda

3. City of Fairmont Fire Department DROP Request –

For background when a plan sends a proposal of DROP design to the MPOB the MPOB sends the DROP design to Bolton for analysis. In accordance with the WV code the actuary will determine that there will be no negative impact on the members' pension and relief funds. There are 3 different ways to show an analysis of a DROP study. The board chose which way to analyze a DROP for the actuaries; Bolton shows all 3 ways in the DROP study letter. In completing a DROP analysis, Bolton will list the components of the calculation.

- **Payment Trade Off -** Looking at the change of liability, the cost is $37,000, which is a slight liability increase to the plan.
- **Delay in New Hire Total Norman Cost -** The delay in new hire normal cost does not affect this plan because they are closed to new hires.
- **Extra Member Contribution Due to DROP -** For extra member contribution due to DROP, if the plan didn't offer a DROP and member was to assume to retire at age 53 what offering a DROP do, it may say is that person may enter the DROP at age 50 and maximize the DROP and take the full 5 years, working to the age of 55. What happens in that scenario if they had worked until 53 in the absence of DROP, but with the DROP they are staying until 55, this gap of time, the plan is receiving more employee contributions from the employee than it would otherwise.
- **Premium Tax Allocation –** Using the same reference as above (retired at 53 if there in an absence of DROP or staying until 55 with a DROP) – Both active and retirees get counted in the premium tax allocation amounts. In a non-DROP scenario, the person would have retired, and a new member would have been hired. That would have counted for 2 people, however because the person is staying longer than otherwise due to the DROP design, it is only one person, making it a cost to the city of $166,855.
- **Methodology –** The methodology the board implemented was to sum all the components and in doing so, it results in a savings to the plan of over $900,000. Page 4 will list the 3

options initially presented to the board, which is the liability impact, Contribution impact to the City, and Net plan impact.

Mr. McClane states that, as a disclosure, this is based on the Actuaries' best assumptions, using the assumptions from the valuation.

Motion to approve the Fairmont Fire DROP Study as presented; Moved by Mr. Jason Matthews: Seconded by; Mr. Craig Slaughter, Passed unanimously.

RESOLVED: Fairmont Fire DROP study is approved as presented.

2. Experience Study 2026 (using data from 2020-2024) **-**

Mr. McClane Presenting

The procedure for the MPOB states that the actuary uses 3 years for the Experience Study but in the March, board meeting the board voted to use 4 because of the COVID year to isolate the impact. Mr. McClane goes over the PowerPoint presentation. Bolton looks at both Economic and Demographic assumptions. Mr. McClane states that the actuaries are not seeing major changes. Mr. McClane addresses slide 26 *"Amortization Methodology"*.

- **Amortization Methodology –** Mr. McClane states that 3 funding policies are now actuarial sound. Where they the normal cost and amortization the unfunded liability. Prior to Bolton becoming the actuaries, the Standard and the Optional would pay down their unfunded liability over a set number of years, with the years declining each year. The impact of that means that any new gains and losses get thrown into that same base and it's being recognized over a declining number of years. In almost every other client that Bolton has, when the period gets too short, you need to change the amortization policy, otherwise if you have some kind of negative or positive experience when the period is short it's going to impact your results, and your contributions are going to be volatile. During the first Experience Study, Bolton came to the Board and discussed and implemented a layered amortization method, where each gain or losses get their own layer over 15-20 years, which was then written into the code to use these policies. In using the layered amortization method, the future gains and losses will have a recognition period of about 15 years. The only problem with that is the Optional II methodology came out after the layering method occurred. The Optional II methodology states that the unfunded liability can be paid down over 40 years, however, if you get a gain the next year, you take it over 15 years. What can happen is, if you recognize these gains over a much shorter time, you're paying down your liability you can run into negative amortization, where unfunded liability continues to grow because you haven't yet paid the interest on the unfunded liability, taking credit for your gains over a much shorter period, than you are paying down your losses.

