

AUGUST 2020

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS

A TOOLKIT FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE NEGOTIATION OF POLICE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS*

For several years, city officials, researchers and activists have lamented that police union contracts have been used to shield officers from discipline and created barriers to the timely and thorough investigation of police misconduct complaints. The NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. (“LDF”) has prepared this toolkit to support police accountability efforts of activists and advocates nationwide by providing a resource that will allow them to engage in police union contract discussions. This toolkit includes a list of questions that members of the public can pose to government officials to determine whether a police union contract in their city contains provisions that inhibit investigations of police misconduct complaints or shield officers from discipline.

The toolkit is divided into six sections addressing different areas of concern that LDF has identified

through a review of police union contracts in 82 of the country’s largest cities: **(1)** delays in interviewing officers accused of misconduct; **(2)** limits on time periods for imposing discipline on officers accused of misconduct;

“ OVER THE YEARS, ACTIVISTS
IN CITIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY
HAVE MADE PUBLIC DEMANDS
FOR CHANGES TO POLICE UNION
CONTRACTS. **YOU CAN TOO.** ”

**Acknowledgements and Disclaimer: LDF’s [Policing Reform Campaign](#) published this toolkit with the generous pro bono support of the Orrick law firm.*

Our focus on police union contracts began in 2015 with a partnership with [Campaign Zero](#), a national organization that has provided important contributions to the public’s understanding of how police union contracts can advance a regime of impunity for police officer misconduct. The information provided in this document and appendices do not, and is not intended to, constitute legal advice; instead, all information, content, and materials are for general informational purposes only. LDF is committed to ending police violence, promoting police accountability, and supporting public safety models that drastically reduce the presence of armed law enforcement in Black and Brown communities.



(3) requirements that complaints be signed or sworn; (4) removal of disciplinary records from police personnel files; (5) the composition of disciplinary hearing boards; and (6) the use of vacation or other leave time in lieu of suspension. Each section briefly describes how such provisions can impede investigations of complaints or shield officers from discipline for misconduct and provides a list of questions that members of the public can use to help identify needed changes in police collective bargaining agreements for their city. At the end of this toolkit is a list of recommended changes to police union contract provisions that can help address these areas of concern.

A chart containing links to 112 police union contracts is included as **Appendix A**. Some contracts will expire soon, and confidential negotiations of new contracts may be underway. Over the years, activists in cities across the country have made public demands for changes to police union contracts.¹ You can too.

Additionally, a chart of Law Enforcement Officer Bill of Rights (LEOBOR) is attached as **Appendix B**. These are state laws that often serve as a basis for police union contract provisions. Activists and advocates should review these laws to determine which police union contract provisions are required by state law. To the extent that provisions are required by law, activists and advocates can then consider urging state legislators to

1	Delays in interviewing officers
2	Limited time periods for imposing discipline for officer misconduct
3	Requirements that complaints be signed or sworn
4	Removal of disciplinary records from police personnel files
5	Composition of disciplinary hearing boards
6	The use of vacation or other leave time in lieu of suspension
A	Links to 112 police union contracts
B	Law Enforcement Officer Bill of Rights

advance policy changes. You may find examples of recent policy changes to state LEOBORs in the footnotes of Appendix B.

1

DELAYS IN INTERVIEWING OFFICERS

Some police union contracts require a waiting period of **48 hours or more** before an officer accused of wrongdoing or involved in a critical incident, such as a police-involved shooting, can be interviewed about alleged misconduct or required to submit a statement.² Others do not specify the number of days but require the passage of a “reasonable time” or that an officer be allowed to have a representative present during an interview without limiting the amount of time afforded the officer to secure the presence of a representative.³ The resulting delay gives officers an opportunity to collude on a consistent story and is contrary to police practice when investigating a member of the public accused of a crime.

The following questions can help members of the public determine whether a police union contract prevents timely interviewing of officers:

1

Does the contract require that the officer receive notice before the officer is interviewed or provides a statement?

If so, how much time must elapse between the notice and when the officer can be interviewed or required to submit a statement?

2

Does the contract require that the officer receive a copy of the complaint or other information about the allegations raised in the complaint before the officer is interviewed or provides a statement?

If so, how much time must elapse between when the officer receives the complaint or information and when the officer is interviewed or required to submit a statement?

3

Does the contract allow the officer to request a postponement of an interview?

If so, how long can an interview be postponed at the officer’s request?

4

Does the contract require or allow the officer to have a representative present during the interview?

If so, is there a limit on how long the officer can delay the interview to find representation?



2

LIMITED TIME PERIODS FOR IMPOSING DISCIPLINE FOR OFFICER MISCONDUCT

Some police union contracts require that any discipline for officer misconduct take place within a limited time period following the incident—typically between 14 days and one year.⁴ These limits effectively preclude discipline if a complaint is not filed quickly after the alleged misconduct takes place. Victims of police misconduct may be hesitant to file a complaint for fear of retaliation and should be afforded ample time to consider the pros and cons of coming forward.

The following questions may help members of the public determine whether a police union contract imposes time limits on when discipline can be imposed for officer misconduct:

1

Does the contract prohibit discipline of an officer if a complaint is not filed within a specific amount of time after an incident?

If so, much time does a victim of police misconduct have to file a complaint?

2

Does the contract prohibit discipline of an officer if an investigation is not completed within a specific amount of time after an incident or after notice or discovery of an incident by the department?

If so, how long does the department have to complete an investigation before an officer becomes protected from discipline?

3

Does the contract require officer discipline to be imposed within a specific amount of time after an incident or after notice or discovery of an incident by the department?

If so, after how long is a recommendation of discipline no longer permitted?

“ SOME...CONTRACTS REQUIRE THAT ANY DISCIPLINE FOR OFFICER MISCONDUCT TAKE PLACE WITHIN A LIMITED TIME PERIOD FOLLOWING THE INCIDENT—TYPICALLY BETWEEN **14 DAYS AND ONE YEAR** ”



3

REQUIREMENTS THAT COMPLAINTS BE SIGNED OR SWORN

Some police union contracts prohibit anonymous complaints or require citizen complaints to be signed and/or supported by a sworn affidavit.⁵ Anonymity may be allowed for complaints that allege criminal misconduct but prohibited for complaints that allege non-criminal misconduct. Such requirements discourage victims of police misconduct from coming forward, especially if they prefer to stay anonymous for fear of retaliation.

