

**BIENNIAL REGULAR MEETING OF THE
LEGISLATIVE COMPENSATION BOARD MEETING
October 21, 2025
9:00 a.m.
Senate Conference Room 4s.9
State Capitol Building
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma**

A meeting notice was filed with the Secretary of State, and the agenda was posted in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brian Jackson, Governor Appointee, Chairman
Robert DeNegri, Governor Appointee
Scott Douglas, Governor Appointee
Jennifer Miller, Governor Appointee
David “Chip” Carter, Governor Appointee
Jeff Baumann, Senate President Pro Tempore Appointee
Gary Unruh, Senate President Pro Tempore Appointee
James Leewright, Speaker of the House Appointee
Matt Tilly, Speaker of the House Appointee
Mark Wood, Chairman of the Oklahoma Tax Commission (Non-voting member)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David Ostrowe, Interim Director of the Office of Management and Enterprise Services, State Chief Operating Officer (Nonvoting member)

GUESTS:

Maria Maule, AAG, to Board	Arnella Karges, Senate
Beverly Hicks, OMES	Becky Gooch, Senate
Emily Roberson, OMES-HCM	John McPhetridge, House
Tasha Riley, OMES-HCM	Jay St Clair, House
Deanna Ferron, OMES-HCM	Jennifer Monies, House
Ryan Bair, OMES	Jeff Kline, Corporation Commission
Steven Wolfe, OMES	Margaret Kerr, Ethics Commission
Kristi Kelley, OMES	Shawn Ashley, Quorum Call
Sarah Sands, OMES	Trey Savage, NonDoc
Tracy Osburn, OMES	Erik Darker, LegisOK
Charity Lassiter, OMES	Barbara Hoberock, OK Voice

1. Call to Order, roll call, and determination of a quorum:

Chairman Brian Jackson called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM. A roll call was conducted, and a quorum was established.

2. Certification of Open Meeting Act Compliance:

Chairman Jackson was informed that notice of the meeting was given and an agenda was posted in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

3. Discussion and possible action on minutes from October 17, 2023, Board meeting:

Robert DeNegri moved to approve the October 2023 meeting minutes. Chip Carter seconded the motion. The motion carried, and the following votes were recorded:

Chip Carter, aye; Jennifer Miller, aye; Robert DeNegri, aye; Scott Douglas, aye;
Jeff Baumann, aye; Gary Unruh, aye; James Leewright, aye; Matt Tilly, aye; Brian Jackson, aye.

4. Short presentation by the Office of Management and Enterprise Services and possible discussion regarding Board procedures, comparisons of legislative compensation, and history of Board actions:

Emily Roberson, Chief Human Resources Officer for Human Capital Management at OMES, gave a presentation, recognizing the efforts of her colleagues Tasha Riley and Deanna Ferron, who contributed to the slide deck.

Ms. Roberson provided the Board members with an overview of their constitutional and statutory duties, pursuant to the Oklahoma Constitution, Article V, Section 21, and Title 74 O.S. § 291.2.

Ms. Roberson reported that the Legislative Compensation Board shall review, every two years (biennially), the compensation paid to the members of the Legislature, and if necessary, shall have the authority to change the compensation; such changes to become effective on the fifteenth day following the next general election. The upcoming effective date of the legislative compensation change is November 18, 2026.

The Board convenes on the third Tuesday of October every odd-numbered year, in the State Capitol Building, at 9:00 AM.

The Board consists of five members appointed by the Governor, two members appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. No member of the Legislature may be appointed to or serve on the Board. In addition to the members specified, the Chairman of the Tax Commission and Director of the Office of Management and Enterprise Services shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members.

The appointed members of the Board shall serve terms concurrent with the respective appointing authorities and shall serve at the pleasure of their appointing authorities.

Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and a majority vote of such quorum shall be necessary for the Board to act.

The Board may, at the call of its chairman or upon a majority vote of its membership, hold additional meetings as necessary to fulfill its duties. Any change in legislative compensation must be made by the Board no later than the third Tuesday of November in said odd-numbered years.

Ms. Roberson gave the Board members an overview of how salaries are set for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. She explained that this Board is responsible for setting legislative pay, while executive salaries are established by statute and judicial salaries are decided by the Board of Judicial Compensation. She also shared salary surveys for 2025, 2023, and 2021 across the three branches, including data on the state employee benchmark average. The survey additionally included the Oklahoma median household income for 2025.

