State of Louisiana

MUNICIPAL POLICE OFFICERS' SUPPLEMENTAL PAY **BOARD MEETING**

MAY 11, 2022

10:00 a.m.

Municipal Police Officers' Supplemental Pay Board Meeting

May 11, 2022 10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS AND STAFF PRESENT:

<u>Board Members</u> Bry Layrisson,Chairman, In Person Ternisa Hutchinson, In Person Robert Burns, Video Conference

<u>Staff</u>

Michele Giroir, Esq. Wayne Tedesco Candy Diez Susanne Tessier

INDEX	
	PAGE(S)
CALL TO ORDER	4
ROLL CALL	4
INTRODUCTION OF LEGAL COUNSEL - MICHELE GIROIR	5
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9, 2022	5
OLD BUSINESS JLCB Act 110 Appearance Frequency	6
NEW DEPARTMENTS: St. Landry Parish Government - Steven Keith Adam Mary Magdeline Milton Mark E. Semien Jody Everette White	7
STATUTE/ADMINISTRATIVE RULES UPDATE	10
SUMPAY MODERNIZATION PROJECT UPDATES	11
MOST RECENT BUDGET PROJECTIONS	15
NEW APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL - 195	15
ACT 110 MONEY APPROVAL - 12 - \$3,733	17
SET TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING	18
ADJOURN	23

1	Municipal Police Officers' Supplemental Pay Board Meeting
2	May 11, 2022
3	
4	
5	CALL TO ORDER
6	MR. TEDESCO:
7	All right, everyone. Welcome, May 11th, 10 o'clock, Police Board meeting. It
8	looks like we've got the main players on the line and in attendance.
9	ROLL CALL
10	MR. TEDESCO:
11	So I guess we'll just start off by establishing a quorum.
12	So we've got Chief Bry Layrisson present.
13	We've got Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson present.
14	MS. HUTCHINSON:
15	Present.
16	MR. TEDESCO:
17	And Captain Robert Burns with State Police.
18	MR. BURNS:
19	I'm present.
20	MR. TEDESCO:
21	We actually have all three Board members present. We're ready to go.
22	And St. Landry Government on the line, could you also identify yourself?
23	MS. ROBERTS:
24	Yes, Candace Roberts (phonetic), HR Director.
25	MR. SEMIEN:

1	Mark Semien, Security Supervisor.
2	MR. TEDESCO:
3	All right. Very good.
4	Could you just spell that for Suzanne's records, please?
5	MS. ROBERTS:
6	Which which name?
7	MR. TEDESCO:
8	The second person, please.
9	MR. SEMIEN:
10	Semien, S-E-M-I-E-N.
11	MR. TEDESCO:
12	So the court reporter isn't present today, that's why we're just making sure that we
13	get everything Zoomed and recorded so that we can send it to her for transcribing.
14	INTRODUCTION OF NEW LEGAL COUNSEL - MICHELE GIROIR
15	MR. TEDESCO:
16	All that to say, I wanted to just first mention our new legal counsel, Michele Giroir,
17	here at DPS with us. She's just serving as the interim legal counsel for the moment,
18	since Connor Junkin has departed DPS.
19	So, welcome, Michele.
20	MS. GIROIR:
21	Thank you.
22	APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FEBRUARY 9, 2022
23	MR. TEDESCO:
24	All right. Well, I guess the first thing is to just review and approve the prior Board
25	meeting minutes.

1	MR. LAYRISSON:
2	I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes from the prior meeting on February
3	9, 2022.
4	MS. HUTCHINSON:
5	I'll second.
6	MR. LAYRISSON:
7	All in favor, certify by saying "aye."
8	(All aye.)
9	MR. LAYRISSON:
10	The motion carries.
11	MR. TEDESCO:
12	All right. We don't have any appeals on the agenda for this particular quarterly
13	Board meeting, so nothing there.
14	OLD BUSINESS
15	JLCB Act 110 Appearance Frequency
16	MR. TEDESCO:
17	All right. The next item on the agenda for old business is, I just wanted to mention
18	the JLCB Act 110 appearance frequency. Historically, we've always went annually, in
19	December, which we did do this past December, December 2021, but we had mentioned
20	as a result of the project, the new SuMPay project that we were going to try to go more
21	frequently so that the individuals didn't have to wait so long for the backpay. And the
22	initial intent was to go in March, which we weren't we were going to go in March and
23	September. We were going to shift to a semi-annually approach, and we weren't able to
24	go in March due to legal counsel having a hearing and they weren't available. So the
25	next attempt was to try to go in April, last month, and we did not go. I just wanted to