The following questions may help members of the public determine whether a police union contract prohibits anonymous complaints or requires that a victim attest to the allegations in the complaint.

1

Does the contract require that complaints be signed, made under oath, or supported by a signed or sworn statement? Does the answer depend on whether the misconduct alleged is criminal or non-criminal?

2

Does the contract prohibit the investigation of anonymous complaints? Does the answer depend on whether the misconduct alleged is criminal or non-criminal?

3

If the contract permits anonymous complaints only for allegations of criminal misconduct, what types of misconduct are considered non-criminal? Is excessive use of force considered criminal or non-criminal for purposes of whether a complaint can be brought anonymously?

4

Does the contract permit the investigation of anonymous complaints only when police department officials determine other corroborating evidence exists?

4

REMOVAL OF DISCIPLINARY RECORDS FROM PERSONNEL FILES

Police union contracts often permit or require that records of disciplinary actions against an officer be removed from the officer's personnel file after a period of time if no further disciplinary actions occur during that time.⁶ The time periods typically range between one and five years depending on the type of disciplinary action that was taken. Removal of disciplinary records makes it more difficult to identify patterns of misconduct by individual officers and by police departments as a whole.

The following questions may help members of the public determine whether a police union contract permits or requires records of disciplinary actions to be removed from an officer's personnel file:

1

Does the contract require the removal of disciplinary records from an officer's personnel file after a specified amount of time?

If so, after how much time are disciplinary records removed?

3

If the contract requires or permits removal of disciplinary records from an officer's personnel file, are there any limitations on the types of violations that can be removed or variations in the amount of time after which removal is required or permitted (e.g., an oral or written reprimand vs. a suspension or demotion)?

2

Does the contract permit an officer to request the removal of disciplinary records from the officer's personnel file after a specified amount of time?

If so, after how much time may disciplinary records be removed?

4

If the contract requires or permits removal of disciplinary records from an officer's personnel file after a specified period of time, does the occurrence of additional violations extend the period during which the record must be kept in the file?

Does the occurrence of any violation extend the retention period or only similar violations? If only similar violations extend the retention period, what violations are considered similar?



5

COMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINARY HEARING BOARDS

Some police union contracts require that disciplinary hearing boards—the bodies that adjudicate whether discipline is warranted in the event that an officer challenges a disciplinary action—be composed exclusively or primarily of law enforcement personnel.⁷ Hearing board composition requirements transfer responsibility for identifying and punishing police misconduct to rank-and-file police officers who may be biased in their decision making and minimize or eliminate public participation in the governance process.

The following questions may help members of the public determine whether a police union contract requires that disciplinary hearing boards be composed exclusively or primarily of law enforcement personnel:

1

Does the contract require that the disciplinary hearing board for a challenged violation consists exclusively of law enforcement personnel?

2

Does the contract require that a majority of the disciplinary hearing board for a challenged violation be law enforcement personnel?

3

Are there differences in disciplinary hearing board composition requirements based on how a violation is classified (e.g., minor violations vs. major violations)?

If so, what types of violations are and are not subject to hearing board requirements?



6

USE OF VACATION OR OTHER LEAVE TIME IN LIEU OF SUSPENSION

Police union contracts sometimes allow officers to use vacation or other leave time in lieu of a disciplinary suspension. Some limit the substitution of leave time for suspension to periods of five days or fewer, while others allow substitution for longer suspensions or do not specify the number of suspension days that can be substituted.⁸ Use of leave time in lieu of disciplinary suspension can remove the deterrent effect of disciplinary suspensions because it allows the officer to continue receiving normal pay during the suspension.

The following questions may assist members of the public with determining whether a police union contract permits the use of leave time in lieu of disciplinary suspension:

1

Does the contract permit officers to use vacation or other leave time in lieu of a disciplinary suspension?

2

If the contract permits the use of leave time in lieu of a disciplinary suspension, is there any limit on the number of suspension days for which leave time can be substituted?

3

If the contract permits the use of leave time in lieu of a disciplinary suspension, are there any types of violations for which substitution of leave time is not permitted?

4

If the contract permits the use of leave time in lieu of a disciplinary suspension, does the Police Chief or another official have to approve all such substitutions?



PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICE UNION CONTRACT PROVISIONS

FOR FAIR AND THOROUGH INVESTIGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT AND POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Below are examples of provisions for police union contracts that address some of the areas of concern described above. While LEOBOR laws may present an obstacle to the adoption of such provisions in some states, members of the public in states without such laws can advocate that these provisions be incorporated into the police union contracts for their cities. Police union contracts must:

1 AVOID DELAYS IN INTERVIEWING OFFICERS INVOLVED IN ALLEGED MISCONDUCT.

Investigation of alleged misconduct must commence as soon as possible after the incident and union contracts should require officers to be interviewed immediately. When an officer can reasonably expect discipline to result from an interview or interrogation conducted by the police supervisors and officials, at the request of the officer, questioning shall be delayed for no longer than two (2) hours to give the officer an opportunity to consult with a union representative or an attorney for criminal interviews and interrogations. The Department may allow additional time at its discretion if the issue is sufficiently complex and requires additional time for preparation. Additional time will not exceed four (4) hours.

2 ELIMINATE TIME LIMITS TO FILE A COMPLAINT, IF POSSIBLE. OTHERWISE, ALLOW SUFFICIENT TIME FOR VICTIMS OF POLICE MISCONDUCT TO FILE COMPLAINTS. Some state LEOBORs may require complaints be filed within a certain time period and removing this barrier would require a change in state law. If eliminating the time limit is not feasible, recommend that individuals be able to file complaints alleging police misconduct for the same length of time as your state's statute of limitation for civil legal actions.

3 ELIMINATE TIME LIMITS ON OFFICER DISCIPLINE, IF POSSIBLE. ALLOW SUFFICIENT TIME FOR AN OFFICER TO BE DISCIPLINED FOR MISCONDUCT. In some states, contractual time limits on discipline may also exist in state law and their elimination would require a change in the law. If eliminating the time limits is not feasible, recommend that disciplinary actions against officers may be taken within two years after notice to the department of the incident.



4 PERMIT THE FILING OF ANONYMOUS COMPLAINTS. The Department must investigate complaints filed by members of the public and other sworn officers, including anonymous and unsworn complaints.