Ms. Roberson highlighted the important dates for the Board: the deadline to modify legislative compensation is November 18, 2025, and the effective date of any legislative compensation change is November 18, 2026. The next biennial Board meeting is set for October 19, 2027.

Ms. Roberson provided data on legislative salaries, per diem rates, and benefits, comparing Oklahoma to neighboring states. She states that the current legislative base salary set by this Board is \$47,500 annually and has remained the same since 2021. Per diem is set by statute at Title 74 O.S. § 291.1, \$196 per day. Per diem rates are based on Oklahoma's session length of 68 days. Current additional salaries approved by this Board for leadership roles are \$18,829 per year for the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and \$12,982 per year for the Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Chair of the House Committee on Appropriations and Budget, the Speaker Pro Tempore of the House of Representatives, as well as the Majority Floor Leader, Minority Floor Leader, and one Assistant Majority Floor Leader in the Senate. She provides further details on the mileage rate established by law under Title 74 O.S. § 291.1b, which is currently 70 cents per mile. Reimbursable trips are also covered in § 500.4 of the law. Source: National Conference of State Legislatures, April 2025.

Ms. Roberson shared information about benefits; benefit allowances are also determined by this Board, and the current benefit allowance per employee is \$725.58 monthly. She explained that Oklahoma's typical annual compensation totals \$72,860, which includes a base salary of \$47,500 without the leadership position, a per diem of \$13,328 for the 68 days of the state's 2025 legislative session, a benefits allowance of \$8,707 (calculated at \$725.58 per month), and the state's retirement contribution (7%) of \$3,325.

Board member Chip Carter questioned whether per diem is available for legislators who live more than 50 miles from the State Capitol. Ms. Roberson confirms that per diem is only provided if a legislator resides more than 50 miles away and suggests using this as a data point. Maria Maule, counselor to the Board, found specific language in the Statewide Accounting Manual on page 190, section 10.11.3, that addresses per diem for State legislators. Ms. Roberson read aloud from the text that, for in-state travel to the Capitol when the Legislature is in session, the GSA per diem rates applies for each night spent away from home. IRS limitations provide that the legislator is only considered to be in travel status subject to per diem, when the legislator lives more than 50 miles from the Capitol.

Mr. Carter asked about the number of legislators eligible for per diem, and Ms. Roberson agreed to get this information.

Board member James Leewright remarked on the per diem for the 68 days of the legislative session, noting that legislators reside in the state year-round outside of those days. Ms. Roberson mentioned she will consider this as a takeaway.

Board member Matt Tilly inquired with Ms. Roberson about salary survey comparisons for state positions across 2025, 2023, and 2021. He noted that legislative salaries have not increased since 2019 and asked if that is accurate and why the focus is on 2021 data instead of 2019. Ms. Roberson clarified that the decision was made to align the data to give you an annuity, based on 63 sessions for this Board meeting, and emphasized that staff have no other reason; it's simply where the data points are stored. Mr. Tilly questioned whether there might be additional increases and whether all other salaries since the last increase are included. She agreed it could be possible and offered to review and adjust the data accordingly.

Ms. Roberson discussed the 2025 regional legislator pay assumptions, noting that most states provide legislators with an allowance for office supplies, which is not included in the salary figure. Salary figures exclude benefit allowances and retirement contributions. Session length calculations are based on the dates each state legislature convened and adjourned in 2025, assuming a four-day work week (Monday through Thursday), excluding holidays and recesses. Session limits are applied when relevant, but special sessions are not included. She also covered 2025 legislative salaries and per diem rates for Oklahoma and neighboring states, where OMES is normalizing that data to compare Oklahoma's rates with those of the surrounding states.

Board member James Leewright asked Ms. Roberson whether the comparison slide for neighboring states includes any office expenses that other states receive but Oklahoma does not. Ms. Roberson responded that the slide does not include office supplies.

Ms. Roberson shared regional data highlights, noting that Oklahoma has a single per diem rate of \$196 per day. Meanwhile, Colorado's per diem for those more than 50 miles from the State Capitol is \$237 per day, and for those within 50 miles, it is \$45 per day, showing a varied approach rather than a uniform per diem rate.

Board member James Leewright asked Ms. Roberson if the regional data highlights slide shows the last time the \$196 per diem was increased in Oklahoma. She replied that it does not, but she would consider it as a data point.

Board member Jeff Baumann told Ms. Roberson that he could not find the data on the slides showing where legislators use campaign funds to offset costs with other states that Oklahoma might not. Is that considered? Ms. Roberson replied that she and her team did not take that into account, and it could be considered a conflict of interest.