Г

1	mention that, you know, as we consider for the Department both Police and Fire, Fire
2	had some budgetary issues so we were trying to pursue whether we were going to go all
3	or nothing, if you will, for both Police and Fire or just go for Police, and all that to say,
4	the decision has not yet been made, so we did not move forward with trying to go in
5	April. Those conversations are still being had.
6	That being said, as we get farther down the agenda, you know, a new item that we
7	have on the agenda or a resurrected item is to just be transparent with those budget
8	projections. I think historically that was being provided to the Board and, somewhere
9	along the way, that ceased, so we just wanted to resurrect and bring that forward as a
10	new or as a resurrected standing item each each Board meeting, so we will go over
11	that as we get to the bottom of the agenda.
12	So I just wanted to disclosed, you know, what we had attempted to do and what
13	didn't happen just so that everybody is on the same page.
14	NEW DEPARTMENT
15	ST. LANDRY PARISH GOVERNMENT
16	Steven Keith Adam, Mary Magdeline Milton, Mark Semien, Jody Everette White
17	MR. TEDESCO:
18	That being said, the next item on the agenda are some new applications that Soonie
19	will take the wheel on, so go ahead, Soonie.
20	MS. TESSIER:
21	So we received four applications from the St. Landry Parish Government, and
22	they're all security officers. So the applications are complete. Everything is there.
23	We just don't have anyone receiving supplemental pay from this particular municipality.
24	MR. LAYRISSON:
25	Captain Burns?

Г

1	MR. BURNS:
2	Yes, sir, Chief.
3	MR. LAYRISSON:
4	Am I correct in saying a security officer are not eligible for supplemental pay?
5	MR. BURNS:
6	Did Soonie say something?
7	MS. TESSIER:
8	a court security guard who is a policeman for City Court and they are getting
9	supplemental pay.
10	MR. LAYRISSON:
11	Okay. Would someone with St. Landry Parish Government answer some questions
12	for me, please?
13	MS. ROBERTS:
14	Sure.
15	MR. LAYRISSON:
16	Are these security officers P.O.S.T. certified and have arrest authority?
17	MS. ROBERTS:
18	Yes.
19	MR. LAYRISSON:
20	And they have arrest authority?
21	MS. ROBERTS:
22	Yes, sir.
23	MR. LAYRISSON:
24	Ternisa, do you have any questions?
25	MS. HUTCHINSON:

i	
1	I do not.
2	MR. LAYRISSON:
3	Okay.
4	MR. BURNS:
5	Chief, this is Robert. That was going to be my basic question is P.O.S.T.
6	certification with arrest powers. And I guess my my only other question is, were
7	there never are these new positions that did these types of officers not exist prior to
8	to these personnel?
9	MS. ROBERTS:
10	Yes, they did no, they didn't.
11	MR. SEMIEN:
12	It was it was our choice to agencies, and then now we have our own police
13	officers to cover the courts (phonetic) and commissioned (phonetic) (unintelligible).
14	MR. BURNS:
15	I got you. So that was my next question. So their commission is actually through
16	the police department?
17	MR. SEMIEN:
18	That's correct, Opelousas.
19	MR. BURNS:
20	I got you.
21	MR. LAYRISSON:
22	Based on the essential duties and responsibilities that I see in the the application, I
23	make a motion that we approve all four of these P.O.S.T. certified security officers to
24	receive supplemental pay.
25	MS. HUTCHINSON:

1	Second.
2	MR. LAYRISSON:
3	All those in favor, certify by saying "aye."
4	(All aye.)
5	MR. LAYRISSON:
6	Any opposed?
7	(No response.)
8	MR. LAYRISSON:
9	The motion carries.
10	STATUTE/ADMINISTRATIVE RULES UPDATE
11	MR. TEDESCO:
12	Okay. The next item, new business, none.
13	The following item, I just wanted to just offer a little update and Michele may
14	have a little more, we'll see, but all of that to say, I just wanted to remind everyone that
15	we are waiting on two Attorney General opinions to come back. Before Connor left, I
16	would say he would submitted these Attorney General opinions in late February, early
17	March. There were two of them. One of them is on the Act 110 payment limit, if you'll
18	recall, where we were trying to learn if the \$10,000 threshold was in a one-time cap or if
19	it was a one-time per payment. We're waiting on that to come back, as well as the active
20	duty military leave Attorney General opinion, and that all started with an internal audit
21	finding specifically on whether or not full-time National Guard duty qualifies as
22	eligible. Our last legal counsel, Connor Junkin's opinion was that it did not qualify as
23	active duty, but when we discussed that last quarterly Board meeting, Chief Layrisson
24	wanted to get more of a blanket opinion on exploring all branches of military. So we're
25	waiting on that opinion to come back, because we do continually have cases with full-