Mr. McClane sites §8-22-20

Language from WV Code §8-22-20:

The management of these amortization bases by the actuary should entail the consideration, at least every five years, of whether to implement strategies, such as the synchronization of certain amortization layers, to help avoid volatility to the sum of the amortization payments generally resulting from the expiration of charge and credit layers at different times.

Mr. McClane states that last year they synchronized all the bases in the prior valuation for Optional (from Alternative or Conservation) and Optional II Funding policies.

- **Recommended Strategy -** Bolton recommends proactively synchronizing the bases for Optional II methodology, which have 38 years left on the unfunded liability base.

What that means is that instead of recognizing the future gains and losses over the 15 years, you recognize the gains should be recognized over the same period as your unfunded liability base that you're paying down, over the 38 remaining years of the Optional II methodology. That would eliminate having negative amortization and you would pay down the unfunded liability faster than you would have otherwise.

Mr. McClane asks if the language in the code gives the authority to implement the gains over a longer period, or if the board would like to implement the gain base position to synchronize the gain bases with the unfunded liability base.

Mr. Eates is asked his opinion if this gives Bolton authority by code, to synchronize gain bases with the unfunded liability base. Mr. McClane states that code gives them authority to smooth gains or losses via the code, but the question becomes do they have the authority to do this proactively, for the gain bases to avoid volatility.

Mr. McClane states that the implication is that, if you have gains in the future, and the anticipation in this Experience Study will show gains, then if using this strategy then the Cities will be paying slightly more than otherwise, because credit for that gain is taken over a longer period of time rather than a shorter period of time. Investment gains and losses have a 4 - year smoothing and they would get this additional smoothing layered on top, that is because the investment returns are the most volatile piece of actuarial valuation, which drives most of the gains and losses. This is to avoid a situation where an employer is paying money into a plan, but your funded status is not going up and could be going down, because you're not paying the portion of the unfunded liability. In the event that there are gains, the city would be paying more. In the event there are gains, the contributions would go down, but they would not go down as much as they would have otherwise.

Mr. Slaughter states that the Code language looks supportive. Mr. Slaughter asks if there is anything in the code that would contradict that language.

Mr. Eates asks if the years on PowerPoint are set by statute. Mr. McClane states they are set by code. That was because at the time, the Standard policy had 12-15 years left on the initial unfunded liability and the Optional had about 25 years. After the 15-year bases were put into please the Optional II funding policy was implemented that put the unfunded liability to 40 years. That 38 year is written in statute for that funding policy. The problem is the discrepancy between the 38 years, and the other years given to the other plans. If you have losses then you would recognize those over 15 years, but if you have gains, it is not good actuarial practice to take credit for that gain over a much shorter period and pay down this large unfunded liability that a plan has.

Mr. McClane thinks that under the language in the code, proactively making future gains over the 38 years over the initial Unfunded Liability and Assumption Change Gains would be over\ 38 years. The losses would still be over 15 years.

Mr. Taylor asks if Bolton's proposal is consistent with the ASA best practice standards. Mr. McClane confirms that it is consistent. Mr. Taylor states that the best practice is in the code, and he believes it gives Bolton the ability to synchronize the gains over time.

Mr. Matthews asks if the board passes a motion today, is this something that needs to go to legislature and put into code? Mr. Eates states that he does not believe that it does need to go to legislature, that it fits within the code that exists now.

Motion for Bolton to use the Amortization Methodology period for Optional II funding Policy as allowable by §8-22-20; MOVED By Jason Matthews ; Seconded by; Craig Slaughter; Passed unanimously.

RESOLVED; Bolton to use the Amortization Methodology period for Optional II funding Policy as allowably by §8-22-20

Experience Study Summary Results

- **Economic Assumptions – (no changes)** Inflation 2.50%, COLA 2.45%. Premium tax increase 2.50%, Investment return and discount rate (same rate in matrices), Administrative expenses (average of prior two years adjusted for inflation).

- **Demographic Assumptions –** Over the COVID period there, extremely high salary increases were noted. Because of that Bolton looked at merit only.

Proposed Changes

- Bolton is recommending the salary scale assumption is broken into 3 components.