Ms. Roberson discussed the 2025 regional legislator retirement comparison and explained how it relates to neighboring states. Oklahoma's retirement system is influenced by the actions of elected officials. An outline was provided showing Oklahoma's position compared to surrounding states. She reported that legislators elected after November 1, 2015, will transition into Pathfinder with an employee contribution of 7.0% or more, along with a 7.0% employer match, totaling 14% of salary for their retirement. The regional comparison highlights Oklahoma's standing relative to neighboring states.

Ms. Roberson concluded her presentation with additional notes for the Board to consider: New Mexico does not pay a salary. Oklahoma's salary has stayed at \$47,500. Texas meets once every two years (biennially) for up to 140 regular session days; members are paid \$600 per month, or \$7,200 annually.

Ms. Roberson thanked the Board members for their time and questions and plans to follow up on a few noted inquiries. She also appreciated the invitation to join their discussion today.

Chairman Jackson thanked Ms. Roberson for her presentation and asked if the Board members had any other questions or discussion points before proceeding.

Board member Robert DeNegri noted that in recent years, there have been some increases in state employee salaries based on the national poverty level, ensuring all our state employees earn at or above that wage, if you will. He asked Ms. Roberson and staff when the last time was that a state employee, across the board, received a raise, and what the percentage was. Ms. Roberson replied that it was in 2019. Tasha Riley with OMES HCM stated that the 2019 regular session resulted in the last across-the-board pay raise, with the caveat that there were exclusions for certain

employees, including specific executive employees and elected officials. The flat rates are published in HB 2771.

Chairman Brian Jackson asked Mr. DeNegri if he was talking about state employees or legislators. Mr. DeNegri responded that he was only referring to rank-and-file state employees.

Board member Matt Tilly followed up with Ms. Roberson about the presentation, noting a line referencing the state employee benchmark average salary that indicates it has increased by 35% over the last four years. He asked if he was reading that correctly or if that is what the report should show. Ms. Roberson confirmed that it is correct: it considers our approximately 33,000 employees; it is based on annualized salary; it is not just total compensation; it uses the average of all those salaries to find the current number, so it has increased since 2021. Mr. Tilly commented that, maybe not across the board in the same way, the average salary for state employees over the last four years has been a little over 35%. Ms. Roberson concurred with Mr. Tilly.

Mr. DeNegri responded that we do not know whether 35% of the State of Oklahoma's employees received a 35% salary increase over the last four years. Some employees might have gone from \$50,000 to \$100,000 because they changed jobs, but that increase is not necessarily a consistent 35%. I do not think anyone in this room believes that everyone working for the State of Oklahoma in 2021 is earning 35% more than they were back then, because that is not true.

Chairman Brian Jackson asked if anyone had additional comments or questions about the presentation. Since there were no further remarks, he thanked everyone and appreciated the questions. He found the discussion very insightful.

Presentation and discussion only. No action was taken.

5. Public comment on listed agenda items: [Chair]

Chairman Jackson asked if the public had any comments, and there were none. He then inquired whether Board members had any additional comments or discussions on agenda items.

Board member James Leewright asked a question discussed at the 2023 meeting about the percentage of leadership positions in the House and Senate. Chairman Jackson noted that the additional stipend for leadership roles was increased by 5%.

Board member Chip Carter agreed with Chairman Jackson. He also noted that the Legislature's work resembles a full-time job more than a part-time one. Ms. Roberson's presentation highlights that legislators work only four days a week, which is technically correct, and most votes occur on those days. However, during legislative sessions—especially in those four months—it often feels

more like a full-time role, with activities spilling into Friday as members stay engaged in legislative duties. This includes leadership meetings, caucus gatherings, and district responsibilities. During December and January, the Capitol gets quite busy, with many members involved in legislative activities. Based on his conversations with legislators, Mr. Carter estimates most spend 15 to 20 hours weekly during the year. From June to December, legislators continue their work even if they are not physically at the Capitol. He pointed out that, although designed as a part-time job, legislators do significant work throughout the year, both during and outside the legislative session.

Mr. Carter also explained that he had earlier asked about the per diem because he estimates that about 35% of the workforce, or a third, lives in the metro area and does not receive it. He noted that his estimate might be wrong, but when looking at the slides showing the total compensation amount, we need to add a big asterisk there because many men and women are not receiving that \$196 a day. The benefit for those who do receive it is that they can go home, sleep in their own bed, and have dinner with their families. However, this means the other two-thirds are paid that \$196 because they cannot go home and must use those funds to pay for apartments or hotels. He added that, from a perspective point of view, legislators have not had a pay increase in several years, and as Mr. Tilly pointed out, state employees—on average—not across the board—have seen a 35% increase. In fact, the median income in Oklahoma has grown by 20%. Just keep in mind that our legislators still are not being compensated in the way I believe we should consider.