Г

1	time National Guard duty, and we need that clarity.
2	So before Connor departed, I asked him how long it might take for these Attorney
3	General opinions to come back, and he did not have a concrete answer because it could
4	take as long it takes, I guess, you know, it could be months, could be, I don't know, a
5	year. Who knows, we don't know.
6	So, you know, Michele coming into it, she's aware of the fact that these two
7	outstanding opinions are in route, and she was going to try to check on a status of those,
8	and I don't know if she yet has been able to do that.
9	MS. GIROIR:
10	So we spoke with Ms. Adrian Gauchaux (phonetic) at the Attorney General's Office,
11	and she confirmed that they did receive the request. They've both been written, and
12	they're in the review stage, so they're not authorized to be released yet, but at least they
13	are in the works. She did not have any timeframe for when they would be released.
14	MR. TEDESCO:
15	So good. We have progress, and they're confirmed to be received and underway.
16	SUMPAY MODERNIZATION PROJECT UPDATES
17	MR. TEDESCO:
18	Okay. The next item on the agenda, I was just going to mention the new SuMPay
19	modernization project that is underway for us internally, and we're making good
20	progress.
21	I just wanted to make y'all aware from a municipality standpoint, I know y'all may
22	have gotten calls from, I guess, the different constituents, municipalities, on some things
23	that we're working on, the first being the annual certification signature forms. We just
24	want to be more diligent in who we communication with for security purposes. So
25	every year, we send out the annual certifying signature forms, and on there, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

municipality will list the individuals that we are authorized to communicate with. A lot of times, we do hear from persons not authorized on that particular form, and we just want to be more diligent in not communicating with those folks and communicate to them that their requests or their inquiries need to be facilitated through those authorized persons. So all that to say, the annual form did go out with the February warrant package, and we are starting to get some answers, not in all cases, and so we are reaching out via email and we will -- if not already, we'll also reach out to those persons via phone calls, but we're trying to reel all of that in and just wanted to let everyone know should they get some phone calls.

10 The next thing is the warrant exceptions, you know. At the bottom of that warrant, 11 the -- you know, those municipalities certify each month, there are exceptional items, things like leave without pay, suspension, and even -- even these military leave 12 instances, and, you know, we don't always get the communication from the municipality 13 as we should. For example, if I just think of a recent approach here this month, you 14 know, there was a particular individual that was going to be returning in April, and 15 when we reached out just to kind of get a sanity check on that, we learned that they 16 17 actually came back in January, and that was not communicated to us, yet, still showing up at the bottom of the warrant as an exception item. And, again, they're certifying this 18 each month and did not communicate to us that the officer was actually back at work 19 20 and employed. So municipalities will be hearing from us as we solicit those inquiries 21 via email and/or phone calls to clear up these -- these old exceptional items, again, all in an effort to data cleans as we convert this information into the new system. 22

The next item is the accounts receivables, so we did move forward with all new invoices that go out where we try to recoup overpayments, sending out a second and a final third notice, inquiry, whatever you want to call it. And that has done some -- some

good, but we are going to soon be moving forward with trying to send out invoices for 1 receivables that are owed the Department within a three-year prescriptive period. If 2 you'll recall, we conferred with legal counsel on whether that prescription period was 3 going to be three or five years. We decided three. The opinion was three, so we're only 4 going to go back and try to recapture within a three-year prescriptive period. So I would 5 6 say soon, in the next couple of months, we are going to be moving forward with trying to send out the invoices for those receivables. Again, when I say second and final 7 notice, that final notice from us, the Department, is going to be essentially our last 8 9 attempt at it. But at some point in the future, we may invoke other partners, like IVA (phonetic), the Office of Debt Recovery, or the Attorney General's Office, or some other 10 11 avenue or platform to help go after those receivables for us if we felt we needed to, and we're going to move forward with that. 12

MS. GIROIR:

13

14

15

16

I have a question. Are you trying to recoup from the municipalities or the individual who received the money?