    - **Base inflation –** 2.5%
    - **Wages –** Typically increase faster that base inflation by anywhere between 50 to 150 bases points and you add merit on top of that. Bolton recommends that the salary inflation decreases from 1.0% to .75%, which is 75 bases points. That is supported by recent experience and Social Security data and how national wages have grown over time.
    - **Mortality-** The procedure says that the actuary must use the most recent table available. The newest table is 2016. This year Bolton used partial credibility

theory, to give MPOB experience weight in addition to national experience. Findings show the WV Mortality experience is much higher than the National Mortality average by 25% to 30%, using this theory Bolton can use a scaler to the base table of 14%.

- **Marriage assumption –** Decrease the assumption from 70% to 65%. That comes into play because of Survivor benefits.

- **Impact on Results:**

  - **Total –** Anticipate about a $32 million dollar decrease in liability. Which is about 2.0% of liability. Looking at normal cost, there was about a 1.6% reduction in normal cost. That means if your liability goes down your funding ratio goes up.

Mr. Slaughter asks what assumptions Bolton are least confident in and Mr. McClane states the investment returns will be from year to year. He states that is the assumption that has the most volatility and the most impact on a contribution. Bolton thinks of the discount rate and the investment return as one in the same. Because you are discounting future liabilities based on the discount rate.
Mr. McClane states the assumptions don't impact the cost of the plans; it just puts what the actuary thinks will happen into future into today's dollars. So, if using aggressive assumptions, what will happen is there will be losses in the future. If using conservative assumptions, they will find gains, over time, in the future. Bolton does an annual gain/loss analysis for MPOB plans to see if the assumptions are correct. Salaries and COLAs had the biggest impact on those assumptions.

Motion to approve the WV MPOB 2026 Experience Study as presented; Moved by Mr. Criag Slaughter; Seconded by; Ms. Sarah Long, PASSED unanimously.

RESOLVED; WV MPOB 2026 Experience Study is approved as presented.

a. South Charleston Firemen's Pension Request continued –

Mr. Taylor Presenting

Mr. Taylor points the board to a letter that was sent to Assistant Chief Troy Painter, Pension Secretary of the South Charleston Firemen's Pension and Relief Fund, and the Honorable Frank Mullins, Chairman of the South Charleston Firemen's Pension and Relief Fund. The letter was signed by Mr. Taylor, Executive Director, MPOB and James Ritchie, Senior Actuary of Bolton. The letter told South Charleston Fire that they are surviving spouses that were underpaid and needed to be made whole going forward. Accompanying the letter was a spreadsheet indicating the surviving spouses are being underpaid based on the data South Charleston Firemen's Pension and the City of South Charleston staff had provided Bolton They were asked to review the spreadsheet and if they had any questions to bring that to Bolton and the MPOB and to sign and notarized certification letter as to when those survivors were brought up and made whole on their payments. South Charleston Firemen's Pension has sent a letter to the MPOB and asks for the ability to approve the changes for two members, Patricia Walker and Beth Brannon, but not approve the changes to one member, Joyce Chancey. The pension secretary believes that the information that they have provided to Bolton over the years and to the previous actuary over the years was not correct. South Charleston Fire Pension indicates they do not have documentation on the member's pension or how the surviving spouse's pension was calculated. The data provided by the pension does show the member retired in 1991 and died in 1998. The data that we have goes back at least to 2013. This was data that had been provided to Gabriel Rhoder Smith & CO (GRS) who was our actuary at that time. That data shows what she was being paid at that time. There were years after 2009 that South Charleston Fire could not grant COLAs due to the City of South Charleston not providing additional actuarially required contributions from the actuarial valuation reports, and those years have been adjusted on the Bolton spreadsheet for South Charleston Firemen's Pension. One thing that the current secretary and the previous secretary have indicated is that when the member died, they took 60% of the original member's benefit and applied it to the surviving spouse, often without reindexing the members' COLA. Assistant Chief Painter did go to the members' home to try to find data records on what the survivor was paid. Assistant Chief Painter spoke with both Ms. Chancey as well as her daughter; however, Ms. Chancey has not responded back to the Pension Board with any additional information. They don't have any disputable evidence that the numbers they gave Bolton are incorrect and Mr. McClane states that the numbers are based on the number that South Charleston Fire gave Bolton several years ago. In looking at the number, they gave Bolton and the number they gave the prior actuary, that number did not change on the data request in those years.