5 MAINTAIN DISCIPLINARY RECORDS LONG ENOUGH TO UNCOVER REPEATED OFFICER MISCONDUCT. Any records relating to complaints that resulted in the termination or resignation of an officer shall be maintained forever. If any complaint resulted in a suspension or demotion, it may be destroyed after five years, unless there are similar complaints filed during that time period. Records of a suspension or demotion involving allegations of sexual misconduct, domestic violence, and excessive use of force shall be maintained forever.

6 ELIMINATE DISCIPLINARY TRIAL BOARDS, IF POSSIBLE. IF NOT, ENSURE DISCIPLINARY TRIAL BOARD MEMBERS ARE IMPARTIAL AND DIVERSE. In some states, disciplinary trial boards may be required by LEOBOR laws. If so, their elimination from the contract will require a change in state law. If elimination of the board is not feasible, then recommend provisions that prohibit the accused officer from selecting members of their disciplinary board or to strike members of the boards, and require members of the public must be permitted to sit on the hearing board to ensure impartiality and transparency.

7 PROHIBIT THE USE OF VACATION LEAVE IN LIEU OF SUSPENSIONS. In no event shall the use of vacation or annual leave be permitted in lieu of disciplinary suspension for any officer misconduct.

¹ See, e.g., Gregory Pratt and Dan Hinkel, [Chicago City Council approves changes to police supervisor contracts allowing anonymous misconduct complaints](#), Chicago Tribune, Jul. 22, 2020; See also, King staff, [Seattle council approves police contract with 8-1 vote](#), KING5, Nov. 13, 2018; and Reade Levison, [Across the U.S., police contracts shield officers from scrutiny and discipline](#), Reuters Investigates, Jan. 13, 2017.

² See, e.g., Collective Bargaining Agreement By and Between Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government and River City Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #164, Police Officer and Sergeants, Lodge #614, Police Officer and Sergeants, Art. 17 Sec. 2A, June 30, 2018 (stating “[n]o Member shall be subjected to interrogation in a departmental matter involving alleged misconduct on his or her part, until forty-eight (48) hours have expired from the time the request for interrogation is made to the accused officer, in writing).

³ See, e.g., Master Agreement between the City of Detroit and the Detroit Police Officer Association, October 2014 – June 30, 2019, § 16(B) (stating any officer ordered to make an oral statement as part of an investigation shall receive Miranda and/or Garrity warnings and shall be given a reasonable time to act in accordance with those warnings).

⁴ See, e.g., Memorandum of Understanding By and Between City of San Diego and San Diego Police Officers Association, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2020, Article 64.3304(d)(1) (prohibiting discipline against officers if investigation of misconduct is not completed within one year of the agency learning of the allegation of misconduct).

⁵ See, e.g., Agreement Between the City of Chicago Department of Police and the Fraternal Order of Police Chicago Lodge No. 7, July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2017, Article 6, Sec. 6.1(D) (prohibiting investigations of anonymous complaints unless the alleged misconduct constitutes a criminal violation).

⁶ See, e.g., Collective Bargaining Agreement between Anchorage Police Department Employees Association (APDEA) and Municipality of Anchorage, January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2020, Article V, Sec. 1(H) (requiring removal of disciplinary records after one year for oral or written reprimands and two years for suspensions, demotions, or disciplinary transfers, subject to a one-year extension if a similar violation occurs prior to removal).

⁷ See, e.g., Agreement Between the City of Miami, Miami, Florida and Fraternal Order of Police, Walter E. Headline, Jr., Miami Lodge No. 20, October 1, 2018 – September 30, 2021, Article 12, Sec. 12.1 (stating an officer who is subject to certain types of discipline has a right to review of the discipline by a disciplinary review board consisting of five members of the police department).

⁸ See, e.g., The City of San Antonio, Texas and The San Antonio Police Officers’ Association, September 1, 2016 through September 30, 2021, Article 28, Sec. 18 (allowing officers suspended for up to 45 days to forfeit leave time in lieu of suspension and requiring that a request to forfeit leave time can only be denied due to a consistent overall pattern of substandard performance).

APPENDIX A

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS OF POLICE DEPARTMENTS SERVING THE LARGEST CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES ¹

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Albuquerque, NM	City of Albuquerque and Albuquerque Police Officers Association – Collective Bargaining Agreement (On file at LDF)	July 7, 2018 – June 30, 2020	Article 18 (Personnel Files and Records) Article 20 (Investigation and Discipline) Article 21 (Grievance and Appeal Procedures)
Anaheim, CA	Memorandum of Understanding between the Anaheim Police Association and the City of Anaheim	June 28, 2019 – July 3, 2025	Article 29 (Salary Step Reduction, Suspension, Demotion and Dismissal)
Anchorage, AK	Collective Bargaining Agreement between Anchorage Police Department Employees Association (APDEA) and Municipality of Anchorage	January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2020	Article V (Bill of Rights and Grievance Procedure) Article VI, Section 11 (Discipline and Proper Notice)
Aurora, CO ²	Agreement between the City of Aurora and Aurora Police Association	January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2020	No references to disciplinary procedures.
Austin, TX	Agreement Between the City of Austin and the Austin Police Association	November 15, 2018 – March 31, 2023 (may be superseded by a new agreement effective after September 30, 2022)	Article 16 (Civilian Oversight of the Austin Police Department) Article 17 (Protected Rights of Officers) Article 18 (Disciplinary Actions, Demotions & Appeals)
Bakersfield, CA (Police Officers)	Memorandum of Understanding between Representatives of Management for the City of Bakersfield and Bakersfield Police Officers Association	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022	No references to disciplinary procedures.
Baltimore, MD (Police)	Memorandum of Understanding between the Baltimore City Police Department and the Baltimore City Lodge No. 3, Fraternal Order of Police, Inc., Unit I, Police Officers, Police Agents and Flight Officers, Fiscal Years 2019-2021	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021	Article 16 (Discipline)
Baltimore, MD (Sergeants and Lieutenants)	Memorandum of Understanding between the Baltimore City Police Department and the Baltimore City Lodge No. 3, Fraternal Order of Police, Inc., Unit II, Police Sergeants and Police Lieutenants, Fiscal years 2019-2021	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021	Article 16 (Discipline)

¹ City Mayors Statistics, The largest U.S. Cities: Cities ranked 1 to 100, http://www.citymayors.com/gratis/uscities_100.html.