MR. TEDESCO:

17 It's the municipalities. So we do actually pay the individuals, but, again, this is at the direction of the municipality, right. We pay who the municipalities certifies that we 18 should pay. Let just say, in a lot of the cases -- and here's the big thing, for example, 19 May's warrant is due back in our office, call it yesterday, May 10th. Well, a lot can 20 21 happen between May 10th and May 31st, right. So they may have us and direct us here yesterday to pay this particular individual for the entire month of May, so we'll go ahead 22 and pay them the \$500. Well, we learn later that, you know, that individual, let's just 23 say, separated on May 11th, right, or sometime thereafter. Well, by that time, we've 24 done already moved forward with the full payment, so we have to go and recoup that 25

1

2

3

4

5

money from the municipality who actually directed us to make that payment. And that's always kind of been, you know, Connor's hiccup with the law being a little, I don't know how he says it, it's inconsistent with the instrument to where it's having us pay the individual, but we've got to recoup from the municipality. All of that to say, that is who we -- who we go after, the municipality who authorized it.

6 But one thing that we want to try to do as a part of the project is push back that warrant deadline. Like I said, you know, where at this point in time we're requiring that 7 it be back on the 10th -- by the 10th of this month, right, which is, again, about 21 days 8 9 premature, if you will. So if we can get to the point of shifting that warrant deadline date back to the subsequent month, so, meaning, you're not going to submit May's 10 11 warrant to our office until June, say, 10th or June 15th, right, after the fact. So if we can get that pushed back, that would eliminate the big issue we're having here -- the majority 12 of the issue where we're -- of why we're having so much overpayment. And, again, this 13 was all brought to light in the recent internal audit finding. But the hurdle we're having 14 is making that shift, right. We're trying to figure out how we can make that shift 15 without delaying these officers, these individuals, payment. And so we're examining 16 17 and talking about how we do it in sort of a phased approach, you know. Like maybe there's only a -- a one or a two-week delay initially, and then another two-week delay, to 18 where we just go through that transitionary period for one or two months. You know, 19 how do we get there, right? I think there was a little bit of talk about getting potentially 20 21 I guess some legislative backing on an appropriation to sort of bridge that gap for the shift, but I don't think that that's really something that's going to come to light and be a 22 -- a feasible approach. We're going to have to internally figure out how we -- how we're 23 able to get to that point. And so that's a topic of discussion on how we're going to be 24 able to eliminate the majority of the overpayments to where we don't have this big issue. 25

Because that was the big -- the big cause of it. It was essentially the premature warrant 1 deadline. 2 So, all that to say, the next item is on military leave, and I kind of hit on that earlier, 3 you know, where we do have a lot of folks that may be back from military leave, but not 4 communicated with us. We're going to try to cleans that and send those inquiries out. 5 6 And I don't think I really have anything else to add to that. There's a couple little things, but nothing glaring. 7 **MOST RECENT BUDGET PROJECTIONS** 8 **MR. TEDESCO:** 9 That being said, the next part of the agenda was the presentation of the recent 10 11 budget projections. Like I said, we're going to try to be transparent with all of that 12 going forward. So for Police, and the recent budget project I have was as of March 31st, and Police 13 had a surplus budget projected estimated at \$1.7 million. The specific number was 14 \$1,727,290, that was the estimated surplus projection for Police, again, right, as of 15 March 31st. So there was going to be three more disbursements, April, May, June. 16 17 **MR. LAYRISSON:** That might take care of our thirteenth check right there. 18 **MS. HUTCHINSON:** 19 20 I'm sorry. I already used it in my other job. **NEW APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL - 195** 21 **MR. TEDESCO:** 22 23 All right. That being said, the next item on the agenda is the new applications submitted for approval. It looks like there's 195 applications with an amount of 24 \$37,834. I see -- I think I see Chief Layrisson circling some things over here with 25