Mr. Eates asks if they had data for the other members that they didn't dispute? Mr. Taylor states they had data from when the members died being more recent. One was an error in the beginning COLA amount, and the other one was an agreeable error as well. MPOB can go back and look at the COLAs during years and looking at the reindexing for the member, MPOB can reindex the survivor. South Charleston admits they did not reindex survivors once the members passed away. They state they took 60% of the original benefit. The amount due to the survivor is significate. Mr. Taylor states the letter states "attached is a letter for survivor calculation errors for the South Charleston Pension Fund", the MPOB does not feel like it has errors on this member. Noting that Bolton is using assumptions, but assumptions have been made for all 3 members for South Charleston and all other spouse survivors of all 35 plans. South Charleston states they can't validate the data, but they have been providing that data to us, to Bolton, for years. Mr. Neddo states they submitted their data, MPOB and Bolton are using their data. They agree with 2 out of 3 of the members but disagree with this one.

Mr. McClane states that if you were taking 60%, in all cases where the member initially receiving more than $15,000 a year then you would be underpaying a survivor. That's how Bolton became aware that many survivors were underpaid.

Mr. Eates states that the MPOB started this recalculation of survivor benefits. Mr. Taylor agrees and agrees they are willing to fix 2 out of 3 members. Mr. Taylor states the city does pay their pensioners, but their payroll system may not go that far back.

Mr. McClane states that when Charleston was done, they provided scanned copies, but most cities did not keep those types of records.

South Charleston states that no records exist but they put information fort the member into the data request and submitted by the city treasurer. When they asked about the member, the pension secretary put question marks, but the survivor had an amount listed.

Mr. Taylor states they think that the survivor started at 60% of the original members benefit without reindexing and believe that the survivor is underpaid and continuing to be underpaid.

Mr. Slaughter states that he sees no evidence to approve South Charleston's interpretation of Survivor 3.

Mr. Eates states that there are 3 things that can be done:

1) Agree affirmatively with South Charleston on Survivor 3
2) Affirmatively reject South Charleston on Survivor 3
3) Do nothing

Mr. Taylor states that Mr. Painter is asking for approval of 2 of the 3 survivors and not to fix the 3rd survivor.

Mr. Eates asks what the Boards next step be if you believe this woman is underpaid and no reason to believe that South Charleston will fix it?

Mr. Lemmon states that the board should send a letter asking what due diligence has the South Charleston Firemen's Pension Board conducted to determine the surviving spouse is currently receiving the correct monthly payment. Once due diligence has been completed by South Charleston Fire Pension then the results and the actions taken should be sent to the Oversight Board. Mr. Taylor states if we do nothing then we invalidate all the work that Bolton has done for us and all the other plans. Mr. Taylor doesn't believe doing nothing is the correct option.

Mr. Eates states that he believes you are at the point of calling Mr. Painter and stating that the board met, considered the request, and the MPOB's response is additional investigation needs to occur. Mr. Eates does not believe it is to a point of issuing an order from the board yet. If this continues with no results the next step may be an order from the MPOB.

Mr. Taylor states that in the past the first step would be a letter from the Executive Director to the fund stating that we want you to do XYZ to see if your initial claim is valid. Ask for the results of any investigation to be provided back to the Board.

Mr. Neddo states that the Code is clear if the mistakes occur, they must be rectified. Mr. Neddo doesn't think a motion is needed at this point, however a letter requesting additional information on the due diligence performed to date and what additional due diligence needs to be performed including providing how the survivor was informed there are possible underpayments due her from the pension board and whether additional information needs to be provided to the surviving spouse.