Board member Robert DeNegri responded to Mr. Carter's comments, referring to the chart showing the states surrounding Oklahoma. I think we can all agree that, regarding per diem, we are unsure how to obtain that figure or what factors contribute to per diem rates in other states. However, if you look at the salary numbers of the neighboring states, ours is at or above all of them.

Board member Jennifer Miller asked OMES staff about the number of session days required in other states. The only information provided was about Texas. Ms. Roberson responded that they normalized that data to match Oklahoma's session length for easier comparison; other session lengths were not included in the data.

Board member Matt Tilly clarified that Texas has considerably more flexibility, including the ability to use campaign donations for various purposes that legislators in other states might use for their own offices—something Oklahoma lacks. Texas also provides a generous stipend for staff, permits hiring staff for these roles, and even supports family members. While he appreciates the effort to compare these situations fairly, it is challenging to make an exact apples-to-apples comparison of total compensation across neighboring states, especially Texas, because the rules allow lawmakers there to use state and campaign funds for their expenses. He inquired whether

any Board members or staff were present when the Board approved the increase, and if so, what the thought process was at that time.

Board member Robert DeNegri, who was the Chair at the time, explained that there had been much discussion about how long it had been since the Legislature received a pay raise. I encouraged the Board then, and I continue to encourage now, that past decisions are not our concern because we were not involved in those meetings, did not hear the information, and did not participate in the discussions. Our task, then and now, is to determine whether the compensation paid to a legislator in Oklahoma is fair, regardless of what increases others have received or what state employees then received. Our decision should focus on what we pay legislators today and what constitutes fair compensation.

Chairman Jackson asked the Board members if anyone had anything else to discuss. Seeing no response, he moved on to the next item.

Discussion only. No action was taken.

6. Discussion and possible action on changing compensation paid to the legislative members of the State of Oklahoma:

Board member Jeff Baumann asked whether this Board could adjust per diem based on distance from the Capitol or if that is determined by statute. Ms. Roberson replied that it is set in statute.

Chairman Jackson asked the board members if there is a motion.

James Leewright motioned to increase stipends to 50% for the House Speaker and Pro Tem, and 33% for all other stipends.

Chairman Jackson clarified to Mr. Leewright that his motion concerns agenda items 7 and 8, and that we are now focused on deciding legislators' pay.

Scott Douglas motioned for the salary to remain the same at \$47,500. Jeff Baumann seconded the motion. The motion passed, and the following votes were recorded:

Chip Carter, nay; Jennifer Miller, aye; Robert DeNegri, aye; Scott Douglas, aye;
Jeff Baumann, aye; Gary Unruh, aye; James Leewright, nay; Matt Tilly, nay; Brian Jackson, aye.

Motion carries: 6 ayes; 3 nays.

7. Discussion and possible action on changing leadership stipends paid to members of the Legislature who hold the positions of President Pro Tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives because of extra duties imposed on such officers:

James Leewright motioned to increase stipends to 50% for the House Speaker and Pro Tem, and for other leadership positions, for which I would like to add the Majority Whip, Second Assistant Floor Leader in the Senate, and a Floor Leader, to increase those stipends to 50%, and a 33% increase in stipends for all other legislators.

Board member Scott Douglas asked the Board's attorney, Maria Maule, whether it was within the Board's purview to add more people to said leadership roles for which we can assign stipends.

Attorney Maria Maule responded that, for now, I think we should focus on the President Pro Tem and Speaker, and see no limitations in terms of whether this Board can appoint other leaders and pay them at a different rate. I believe that would be permitted, but we should vote on them separately for clarity in the record.

James Leewright revised his motion to a 50% increase for the House Speaker and Pro Tem, with other leaders listed currently, and a 33% increase for other legislators.

Maria Maule interrupted and said that since we have already voted on what the other legislators should receive, she does not think it should be a compound motion with two items. Again, she believes the clearest way to handle it is to have the motion for the Speaker and Pro Tem as a separate motion and vote.

Chairman Jackson asked the Board members if they agreed, and Mr. Leewright concurred.

James Leewright restated his motion to the House Speaker and Pro Tem for a 50% increase in the stipend.

Chairman Jackson asked if there was a second.