1	respect to that, so y'all go ahead, Soonie.
2	MR. LAYRISSON:
3	All good.
4	MS. TESSIER:
5	We're good.
6	MR. LAYRISSON:
7	I'll make a motion that we approve the 195 applications.
8	MS. HUTCHINSON:
9	Second.
10	MR. LAYRISSON:
11	All those in favor, certify by saying, "aye."
12	(All aye.)
13	MR. LAYRISSON:
14	The motion carries.
15	MS. TESSIER:
16	I was just saying we also need to approve the Act 110 money. We added this.
17	MS. HUTCHINSON:
18	That's next.
19	MR. LAYRISSON:
20	We'll that was the next item on the agenda.
21	MR. TEDESCO:
22	We kind of decided last Board meeting that they wanted to do two separate
23	approvals.
24	NEW ACT 110 MONEY APPROVAL - 12 - \$3,733
25	MR. TEDESCO:

1	That being said, that's okay, look, the next one on the agenda is the new Act 110
2	money. It looks like 12 applications for \$3,733.
3	MR. LAYRISSON:
4	Ternisa?
5	MS. HUTCHINSON:
6	I'll make a motion to approve.
7	MR. BURNS:
8	I'll second.
9	MR. LAYRISSON:
10	We have a motion and a second.
11	All in favor, certify by saying "aye."
12	(All aye.)
13	MR. LAYRISSON:
14	Any opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	MR. LAYRISSON:
17	The motion carries.
18	Before we move on, I would like to make a statement for the record. As the
19	Chairman of this Board elected by the police officers throughout this state, I want to
20	encourage the administration to strongly suggest separating the Police and Fire as it
21	refers to the Act 110 payment. I do not think that our Police officers should be punished
22	or not receive their money because maybe the Fire department side is having financial
23	or budgetary problems. This office is doing a great job managing our budget. As
24	Wayne said, we have a \$1.7 million surplus. I know it will be a little more work on the
25	administration, but as I've said, I don't think we should not be bringing our Police

1	officers Act 110 or not bringing them to the Act 110 committee because of problems
2	on the Fire side.
3	With that being said, the next item on the agenda?
4	SET THE TIME AND DATE FOR THE NEXT MEETING
5	MR. TEDESCO:
6	Well, just to set the date and time of the next meeting. It looks like, being three
7	months from now, August 10, 2022, at 10 o'clock a.m.
8	MS. HUTCHINSON:
9	I will probably not be able to attend. I think I may be coming back from a
10	conference, I'm not sure, on the 10th. I have to check the dates, but I think that I have to
11	fly back on the 10th, so if I'm here, I'll be at the meeting, but
12	MR. TEDESCO:
13	And let me ask, so the House Bill 918, right, I understood from Captain Burns
14	passed the House last night and is headed to the Senate. It was the push to add the
15	additional Board members. So let's just say it passes the Senate and it gets put in place,
16	what's the effective date of that? Will we have these additional Board members before
17	the next meeting in August?
18	MS. HUTCHINSON:
19	Does it not say at the end of the bill? I can't hear.
20	MR. LAYRISSON:
21	Okay. I think that was Captain Burns. I didn't bring the legislation.
22	MR. TEDESCO:
23	I have it here, and I was looking at it and I didn't see it.
24	MS. HUTCHINSON:
25	Usually, it's it doesn't have a date. I'm trying to pull it up right now. A date

Г

1	specified like August let me see
2	MR. BURNS:
3	I'm sorry. This is Robert. Can y'all hear me now?
4	MR. LAYRISSON:
5	Yes.
6	MR. BURNS:
7	I'm sorry about that. I'm on the wonderful wifi in the State Capitol building, but if
8	there's no date specified in the bill, which I do not recall that there being one
9	MR. TEDESCO:
10	Correct. I looked and I didn't see an effective date. All that to say, I was just
11	wondering if we would have these additional Board members in place prior to the
12	August meeting, should Ternisa not be able to be there, but I understand that we only
13	need two to have a quorum. So as long as Chief Layrisson and Captain Burns are
14	present, we'll still be good.
15	MR. BURNS:
16	I'm good for that date.
17	MS. HUTCHINSON:
18	I'm sorry. I'll have my laptop, so if I if I'm able to I can always Zoom if there's a
19	Zoom meeting, but I just wanted to put that out there, so.
20	MR. TEDESCO:
21	Okay. Good. Thank you. No, we'll certainly I think move forward with this
22	direction that we offer it both face to face and Zoom. I guess that's kind of the new way
23	of the world now, so all good.
24	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
25	That would be four new members.