² The Aurora police officers have a new bargaining union (the Fraternal Order of Police's Lodge 49) as of October 2019. A news article indicated that negotiations for a new contract were expected to commence in April 2020: <https://sentinelcolorado.com/uncategorized/a-more-perfect-union-aurora-police-change-bargaining-union-for-first-time-in-47-years/>

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Baton Rouge, LA ³	Agreement between the City of Baton Rouge and Baton Rouge Union of Police Local 237, I.U.P.A. AFL-CIO (On file at LDF)	April 4, 2015 – June 30, 2018 ⁴	Article VIII (Disciplinary Actions) Article IX (Investigation of Employees)
Boston, MA ⁵	Agreement between City of Boston and Boston Police Detectives Benevolent Society	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2020	Article VIII (Discipline and Discharge)
Buffalo, NY ⁶	Buffalo Police Benevolent Association, Inc. Contract and By-Laws	Original contract effective July 1, 1986, as amended by subsequent arbitration. ⁷	Article XII (Discipline and Discharge) Article XXII (Policemen’s Bill of Rights) Note: Buffalo has amended its contract primarily by arbitration over the past ~30 years
Chandler, AZ (Police Contract)	Memorandum of Understanding, July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022, City of Chandler and Chandler Law Enforcement Association Representing Chandler Police Officers	July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022	Section 1-4 (Unit Member Rights)
Chandler, AZ (Sergeant Contract)	Chandler, AZ (Sergeant Contract) Memorandum of Understanding, July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022, City of Chandler and Police Sergeants Bargaining Unit	July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022	Section 1-4 (Sergeant Rights)
Chicago, IL (Police Officers) ⁸	Agreement Between the City of Chicago Department of Police and the Fraternal Order of Police Chicago Lodge No. 7	July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2017	Article 6 (Bill of Rights) Article 7 (Summary Punishment) Article 8 (Employee Security) Section 9.6 (Suspension Grievances)
Chicago, IL (Sergeants, Lieutenants, Captains) ⁹	Agreement between the City of Chicago and the Policemen’s Benevolent & Protective Association of Illinois, Unit 156-Sergeants Agreement between the City of Chicago and the Policemen’s Benevolent & Protective Association of Illinois, Unit 156-Lieutenants Agreement between the City of Chicago and the Policemen’s Benevolent & Protective Association of Illinois, Unit 156-Captains	July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2016	Article 6 (Bill of Rights) Article 7 (Summary Punishment) Article 8 (Employee Security) Section 9.3A (Suspension Grievances)
Chicago, IL (Illinois Council of Police)	Collective Bargaining Agreement between the City of Chicago and the Illinois Council of Police	July 1, 2016 – July 1, 2020	Article 11 (Discipline)
Chicago, IL (University of Chicago)	Agreement between the University of Chicago and Police Benevolent & Protective Association of Illinois, Local 185	May 1, 2018 – April 30, 2023	Article 24 (Rights of Officers Under Investigation/Providing Witness Testimonies)

³ Negotiations of a new agreement appear to have been substantially complete in March 2020: <https://www.wafb.com/2020/05/28/baton-rouge-union-police-puts-up-billboard-advocating-higher-pay-officers/>. However, the City of Baton Rouge indicated in response to a public records request that the 2015 contract was still in effect as of July 2020.

⁴ News articles indicate that the agreement was extended to June 30, 2018 and thereafter on a month to month basis until terminated with 30 days’ notice: https://www.theadvocate.com/baton_rouge/news/article_82fc0d2c-80a0-11e8-9992-8734f009eba8.html

⁵ Negotiations for a new contract were still in process as of July 2020: <https://www.boston.com/news/local-news/2020/07/08/boston-city-councilors-turn-to-police-overtime-spending-and-union-contracts>.

⁶ New contract is in mediation as of July 2020: <https://www.wkbw.com/news/i-team/negotiations-on-new-police-contract-remain-stalled-in-city-of-buffalo>.

⁷ According to news reports, current terms expired in June 2019. See *supra*, note 6.

⁸ As of June 2020, no new agreement has been signed since this contract expired in June 2017, but negotiations are currently in process: <https://chicago.suntimes.com/2020/6/7/21279477/chicago-police-contract-misconduct-sun-times-editorial-fop-cpd-lori-lightfoot-george-floyd>, <https://news.wttw.com/2020/06/26/new-contract-chicago-police-brass-allows-anonymous-complaints-lightfoot>

⁹ An independent arbitrator issued a decision on the sergeants, lieutenants and captains contracts on June 26, 2020, which would govern contracts replacing those that expired in 2016: <https://www.chicagotribune.com/politics/ct-chicago-city-council-settlement-contract-20200722-ndkbr3zmhjb3gij6pilxae5na-story.html>.

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Chula Vista, CA	Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Chula Vista and Chula Vista Police Officer's Association, as amended by that Amendment (Letter of Understanding) to the 2014-2017 MOU Between the City of Chula Vista and Chula Vista Police Officer's Association Contract Amendment	November 4, 2014 – June 30, 2020 (as amended)	No references to disciplinary procedures.
Cincinnati, OH (Police Non-Supervisors)	Labor Agreement by and between Queen City Lodge No. 69 Fraternal Order of Police and the City of Cincinnati – Non-Supervisors	May 12, 2019 – May 1, 2021	Article III (Grievance Procedure) Article X (Police Officer's Rights in Disciplinary Investigations) Article XI (Service Record Availability)
Cincinnati, OH (Police Supervisors)	Labor Agreement by and between Queen City Lodge No. 69 Fraternal Order of Police and the City of Cincinnati – Supervisors	May 12, 2019 – May 1, 2021	Article III (Grievance Procedure) Article X (Police Officer's Rights in Disciplinary Investigations) Article XI (Service Record Availability)
Cincinnati, OH (University of Cincinnati – Law enforcement officers)	Bargaining Agreement Between the University of Cincinnati University Law Enforcement Officers and The Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc.	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021	Article 9 (Discipline) Article 10 (Personnel Files)
Cincinnati, OH (University of Cincinnati – Sergeants and Lieutenants)	Agreement Between the Fraternal Order of Police, Ohio Labor Council, Inc. and the University of Cincinnati (Sergeants and Lieutenants)	January 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021	Article 9 (Discipline) Article 10 (Personnel Files)
Cleveland, OH	Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Cleveland and Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 8	April 1, 2019- March 31, 2022	Article 11 (Reprimand)
Columbus, OH	Contract between the City of Columbus, Ohio and the Fraternal Order of Police Ohio Labor Council, Inc.	June 16, 2017 – June 15, 2020	Article 7 (Internal Investigations Procedures) Article 8 (Corrective/Disciplinary Action and Records)
Corpus Christi, TX	Agreement between the City of Corpus Christi and the Corpus Christi Police Officer's Association	October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2023	Article 7 (Disciplinary Action)
Dallas, TX	Meet and Confer Agreement between City of Dallas and the Meet and Confer Team consisting of Dallas Black Fire Fighters Association, Dallas Hispanic Fire Fighters Association, Dallas Fire Fighters Association, Black Police Association of Greater Dallas, National Latino Law Enforcement Organization, and Dallas Police Association	October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2022	No references to disciplinary procedures.
Denver, CO	Collective Bargaining Agreement between City and County of Denver and Denver Police Protective Association (file name: 17-1021 CBA_DenverPoliceProtectiveAssn_201310456-03.pdf)	January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2020	No references to disciplinary procedures.
Denver, CO	Collective Bargaining Agreement between City and County of Denver and Fraternal Order of Police, Denver Sheriff Lodge 27 (file name: 20-0075 Collective Bargaining Agreement Fraternal Order of Police_202053170-00)	January 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020	No references to disciplinary procedures

