



6/2/2026

The Honorable Tina McKinnor  
California State Assembly  
1021 O Street, Suite 5520  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Assembly Bill 1383—Public Employees' Retirement Benefits—OPPOSE (As Amended April 11, 2025)**

Dear Assemblymember McKinnor,

On behalf of the City of Santa Rosa, I am writing in respectful opposition to Assembly Bill (AB) 1383. While we share your commitment to recruiting and retaining the public safety professionals who serve our communities, this bill would expand pension benefits without identifying a funding source—placing significant new and unfunded costs on cities like ours at a time when local budgets are already strained.

AB 1383 would significantly expand pension benefits for all PEPRA members by increasing the pensionable compensation cap to align with the federal defined benefit limit, reducing the minimum retirement age from 57 to 55 for existing PEPRA safety formulas, and creating a new 3% at age 55 safety retirement formula. These enhanced benefits would apply to both current and future employees beginning January 1, 2026, resulting in substantial increases to employer pension costs.

The California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) was enacted to address escalating pension liabilities that threatened the fiscal stability of local governments and the long-term sustainability of CalPERS. Despite these reforms, employer contribution rates have continued to rise, consuming an increasing share of local government budgets and reducing resources available for core public services such as public safety, infrastructure maintenance, homelessness response, and community programs. As of June 30, 2025, CalPERS reported a net pension liability of \$43.19 billion. AB 1383 would undermine the cost-containment measures established under PEPRA and add significant long-term liabilities to a pension system that continues to face substantial unfunded obligations.

Equally concerning, AB 1383 would impose these benefit enhancements through state statute without providing a corresponding actuarial analysis of the fiscal impacts or state funding to offset the increased employer costs. For the City of Santa Rosa, this would translate into higher required pension contributions and reduced budgetary flexibility to support competitive compensation, maintain service levels, and invest in recruitment and retention strategies.



Moreover, the bill's proposed pension enhancements are not supported by clear evidence demonstrating that they would meaningfully improve the recruitment and retention of public safety personnel.

We respect the goals motivating this measure and remain committed to working with the Legislature on policies that strengthen public safety workforces in a fiscally sustainable manner. However, in the absence of a dedicated funding mechanism and a comprehensive cost analysis, AB 1383 represents a significant unfunded financial risk to cities.

For these reasons, the City of Santa Rosa must respectfully oppose AB 1383. Should you have any questions, please contact our legislative advocate Dane Hutchings with California Public Policy Group at 916-974-9270.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark Stapp".

Mayor Mark Stapp  
City of Santa Rosa

A handwritten note in blue ink that says "Thank you for hearing our concerns!" followed by a signature that appears to be "Mark".

CC: Members and Staff of the Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee  
The Honorable Chris Rogers, Assembly District 2  
The Honorable Damon Connolly, Assembly District 12  
The Honorable Mike McGuire, Senate District 2