Board member Matt Tilly asked if someone could update us on the current numbers and the amount of those stipends.

Maria Maule responded that the current annual amount for the House Speaker and Pro Tem is \$18,828.60.

Board member Robert DeNegri responded that we are discussing a \$9,000 increase in the stipend, which is 50% of \$18,000.

Board member James Leewright clarified, saying, "That is why I asked earlier what those percentages were. I want to increase it to 50%, not a 50% increase over the current amount. Just set it to 50%."

Board member Gary Unruh then asked Mr. Leewright, "50% of what?" He replied, "I do not care about other salaries."

Chairman Jackson clarified with Mr. Leewright that the new stipend would be 50% of the base salary. Mr. Leewright confirmed this and said that was why he was asking about the percentage earlier. Mr. Jackson said he understood and appreciated the clarification, noting that he had been under the impression you were proposing a 50% increase in the stipend, rather than treating the stipend as 50% of the base salary paid to that legislative leadership.

Board member Chip Carter asked, "So, the motion is, the House Speaker and the Pro Tem from this point forward, their leadership stipend would be just 50% of their base pay – you're locking their base pay and their stipend together, and in this case, you have increased the stipend by \$23,750, which would be their new stipend. So that they will get back \$23,750, plus \$18,000." Mr. Leewright confirmed that it was correct.

Board member Robert DeNegri thanked Mr. Carter for the clarification. He further clarified that it is \$5,300 approximately, divided by \$18,000, which amounts to a 33% increase in the stipend.

Board attorney Maria Maule responded, "I thought the motion was 50% of the base salary, and when I do that calculation, the stipend would then increase from its current amount of \$18,828.60 to \$23,750. Is that correct?" Mr. Jackson and Mr. DeNegri both answered, "Yes." Mr. DeNegri further calculated that \$23,750 minus \$18,000 is \$5,375. Therefore, you take the \$5,300 and divide it by \$18,000, resulting in a 33% increase in stipend. Mr. Jackson agreed.

Maria Maule commented on the future impact of any kind of motion. All these motions, once passed, are recorded in an Order, and that Order is then revisited. Therefore, no matter how you determine the stipend, it will not automatically dictate future votes two years later.

Board member Matt Tilly asked Ms. Maule, "So you are saying that it cannot be tied to a percentage. For instance, four years from now, when the salary raises, it does not automatically increase by that percentage." Ms. Maule replied that there is no mechanism that can bind future boards. So, basically, if you decide the stipend should be increased to \$23,750, then in 2027, this

Board will revisit that decision anew. It will not be bound to have the stipend at 50% of the legislative salary.

Mr. Tilly asked Ms. Maule whether they needed to make a specific motion on a specific number. Ms. Maule said she thinks that is honestly the best.

Mr. Carter asked Ms. Maule, "So, you are saying that we do not have the ability to state that, henceforth, stipends are 50% of the pay?" Ms. Maule confirmed that this is correct. She explained that you can state that for the next two years, but when the next Legislative Compensation Board reviews salaries, they can adjust it as they see fit. Chairman Jackson added that this is the same as how we currently have the ability to adjust these items.

Mr. Tilly clarified that his interpretation is that we cannot bind future boards to follow the same preference, and he suggested that we specify an amount rather than a percentage.

Ms. Maule agreed, noting that it is always clearer to provide the exact amount rather than a percentage. She explained that since salaries tend to increase over time, describing actions in percentages alone could be very confusing.

Mr. DeNegri asked Ms. Maule to clarify for everyone whether the motion could be amended to specify the new stipend amount and eliminate the percentages.

Board member Gary Unruh asked, since this is his first time on the Board, does the President Pro Tem incur extra expenses because of that position, or is it just an honorary title?

Mr. Carter weighed in, saying that it is definitely not an honorary position; it is an effort to highlight the significant increase in workload that the House Speaker and Pro Tem assume as part of their leadership responsibilities. It is a year-round job, and the \$47,500 is the base salary. When holding five or six leadership roles, such as the Speaker Pro Tem, heads of appropriations committees, and others, they have additional duties that are compensated because of their extra responsibilities.

Mr. Unruh agreed with Mr. Carter but expressed concern about implementing a 50% increase, as it would not bind the Legislative Compensation Board's future actions. He noted that in two years, the percentage could be adjusted, just as it may be now.

Chairman Jackson asked Mr. Leewright if he was correct in stating that his motion, as it currently stands, would set the stipend for the Pro Tem and House Speaker at 50% of the base salary. Mr.