Mr. Taylor presenting

b. Bluefield Firemen's Pension COLA issues – Through the Survivor recalculation process Bluefield fire has found and reported that the survivor amounts that Bolton supplied to them was incorrect because they did not grant COLA to any member from 2003 – 2015. The MPOB asked Bluefield to provide payroll data, which was provided to the MPOB, on all their retirees and well as their survivors. MPOB verified there were very few years when COLAs were provided to their members or beneficiaries. Mr. Taylor asked if they had letters from their actuaries to show where they didn't have to provide COLAs for those years, and they could not provide any letters. The current administration of Bluefield, the city and fire pension secretary, asks for MPOB to help with recalculation of COLAs.

Mr. Lemmon presenting

Mr. Lemmon states that the city of Bluefield has a new city Treasurer, Brad Burner. He is a certified forensic accountant. He states that the MPOB had the police and fire pension fund secretaries and board members come here for training. Also invited was Brad Burner and the Assistant Treasurer. Mr. Lemmon states that there was $983,000 in underpayments for members in COLAs for Bluefield fire. They are trying to find actuary COLA letters. They have their next meeting on June 24, 2026. That amount will increase because that number does not include the beneficiaries of the plan. We set down and figured every member, when they retired, applied COLAs to every year they didn't get COLAs to get a difference on every member. The fire pension board has told the MPOB they are going to vote to correct all the underpayments. If this occurs, we are not going to take any actions regarding survivors until the retirees are corrected. Once they approve the underpayment, we will provide that to Bolton and ask them to recalculate the survivors with the corrected retiree pension amounts.

Mr. Neddo asks Bluefield Fire funded ratio? Mr. Pauley states that Police are at 64%, and the Fire is at 29%. Mr. Taylor states they have closed their plans from Alternative Methodology to Optional II, so they are scheduled to fund in 37 years. Mr. Pauley states that their actuarial valuation of assets was $5.2 million and their unfunded liability is $13 million.

C. Legislation

Mr. Taylor presenting

1. SB717 – Passed by legislator's and passed by the Governor. It won't show up on code books or on website until July 1, 2026. There were 2 sections to this bill. One was to allow duty related pensioners who had been forced to have a disability prior to age 50, to be able to change their duty related disability changed over to a regular pension after they met the minimum retirement age of 50 years old between 21-30 years of service.

The second part of SB717 for non-duty disability allowed members who had reached normal retirement age by SS standards to stop requiring their tax returns to be submitted to their pension funds to have their pensions potential reduced for earned income over the current minimum wage. When the bill was drafted by "Bill-Drafting" at the Legislature, they inadvertently left out a section of the bill that had been added to the code in 2022. It states that if a member doesn't provide the tax return the pension fund shall hold the members pension in abeyance until the retirant complies. That was left out of the original bill as it was introduced.

There was no strike-through and as such, neither the Senate nor the House attorneys caught the error. Mr. Taylor didn't catch it until the after the bill was passed and signed into law. Staff spoken to Mark McGowen who is a retiree but had been an attorney for the House Finance Committee for over 20 years, he states that strike-through is there as a curtesy and if MPOB wants the language added, another bill will need to be run through next year. He sent another possibility, but Mr. Eates isn't aware of that possibility.

Mr. Slaughter asks a clarifying question, whether this language was in the statute, then we passed another bill that ignored that language, creating a gap? Mr. Eates states that the easiest way to describe this is when someone set down to create the new bill with the additions that someone wanted. They pulled the pre- 2022 version, which didn't have the additions that were added in 2022. To jump to current, Mr. Eates isn't aware of cause of action to file to fix an "error". A new law will need to be submitted.

In 2022 MPOB sponsored that language. The law today reverted to the prior 2022. Mr. Neddo states that local pension boards had a big problem getting members to turn in their tax returns, so they asked MPOB to sponsor the bill requiring the submission of tax returns.

Mr. Slaughter states the MPOB will go to the Governor's office to insert and clean up the bill over the next session. Mr. Slaughter suggests reaching out to the governor's office now. Mr. Eates and states he will send an email to the Governor's office. MPOB will follow through during the 2027 Legislative session.