1	MR. BURNS:
2	It's going to be, say right now, three new voting members.
3	MR. LAYRISSON:
4	It will put us at six.
5	MR. TEDESCO:
6	It's a total of eight, right?
7	MR. LAYRISSON:
8	Six
9	MR. TEDESCO:
10	Yeah, I think it is nine.
11	MS. GIROIR:
12	Marshal Constable Municipal Association
13	MR. TEDESCO:
14	Yeah, it's actually nine, yes.
15	MS. GIROIR:
16	The P.O.S.T. Council and (unintelligible).
17	MR.LAYRISSON:
18	A total of nine members, but three of those members do not have voting authority,
19	so we'll have six voting members.
20	MS. GIROIR:
21	Great for ties, right?
22	MR. TEDESCO:
23	Yeah. And that was brought to light right at the appropriations, and everybody was
24	good with it. They said, okay, just wanted to bring to light that it could cause you some
25	problems, but if you're okay with it, we're okay with it.

Γ

1	MR. BURNS:
2	Yeah. And just for further clarity, I just looked at it, Dr. Wheat (phonetic), yeah, I
3	guess we didn't tell them to, but there's no effective date, so it would become effective
4	August 1st, which is just the general rule.
5	MR. TEDESCO:
6	Okay. Well, then that would make it in time.
7	MS. GIROIR:
8	other required selections or like member of the Louisiana Marshal's and State
9	Constables Associations, they would have to select someone, and the Justice of the
10	Peace, they would have to select someone. The other three, they're named by statute.
11	MR. TEDESCO:
12	So if we have currently three voting members, it takes two to make a quorum, so if
13	we have, I don't know, nine but six being voting members, how many would it take to
14	make a quorum?
15	MS. GIROIR:
16	I think you'd look at the total number. I don't think it's just voting members?
17	MR. TEDESCO:
18	Yeah.
19	MS. GIROIR:
20	I can look at that, and I think it would be the total number of members.
21	MS. HUTCHINSON:
22	But wouldn't that have to be voting members for a quorum, because if they can't
23	vote, then
24	MS. GIROIR:
25	I'm going to look up on it, but I'm not sure because I'll have to look at that, but I

Г

1	don't think it would be the total number that you have to have a quorum for to start a
2	meeting, but I'll look at the open meetings law on that, and then before that happens.
3	MR. TEDESCO:
4	Good. That being said, the only other thing I just wanted to mention, they just kind
5	of wanted me to mention, is that just recently, this week, I accepted a new position at the
6	Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Prepardness. So, for me, I've
7	got three more weeks here at DPS. I've been with DPS for nearly 15 years, but it was
8	just an opportunity that I took. So I know I haven't been at this position long, only five
9	months or so, but I just wanted to mention that that is going to happen, and I will not be
10	present at the next Board meeting. I feel confident, obviously, that they're going to put
11	another person another senior manager of ours in place that will do just a good a job,
12	if not better, so
13	MR. LAYRISSON:
14	Well, congratulations.
15	(Off-the-record discussion.)
16	MS. HUTCHINSON:
17	Congratulations.
18	MR. TEDESCO:
19	Thank you so much.
20	MR. BURNS:
21	Michele, this is Robert, I just pulled up Title 42, Section 13, the open meetings law,
22	and it says a quorum means a simple majority of the total membership of the public
23	body (phonetic).
24	MS. GIROIR:
25	and I don't know if you can even change it if they specifically put in the statute

MAY 11, 2022		
what a quorum is, but I would just imagine they would just default to what our		
(unintelligible) says. I wouldn't recommend changing it to just voting members. They		
were added to the Board for a reason.		
MR. LAYRISSON:		
I don't have a problem with that. With the Zoom meetings, I don't foresee us ever		
having a problem having six out of nine.		
Anybody else have anything, any comments?		
(No response.)		
All right, Captain Burns, keep up the good work at the Capitol.		
ADJOURN		

MR. LAYRISSON: 11 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that being said, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MS. HUTCHINSON: 13

I'll make a motion to adjourn.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED

CERTIFICATE

I, MICHELLE S. ABADIE, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, as the officer before whom this hearing was not reported, on May 11, 2022, a meeting for the Municipal Police Officers' Supplemental Board was held, that this testimony and matters were not reported by me, but was prepared by me from the audio received from the State Supplemental Pay Board, and that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 24, inclusive, is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding; that I am not related to counsel or to the parties herein, nor am I otherwise interested in the outcome of this proceeding.

MICHELLE S. ABADIE, CCR #24032 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Bry Layrisson, Chairman