Leewright confirmed that it was correct. Chairman Jackson asked for a second, and Chip Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed, and the following votes were recorded:

Chip Carter, aye; Jennifer Miller, aye; Robert DeNegri, nay; Scott Douglas, nay;
Jeff Baumann, nay; Gary Unruh, aye; James Leewright, aye; Matt Tilly, aye; Brian Jackson, aye.

Motion carries: 6 ayes; 3 nays.

8. Discussion and possible action on changing leadership stipends paid to members of the Legislature who hold the positions of Majority Floor Leader, Minority Floor Leader, and Appropriations Chair in each House because of extra duties imposed on such officers:

Board member Chip Carter mentioned that he believed one of the Houses had more leadership positions paying than the other House. He also acknowledged that his assumption might be wrong and that there could have been an oversight in previous years. I would like us to identify any inequality and address it first so that both Houses have an equal number of paid leadership roles.

Board member James Leewright said he believes it is correct and suggested adding the House Majority Leader and the Senate Assistant Majority Floor Leader to the Majority list.

Ms. Maule revised her earlier advice. Regarding agenda item number eight, this item is limited to the Majority Floor Leader, the Minority Floor Leader, and the Appropriations Chair of each House, and therefore, you cannot change that designation at this meeting. She informed them that they have the ability to increase stipends for other individuals and recommended that they meet again in November for other reasons. If there are additional items they want to address at that meeting, direction to staff should be provided so we can include them on the November agenda.

Chairman Jackson asked Ms. Maule if her recommendation is to table the expansion of the leadership stipends we are discussing until the November meeting. Ms. Maule confirmed, yes, because the agenda is narrow, with specific positions attached to it, and we do not want to violate the Open Meeting Act.

Board member Jeff Baumann asked if staff knew whether they had examined the salaries of legislators in leadership positions in other states and, if they had, what that number was. He also asked Ms. Maule about the current stipend. Ms. Maule stated it is \$12,982.20. He replied, "So we are looking at another 30% plus increase on the stipend." Board members discussed the figures. Chairman Jackson confirmed that the new stipend would be \$15,675. Ms. Maule confirmed that the stipend increase would therefore be \$2,692.80.

Mr. Leewright mentioned that his figures are meant to offset some costs because the Legislature hasn't seen any increases in a while, even though we know inflation has risen to 115% for some products. Many of these legislators have to maintain their apartments, living year-round without additional compensation. Speaking as a former legislator himself, he understands the financial hardship this causes, and his goal is to help because, as more of these legislative years pass, most are either retired, very wealthy, or recent college graduates. It is very difficult to get those in their prime earning years—the ones with the knowledge and who understand their district's pulse—to commit to 12 years of service. He wants to help offset some of those costs and almost takes it personally as an insult that this is seen as an increase in their take-home pay. This is the time to help defer the costs they have already incurred.

Chairman Jackson acknowledged and appreciated Mr. Leewright's comments.

Board member Matt Tilly mentioned that part of his preparation for today involved examining cost-of-living increases since the last legislative salary raise, as well as the legislative leadership over the past four years. According to his research, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the cost-of-living in Oklahoma has risen by over 20%, and the proposal currently on the table essentially restores leadership positions to where they were over four years ago.

James Leewright motioned to increase the stipend for the Majority Floor Leader, Minority Floor Leader, and Appropriations Chair in each House to 33% of the base salary, amounting to \$15,675. Chip Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed, and the following votes were recorded:

Chip Carter, aye; Jennifer Miller, aye; Robert DeNegri, nay; Scott Douglas, nay;
Jeff Baumann, nay; Gary Unruh, aye; James Leewright, aye; Matt Tilly, aye; Brian Jackson, aye.

Motion carries: 6 ayes; 3 nays.

9. Discussion and possible action to set a meeting of the Statewide Official Compensation Commission on November 4, 2025, in accordance with 74 O.S., §§ 291.2 and 291.4.

Chairman Jackson requested Counsel to clarify this agenda item.

Ms. Maule explained that she will base her recommendations on statutory language. There are two separate boards composed of the same individuals: the Statewide Official Compensation Commission (SOCC) and the Legislative Compensation Board (LCB). She told the Board members they will also serve on SOCC, but this will not take effect until November 1. The statutory language also states that SOCC must meet on the same date as the LCB. However, the LCB is required to meet on the third Tuesday in October in odd-numbered years. Therefore, for this first year, there is some conflict between these statutes because a board that is not yet in effect

cannot meet. She informed Board members that, in accordance with State law, the LCB can meet on different dates up until the third Tuesday in November to complete its business. The Board can also meet at the call of the Chair or by a vote of the Board.