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Detroit, MI (Master Agreement) ¹⁰	Master Agreement between the City of Detroit and the Detroit Police Officers Association	October 2014 – June 30, 2019	Article 9 (Discipline) Article 16 (Employees' Right – Investigative Procedures) 24 (Department Files)
Detroit, MI (Police Command Officers)	Master Agreement between the City of Detroit and the Detroit Police Command Officers Association	June 18, 2014 – June 30, 2019	8 (Discipline Procedure) 9 (Employees' Rights) 10 (Department Files)
Detroit, MI (Police Lieutenants and Sergeants)	Master Agreement between the City of Detroit and the Detroit Police Lieutenants and Sergeants Association	November 2014 – June 30, 2019	10 (Discipline Procedure) 11 (Employees' Rights) 12 (Department Files)
El Paso, TX	Articles of Agreement between City of El Paso, Texas and El Paso Municipal Police Officers' Association, February 19, 2019 to August 31, 2023 (Accessed via agenda item 27.1)	February 19, 2019 – August 31, 2023	Article 21 (Grievance Procedure) Article 26 (Working Off Suspended Time) Article 30 (Internal Affairs Investigations)
Fort Wayne, IN	Agreement between the City of Fort Wayne and Fraternal Order of Police, Indiana F.O.P. Labor Council, Inc.	January 1, 2020 – December 31, 2021	Article 11 (Police Officers' Bill of Rights)
Fort Worth, TX	Meet and Confer Labor Agreement Between City of Fort Worth, Texas and Fort Worth Police Officers Association (file name: MCA with all changes 5.20.2020. Note this shows changes made to the prior 2017-2020 agreement)	June 1, 2017 – September 30, 2020 October 1, 2020 – September 30, 2024	Article 7 (Disciplinary Action)
Fremont, CA (Police)	Memorandum of Understanding on Wages, Hours, and Other Terms and Conditions of Employment – Fremont Police Association and City of Fremont	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2021	Chapter 7 (Grievances and Appeals)
Fremont, CA (Police Managers)	Memorandum of Understanding on Wages, Hours, and Other Terms and Conditions of Employment – Fremont Police Association and City of Fremont	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2021	Chapter 6 (Grievance and Disciplinary Appeal Procedures)
Fresno, CA (Non-Management Police)	Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Fresno and Fresno Police Officers Association (Non-Supervisory Police-Unit 4)	June 24, 2019 – June 20, 2021	7.20 (Disciplinary Procedures) 7.21 (In Lieu of Suspension) 7.22 (Use of a Hearing Officer in Disciplinary Action Initiated by City) 7.23 (Administrative Hearing Procedure)
Fresno, CA (Police Management)	Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Fresno and Fresno Police Officers Association (Police Management-Unit 9)	June 24, 2019 – June 20, 2021	Article VII, Section P (Disciplinary Procedures)
Glendale, AZ	Memorandum of Understanding between City of Glendale and the Glendale Police Officer's Association (GPOA)	July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2022	Appendix A (Amendment to Civil Service Rule X – Disciplinary actions, appeals and hearings)
Henderson, NV (Supervisors)	Collective Bargaining Agreement between City of Henderson and the Henderson Police Supervisors Association Second Amendment to Labor Agreement Between City of Henderson, Nevada and Henderson Police Supervisors Association	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020	Article 22 (HPSA Member Discipline/ Termination) Article 26, Section 5 (Record of Previous Discipline) Article 29 (Grievance Procedure) Appendix A (Types of Discipline Chart)

¹⁰ A news article indicates the contract was extended until 2022. See, <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/detroit-city/2018/10/18/detroit-police-officers-get-seven-percent-raises/1680931002/>