IV. New Business

A. P-Card Expenditures – March, April, and May 2026

Mr. Matthew Pauley presenting

Mr. Pauley presents the PCard expenditures for March, April and May 2026, states that there are any questions he is available to answer.

Mr. Neddo calls for a motion to approve.

MOTION: Motion to approve the PCard expenditures March, April, and May 2026, *as presented. Moved by Mr. Craig Slaughter.; seconded by Ms. Sarah Long.*

***RESOLVED*, the PCard expenditures for March, April, and May 2025, are approved as presented.**

B. Legal

1. Martinsburg Police Pension

Mr. Craig Slughter makes a motion to go into the Executive session as provided for in the Open Meetings Act, under W.Va.§6-9A-4(b)(2)(A) to discuss attorney-client matters.

MOTION: Moved by Mr. Craig Slaughter; Seconded by Ms. Sarah Long for the Municipal Pensions Oversight Board to go into Executive Session pursuant to W.Va. §6-9A-4(b)(2)(A) *to discuss personnel matters. Passed unanimously.*

Mr. Neddo calls back to order the meeting, stating no motions or decisions were made during the executive session.

C. Personnel

1. Across-the-Board Salary Increase July 1, 2026

Mr. Fleck presenting

The personal committee, in the last meeting, discussed pay increases for staff and the Governor has approved an average 3% pay increase for state employees this year. It amounts to $1794.00, for that increase to impact on the MPOB staff the board needs to approve it.

Mr. Jeff Fleck makes a motion that the employees of MPOB receive the same across-the board pay increase of $1794.00 per Governor's increase effective July 1, 2026.

MOTION: Moved by Mr. Jeff Fleck; Seconded by Mr. Craig Slaughter for the Municipal Pensions Oversight Board to receive an across-the board pay increase of $1794.00 effective July 1, 2026. Passed unanimously.

2. Other Business - None

D. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Blair Taylor presenting

- MPOB has been very busy over the last 3 months.
- MPOB has been traveling providing training to Municipalities, aiding Municipal Treasurer's as well as the pension boards. That will continue throughout the year.
- Mr. Lemmon and Mr. Pauley traveled to Grafton, Weston, and St. Albans
- Mr. Taylor and Mr. Lemmon met with Charleston's Mayor, Ms. Goodwin and her staff on a DROP program. They met with 15 or so Charleston Police Officers regarding DROP to answer any questions they had.
- Blair has been working with plans thinking of switching to the IMB.

Mr. Lemmon presenting

- Death Audits – Mr. Lemmon has spoken to numerous vendors. One vendor is a uses a certi-check system, its data-mines 40,000 data sets. That will help us identify a member who has passed or help locate a beneficiary. The other vendor tags about 30,000 data sets. The board had asked the MPOB to look at providing this service to all of our plans. If MPOB provides it to the plans, it would be better priced than if an individual plan hired the company.

Mr. Taylor presenting

- Legislative rule Title 211 Series 2 passed into law and was signed into law becoming effective June 04, 2026. It has to do with the ability to obtain actuary services.
- MPOB has issued a contract to Brown Edwards for audit services. They won the bid to be our auditor.
- MPOB entered into an agreement with CAMC to provide mental health IMEs.
- We have 6 remaining plans that need review, Fairmont Police and Fire, Clarksburg Police and Fire, and Princeton Police and Fire. We will start this year working on some of these plans.

Mr. Taylor asks if anyone has any questions.

V. Public Comments

Mr. Lemmon presenting

A. Safety Meeting

1. Drive safely on your return to work or home today.

VI. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting for June 18, 2026; Moved by Mr. Craig Slaughter; Seconded by Ms. Sarah Long.

RESOLVED, **that the June 18, 2026, meeting of the MPOB is adjourned.**

____
Stephen Neddo, Chairman

Minutes approved __________________
(Date)

Referenced documents can be found in the Board Meeting Packet.