Ms. Maule recommended that Chairman Jackson call a special meeting of the LCB for November 4. The length of that meeting will typically depend on the shared consultation with other members, so it could be a brief meeting to review, revise, and adopt the meeting minutes, or it could be longer and include stipends for other leadership positions. No vote is necessary for this action.

Ms. Maule also recommended that this Board vote to have SWOCC meet on November 4 to conduct its business, and that the announcement of this meeting date be made for the record. As a result, both entities will meet on the same day to comply with the statutory language.

Chairman Jackson asked the Board members if they had any questions for Ms. Maule.

Board member Matt Tilly asked whether the Board could vote now since the SOCC does not take effect until November 1.

Ms. Maule explained that, based on the statutes, the SOCC references the LCB. The LCB convenes on the third Tuesday in October and can continue meeting until its work is completed. That is why this item is included on the agenda—to ensure transparency and to be above board with the public about the SOCC meeting.

Board member James Leewright informed Chairman Jackson that he and several other members had been newly appointed about a week ago. Accordingly, Mr. Leewright motioned that the Board reconsider the compensation for legislative pay. Matt Tilly seconded the motion.

Chairman Jackson inquired whether there was any discussion about that.

Ms. Maule stated that it is not technically on the agenda, and she does not think the Board should vote on it. However, she believes the Chair will work with staff to make sure all agenda items the Board wants to discuss at the November meeting are included.

Board member Chip Carter inquired if Ms. Maule thought Mr. Leewright's motion could serve as a recommendation for the Board to include in a future meeting. Ms. Maule confirmed, "Yes."

Board member Robert DeNegri addressed Ms. Maule and said he did not understand her response. The Board just voted on legislative compensation. Ms. Maule replied that it is correct. She advised him that if he accepts it, they should meet again in November, noting that there has been some indication that certain board members want to include stipends for other leaders within the Legislature. She explained that the Board does not have to finish its work today and can meet

through the third Tuesday in November. There will always be an opportunity to vote yes or no, and that is not as though an action has already been taken or that it is set in concrete.

Mr. DeNegri said that he is fine with extending the Board's unfinished business, which has not been completed today, to November 4. However, he added that the business already addressed in this meeting does not need to be reevaluated or revoted on. Ms. Maule agreed, noting that she does not believe the other members are talking about redoing any votes, but rather about discussing adding additional leadership positions.

Mr. DeNegri said he must have misunderstood Ms. Maule.

Board member Scott Douglas replied to Ms. Maule's response, "That is not correct."

Mr. DeNegri reiterated that he must have misunderstood what she said, while Mr. Douglas assured him that he did not misunderstand what Ms. Maule said.

Mr. DeNegri asked Ms. Maule for clarification that we are not going to re-vote on anything, because we have already done that here.

Board member Chip Carter added, "But we can; that is up to us as a body to make that decision." Until we adjourn and the third Tuesday in November arrives, it is up to us as a body to decide.

Mr. DeNegri responded, "So we are going to have another revote on what we have already voted on?"

Mr. Tilly clarified that his understanding is the motion or proposal was to include it on the agenda for the Open Meeting Act, allowing the Board to revisit and discuss it legally at a future time if they choose.

Mr. DeNegri reiterated that it is not necessary; this Board has a quorum; a motion was made, and the motion passed. This Board cannot continue to meet every time someone wants to change a prior vote.

Mr. Leewright asked Ms. Maule if there was anything the Board could change to vote on the second date at the next meeting in November.

Ms. Maule told Mr. Leewright she would like some time to look into that and could brief him at the next meeting.

Mr. Leewright suggested that our role is to ensure fairness and transparency, which is why I addressed it in the next meeting. Additionally, it is our responsibility in this position to thoroughly review all matters, leading me to make a motion to reconsider for the next agenda.

Mr. Douglas stated he believed we were fair, and the motion passed. I see no reason to revisit a matter after it has been moved, seconded, and approved. That's not how my mind works, and I simply don't understand.

Mr. Carter replied that he sees no harm in keeping the item as an option for a future meeting within the time frame allowed by the statute, and if this body wants to reconsider, we should be able to do so.

Mr. Douglas asked Mr. Carter, "Then, why are we here now? And why did we just vote?"

Mr. Carter told Mr. Douglas that he might have learned something that changed his mind.