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Henderson, NV (Police Officers)	Amended Labor Agreement between the City of Henderson, NV and the Henderson Police Officers' Association	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020	Article 21 (Employment Status/ Disciplinary Process) Article 28 (Grievance Procedure)
Hialeah, FL	City of Hialeah, Florida and Fraternal Order of Police Lodge No. 12	August 17, 2018 – September 31, 2021	Article 25 (Disciplinary Review Procedures) Article 43 (Personnel Records)
Honolulu, HI ¹¹	Agreement between State of Hawaii, City & County of Honolulu, County of Hawaii, County of Maui, County of Kauai and State of Hawaii Organization of Police Officers Bargaining Unit 12 Contract extension through 2018	July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2018	Article 12 (Police Officer's Protection – Administrative Investigations and Interrogations) Article 13 (Discipline and Dismissal)
Houston, TX	Meet & Confer Agreement between the Houston Police Officers' Union (HPOU) as the Majority Bargaining Agent for all Police Officers and the City of Houston, Texas	Through December 2020	Article 14 (In Service Training and Pre-service training) Article 30 (Investigation of Officer Misconduct) Article 31 (Discipline and Discharge) Article 32 (Supervisory Intervention)
Indianapolis, IN	Agreement between the City of Indianapolis and the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge #86 (On file at LDF)	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2020	Article IV, Section 2 (Access to Files), Section 11 (Accumulation of Discipline), Section 14 (Discipline)
Irvine, CA (Police Association)	Memorandum of Understanding between Irvine Police Association and City of Irvine	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2023	Article 6 (Disciplinary Action)
Irvine, CA (Police Management)	Memorandum of Understanding between Irvine Police Management Association and City of Irvine	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2023	Article 6 (Disciplinary Action)
Jacksonville, FL (Lieutenants and Captains)	Agreement between the City of Jacksonville and the Fraternal Order of Police, Lieutenants and Captains	October 1, 2017- September 30, 2020	Article 10 (Discharge and Discipline) Article 11 (Bill of Rights) Article 13 (Emergency Suspension) Article 14 (Files)
Jacksonville, FL (Police Officers)	Agreement between the City of Jacksonville and the Fraternal Order of Police, Police Officers through Sergeants	October 1, 2017- September 30, 2020	Article 10 (Discharge and Discipline) Article 11 (Bill of Rights) Article 13 (Emergency Suspension) Article 14 (Files) Article B-2 (Discharge and Discipline)
Jersey City, NJ	Agreement between City of Jersey City and Jersey City Police Officers Benevolent Association, January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016 Memorandum of Agreement extending the terms and conditions of the 2013-2016 contract except as modified therein	January 1, 2021 – December 31, 2024	Article 24 (Grievance Procedure) Article 38 (Police Officer's Bill of Rights) Article 42 (Discharge and Discipline)

¹¹ Honolulu City Council resolution on cost items references a new agreement that ends June 2021, but a copy was not found online: https://honolulu.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=3&cclip_id=1070&meta_id=98504

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Kansas City, KS	Memorandum of Understanding Between the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas and Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge #4 of Kansas City, Kansas	January 1, 2020 – December 31, 2022	Article 13 (Internal Investigation Procedures) Article 13.2 (Administrative Investigation Procedure) Article 13.3 (Criminal Investigation Procedure) Article 13.5 (False Complaints) Article 13.6 (Officer's Privacy) Article 14 (Discipline)
Laredo, TX	Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Laredo and The Laredo Police Officers' Association	October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2020	Article 26 (Disciplinary Action) Article 28 (Internal Investigation)
Las Vegas, NV	Collective Bargaining Agreement between Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and Las Vegas Police Protective Association	July 1, 2019- June 30, 2023	Section 4.4 (Notice of Investigatory Interviews) Section 10.10 (Bonus Time); Section 10.12 (Cash Out) Article 12 (Grievance Procedure) Section 24.3 (Personnel Files)
Lexington, KY	Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Bluegrass Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 4 and Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government Police Officers and Sergeants Unit (file name: 237-2016 Contract)	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2020	Article 15 (Disciplinary Procedures and Bill of Rights) Article 16 (Personnel Files)
Lincoln, NE	Agreement between Lincoln Police Union and the City of Lincoln, Nebraska	August 22, 2019 – August 31, 2022	Article 8 (Discharge, Discipline and Employee Incident Reports) Article 9 (Grievance Procedure) Article 10 (Internal Affairs and Employee Rights)
Long Beach, CA	Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Long Beach and the Long Beach Police Officers' Association (accessed via first attachment)	October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2022	Article 6, Sections VI (Internal Affairs Investigations) and IX (Public Records Requests)
Los Angeles, CA	Memorandum of Understanding No. 24 for Joint Submission to the City Council Regarding Police Officers, Lieutenant and Below Representation Unit by and between the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Police Protective League	August 1, 2019-June 30, 2022	Article 8.2 (Matters Not Grievable or Arbitrable) Section 9.0 (Administrative Appeals) Section 10.0 (Representation)
Louisville/Jefferson County Metro, KY (Police Officer and Sergeants)	Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government and River City Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #614, Police Officer and Sergeants	July 3, 2013 – June 30, 2018 ¹²	Article 17 (Disciplinary Procedure and Bill of Rights) Article 18 (Personnel Files)
Louisville/Jefferson County Metro, KY (Captains and Lieutenants)	Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government and River City Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #614, Captains and Lieutenants	January 24, 2014 – June 30, 2018 ¹³	Article 17 (Disciplinary Procedure and Bill of Rights) Article 18 (Personnel Files)
Madison, WI (Supervisors)	Agreement between the City of Madison and the Association of Madison Police Supervisors	January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2021	No references to disciplinary procedures.
Madison, WI (Non-Supervisors)	Agreement between the City of Madison and the Association of Madison Professional Police Officers Association	January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2021	Article XXI (Discipline)

¹² The Louisville website indicates this agreement was extended through December 31, 2020: <https://louisvilleky.gov/government/human-resources/union-contracts>

¹³ The Louisville website indicates this agreement was extended through December 31, 2020: <https://louisvilleky.gov/government/human-resources/union-contracts>

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Memphis, TN	Agreement between the Memphis Police Association and the City of Memphis, Tennessee	July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2021	Article 14 (Departmental Disciplinary Procedures) Article 15 (Internal Investigation Procedures)
Mesa, AZ	Memorandum of Understanding, City of Mesa and Mesa Police Association	July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017	Article 2 (Rights)
Miami-Dade County, FL (Non-Supervisor)	Collective Bargaining Agreement between Miami-Dade County, Florida and the Dade County Police Benevolent Association Rank and File Unit	October 1, 2017 – September 30, 2020	Article 9 (Rights of Employees in Departmental Disciplinary Matters) Article 10 (Civil Suits and Criminal Actions)
Miami-Dade County, FL (Supervisors)	Collective Bargaining Agreement between Miami-Dade County, Florida and the Dade County Police Benevolent Association Law Enforcement Supervisory Unit	October 1, 2017 – September 30, 2020	Article 8 (Internal Affairs) Article 9 (Rights of Employees in Departmental Disciplinary Matters) Article 10 (Civil Suits)
Miami, FL	Agreement Between the City of Miami, Miami, Florida and Fraternal Order of Police, Walter E. Headline, Jr., Miami Lodge No. 20	October 1, 2018 – September 30 2021	Article 8 (Disciplinary Procedure) Article 12 (Department Disciplinary Review Board)
Milwaukee, WI	Agreement Between City of Milwaukee and The Milwaukee Police Association, Local #21 I.U.P.A., AFL-CIO	January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020	Article 7 (Grievance and Arbitration Procedure) Article 71 (Internal Investigations)
Minneapolis, MN	The City of Minneapolis and The Police Officers' Federation of Minneapolis Labor Agreement – Police Unit (link: Contract (Signed))	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2019	Article 3 (Management Rights) Article 4 (Discipline)
Newark, NJ	Agreement between the City of Newark New Jersey and Fraternal Order of Police Newark, Lodge No. 12	January 1, 2009 – December 31, 2012	Article 4 (Grievance Procedure and Arbitration) Article 30 (Discipline and Discharge)
New York, NY (Patrolmen) ¹⁴	Patrolmen's Benevolent Association 2006-2010 Agreement Memorandum of Understanding Between The City of New York and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association	August 1, 2006 – July 31, 2010 2012 – 2017	2006-2010 Agreement: Article XV, Section 8 (Disciplinary Records), Section 9 (Disciplinary Procedures) MOU: Section 6 (Neighborhood Policing)
New York, NY (Lieutenants) ¹⁵	Lieutenants' Benevolent Association 2009-2011 Agreement	November 1, 2009 – October 31, 2011	Article XVI, Section 8 (Disciplinary Records), Section 9 (Disciplinary Procedures),
New York, NY (Sergeants)	Sergeants' Benevolent Association June 1, 2005 – August 29, 2011 Agreement	June 1, 2005 – August 29, 2011	Article XV, Section 8 (Disciplinary Records), Section 9 (Disciplinary Procedures)
New York, NY (Captains)	Captains' Endowment Association 2003-2012 Agreement	November 1, 2003 – March 31, 2012	No references to disciplinary procedures.
North Las Vegas, NV	2018-2020 Agreement between the City of North Las Vegas, Nevada and the North Las Vegas Police Officers Association	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2020	Article 22 (Disciplinary Action and Peace Officers' Rights)

¹⁴ A news article indicates the PBA began arbitration with the city as of January 2020: <https://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/ny-city-hall-contract-deal-uniformed-union-coalition-20191218-xcqmotnlnftgfosvbqivycq-story.html>

¹⁵ A news report indicates a 3-year agreement covering the captains and lieutenants associations was signed in December 2019, but a copy was not available online as of June 2020: <https://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/ny-city-hall-contract-deal-uniformed-union-coalition-20191218-xcqmotnlnftgfosvbqivycq-story.html>

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Oakland, CA	Memorandum of Understanding Between City of Oakland and Oakland Police Officers' Association	December 12, 2018 – June 30, 2024	Article X (Grievance Procedure) Appendix C (Civil Service Board/Hearing Officer)
Oklahoma City, OK	Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Oklahoma City and The Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 123, FY 2019-2020 (accessed via agenda item IX – L)	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020	Addendum E (Police Officer Bill of Rights)
Omaha, NE	Agreement Between the City of Omaha, Nebraska and the Omaha Police Union Local No. 101 AFL-CIO – I.U.P.A. A/K/A Omaha Police Officers Association	December 21, 2014 – December 26, 2020	Article 6 (Discharge and Discipline)
Orlando, FL	Agreement Between The City of Orlando and Orlando Lodge #25, Fraternal Order of Police, Inc. (download contract attachment)	October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2022	Article 5 (Employee Disciplinary Procedures) Article 6 (Grievance Procedure)
Philadelphia, PA	Contract Between the City of Philadelphia and Fraternal Order of Police Lodge No. 5 (2009-2014 contract) 2014-2017 arbitrators' award 2017-2020 arbitrators' award	July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2020 ¹⁶	XX (Discipline and Discharge (as modified by Section 5 (Discipline) of the 2014-2017 arbitrators' award) XXI (Grievance and Arbitration Procedure) XXII (Miscellaneous Provisions)
Phoenix, AZ	Memorandum of Understanding, City of Phoenix and Phoenix Law Enforcement Association	July 2019 – July 2021	Article I, Section 1-4 (Rights of Unit Members)
Pittsburgh, PA	Working Agreement between the City of Pittsburgh and the Fraternal Order of Police Fort Pitt Lodge No. 1 Interest Arbitration Award Fraternal Order of Police, Fort Pitt, Lodge No. 1 and City of Pittsburgh (On file at LDF)	January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2014 January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2018	2010-2014 Agreement: ¹⁷ Section 19 (Police Discipline Procedures) Section 20 (Personnel Files) Section 21 (Internal Investigation Procedures)
Portland, OR	Labor Agreement Between the Portland Police Association and the City of Portland (accessed via "Link to Exhibit A")	November 11, 2016 – June 30, 2020	Article 20 (Discipline) Article 21 (Discharge and Demotion) Article 61 (Portland Police Officers' Bill of Rights Preamble) Article 62 (Independent Police Review)
Reno, NV (Police)	Labor Agreement, City of Reno and Reno Police Protective Association	July 1, 2019- June 30, 2022	Article 29 (Discipline/Discharge)
Reno, NV (Deputy Chiefs)	Labor Agreement, City of Reno and Reno Police Supervisory/ Administrative Employees Administrative Unit, Deputy Chiefs	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022	Article 31 (Discipline/Discharge)
Reno, NV (Sergeants)	Labor Agreement, City of Reno and Reno Police Supervisory/ Administrative Employees Supervisory Unit, Sergeant	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022	Article 31 (Discipline/Discharge)
Reno, NV (Lieutenant)	Labor Agreement, City of Reno and Reno Police Supervisory/ Administrative Employees Supervisory Unit, Lieutenant	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022	Article 31 (Discipline/Discharge)

¹⁶ A news report indicates the agreement was extended through June 30, 2021: <https://www.inquirer.com/news/coronavirus-covid19-philadelphia-mayor-jim-kenney-fraternal-order-police-contract-extension-20200330.html>

¹⁷ A news report indicates a new arbitration award was made in January 2020: <https://www.publicsource.org/pittsburghs-contract-with-its-police-has-a-lot-to-say-about-officer-discipline-here-are-the-highlights/>