Mr. Douglas explained that this is why we received the information weeks in advance of the meeting. I find this confusing because we were given detailed information through multiple emails, and we all should have reviewed it beforehand. We made the motion, it was seconded, voted on, and the decision is finalized.

Mr. Leewright said we are just trying to find solutions, especially, and I do not approve of the changes, but this is within the rules to do so. I was just attempting to get there at that moment, but the motion was not considered. As I stated earlier, some of us were recently appointed, and we learned new information here in this meeting. Also, I know some of us need to go back and review what we learned today. And again, in all transparency and fairness through this Board, we are able to reconsider the act of compensation at the next meeting.

Mr. DeNegri asked Ms. Maule, if he could move to adjourn the Legislative Compensation Board meeting today and not reconvene. Then, meet on November 4, as the Statewide Official Compensation Commission, which was just created by law.

Ms. Maule responded no; the Chair has the statutory authority to call a new meeting of the LCB on his own, and there is no vote listed on the agenda today regarding a potential LCB meeting in November.

Mr. DeNegri then said, "So I am asking the Chair to call this meeting." We have completed the business that was on the agenda for today.

Chairman Jackson replied that it was his understanding, and please correct him if he is wrong, that statutorily we are required to meet as a Legislative Compensation Board and a Statewide Official Compensation Commission on the same day, and that must happen after November 1, 2025. Is that correct?

Ms. Maule responded, that is correct.

Chairman Jackson responded to Mr. DeNegri's request, saying, "Given that it is the case, I do not believe it is possible to do what you just asked me to do."

Mr. DeNegri responded that he did not understand.

Chairman Jackson replied, "True, but it was my understanding that you just asked me to adjourn and call the business of this meeting."

Mr. DeNegri replied, "Correct, and we will convene on November 4 for the other meeting."

Mr. Carter responded, "But the Board has to convene as well."

Mr. DeNegri replied, "That is not true." We need to convene on November 4 because it has a separate agenda.

Mr. Carter responded, "But there was a matter that wanted to be discussed here that could not be discussed here because the agenda was not put together to allow it. So, because of that, we have agreed that we should meet again, so we can at least assess that."

Mr. DeNegri said, "It is obvious to me what is happening here. There are certain members on the Board that do not like the results of the vote, and they want to reconvene this Board to vote again."

Mr. Baumann asked Chairman Jackson if, assuming the motion passes as presented, if it would be appropriate to just add items six, seven, eight, and other unfinished business to the future agenda so everyone can reconsider and do their homework to decide whether they want to change how they voted, because clearly they want to change the votes on some of the others.

Ms. Maule interrupted and said the Chair will typically set the agenda for board meetings in consultation with the agency and try to be as accommodating as possible to the other members. I do not see any issue with including leadership positions that were not addressed today on the agenda for the November 4 meeting. However, I do not know whether you can redo votes, but I would advise against it, as it can confuse people when you continually revisit the same issue. And really, a no vote is a perfectly acceptable vote if you do not like a motion. That would be my general advice. And again, I will just look into whether it is prohibited or clearly allowed to revisit motions in subsequent meetings. But that is my initial view on the legal position.

Mr. Carter added that he has never been part of any board that could not revisit past decisions, and it is highly unusual if, within our statutory time, we are not allowed to consider it. I am not sure if it will come up, and I certainly have no idea whether anything will be changed. I think it is unusual that we would not be allowed to have a conversation.

Chairman Jackson replied, “At the advice of Ms. Maria Maule, as Chairman of this board, I am calling a meeting of the Legislative Compensation Board for November 4, at 9:30 AM.”

Chip Carter motioned to approve the meeting date of November 4 for the first meeting of the Statewide Official Compensation Commission. Matt Tilly seconded the motion. The motion passed, and the following votes were recorded:

Chip Carter, aye; Jennifer Miller, aye; Robert DeNegri, aye; Scott Douglas, aye;
Jeff Baumann, aye; Gary Unruh, aye; James Leewright, aye; Matt Tilly, aye; Brian Jackson, aye.

Motion carries: 9 ayes; 0 nays.

Chairman Jackson asked Ms. Hicks to inform the board members and guests about the time and location of the upcoming meetings.

Ms. Hicks informed the audience that the Legislative Compensation Board will meet on November 4 at 9:30 AM in Senate Conference Room 4s.9. The Statewide Official Compensation Commission will also meet on the same day, in the same conference room at 10:30 AM.

10. Adjournment:

There being no further business, Mr. Carter made the motion to adjourn. Mr. Baumann seconded the motion. Seeing no opposition, the meeting adjourned at 10:11 AM.