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Riverside, CA	Memorandum of Understanding Police Unit	December 2, 2016 – December 31, 2021	Article 16 (Grievance Procedures)
Rochester, NY	Agreement between The City of Rochester and Rochester Police Locust Club, Inc. (On file at LDF)	July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2016	Article 20 (Discipline) Article 21 (Members' Rights)
Sacramento, CA	City of Sacramento and Sacramento Police Officers Association Labor Agreement Covering Employees in the Police Department Unit	June 22, 2019 – September 25, 2021	June 22, 2019 – September 25, 2021 Section 4.2 (Employee Rights) Article 21 (Discipline)
San Antonio, TX	The City of San Antonio, Texas and The San Antonio Police Officers' Association	September 1, 2016 – September 30, 2021	Article 28 (Disciplinary Actions) Article 29 (Internal Security Interview Procedure)
San Bernardino, CA	Memorandum of Understanding, Specialized Peace Officer Unit, Specialized Peace Officer Supervisory Unit, 2020 – 2024	March 14, 2020 – December 31, 2024	Dispute Resolution Procedure, Section 6 (Disciplinary Hearings) Hours of Work Employee Rights
San Diego, CA	Memorandum of Understanding By and Between City of San Diego and San Diego Police Officers Association	July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2020	Article 21 (Formal Representation) Article 37 (Employee Representation) Article 41 (Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Procedures) Article 64 (Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act)
San Francisco, CA (Police Chief Contract)	Memorandum of Understanding Between City and County of San Francisco and Municipal Executives' Association Police	July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2021	Article II, Section F (Department of Police Accountability Records) Article IV (Training, Career Development, and Incentives)
San Francisco, CA (Police Contract)	Memorandum of Understanding Between City and County of San Francisco and San Francisco Police Officers' Association Units P-1 and P-2A	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021	Article II, Section 3 (Personnel Files) Article II, Section 4 (Rights of Individual Employees) Article II, Section 5 (Access to Records of Department of Police Accountability) Article II, Section 18 (Employee Training Reimbursement Program)
San Jose, CA (Police Contract)	Memorandum of Agreement, City of San Jose and San Jose Police Officers' Association Tentative agreement extending the above.	January 1, 2017 – June 30, 2020 July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021	Article 25, Section 8 (Disciplinary Grievances) Article 43 (Investigations)
Santa Ana, CA (Police Officers)	Memorandum of Understanding between The City of Santa Ana and the Santa Ana Police Officers Association	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021	Article XVI (Discipline)
Santa Ana, CA (Police Management)	Memorandum of Understanding between The City of Santa Ana and Santa Ana Police Management Association Representation Unit	July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2021	Article XVIII (Discipline)
Seattle, WA (Non-Management)	Agreement By and Between The City of Seattle and Seattle Police Officers' Guild	Effective through December 31, 2020	Article 3 (Disciplinary, Complaint Hearing, Internal Investigation Procedures and Police Officers' Bill of Rights)
Seattle, WA (Management)	Agreement By and Between The City of Seattle and Seattle Police Management Association	January 1, 2014 – December 31, 2019	Article 16 (Internal Investigation Procedures and The Police Officers' Bill of Rights)

COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT OF POLICE UNION CONTRACTS: APPENDIX A

CITY	NAME OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT	EFFECTIVE DATE	RELEVANT PROVISIONS
Spokane, WA (Lieutenants and Captains)	Agreement Between City Spokane and Spokane Police Lieutenants and Captains Association	January 1 – December 31, 2018	Article 12 (Discipline & Discharge) Appendix B (Sheriff Lieutenant's Rights in Discipline)
Spokane, WA (Police Guild) ¹⁸	Agreement Between City Spokane and Spokane and Spokane Police Guild	January 1, 2012 – December 31, 2016	Article 24 (Discipline) Article 27 (Civilian Review)
St. Louis, MO ¹⁹	Agreement between City of St. Louis Missouri and St. Louis Police Officer's Association/Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 68	June 30, 2014 – June 30, 2017	Article 9 (Investigative Rights) Article 11 (Discipline)
St. Paul, MN	Collective Bargaining Agreement Between The City of Saint Paul and The Saint Paul Police Federation	January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2020	Article 28 (Discipline)
St. Petersburg, FL (Police Contract)	Agreement Between the City of St. Petersburg and Sun Coast Police Benevolent Association for Police Officers and Technicians	November 25, 2019 – September 30, 2022	Article 2 (Employee rights)
St. Petersburg, FL (Supervisor Contract)	Agreement Between the City of St. Petersburg and Sun Coast Police Benevolent Association for Sergeants and Lieutenants	October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2022	Article 2 (Employee rights)
Stockton, CA (Police Officers Association)	Memorandum of Understanding Between the Stockton Police Officers Association and City of Stockton	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022	Section 7 (Discipline)
Stockton, CA (Police Service Management Unit)	Police Management Unit Successor MOU	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022	Section 7 (Discipline)
Tampa, FL	City of Tampa and Tampa Police Benevolent Association, Inc. (agenda item #31, File No. B2020-17 Resolution approving, ratifying, PBA Contract Redline Version.pdf)	October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2022	Article 4 (Grievance Procedure) Article 36 (Personnel Records) Article 37 (Formal Investigations) Article 38 (Discipline)
Tucson, AZ	Tucson Police Officers Association Exhibit A to Resolution No. 22426 City of Tucson Contract No. 18201	July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018	Article 9 (Employee Rights)
Tulsa, OK	Collective Bargaining Agreement Between City of Tulsa, Oklahoma and Lodge #93 Fraternal Order of Police	July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020	Article 11 (Police Department Rules and Regulations) Appendix B (Police Officer Bill of Rights)
Washington, DC ²⁰	Collective bargaining agreement between the Government of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department and the DC Police Union (Fraternal Order of Police MPD Labor Committee)	October 1, 2017 – September 30, 2020	Article 12 (Discipline) Article 13 (Investigatory Questioning) Article 16 (Employee Records)
Wichita, KS	Memorandum of Agreement by and between the City of Wichita, Kansas and Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #5, Wichita, Kansas, Inc.	December 15, 2018 – December 24, 2021	Article 13 (Disciplinary Procedures) Article 14 (Grievance Procedure)

¹⁸ A news report indicates negotiations for a new agreement are in process as of June 2020: <https://www.spokesman.com/stories/2020/jun/09/spokane-police-guild-eyes-long-overdue-contract-ci/#:~:text=The%20deal%20would%20be%20the,through%202020%2C%20totaling%20%246.2%20million.>

¹⁹ St. Louis approved a new contract for body and dash cameras in June 2020: https://www.kmov.com/news/st-louis-city-approves-contract-for-body-and-dash-cameras-for-city-officers/article_36e3fc3e-b0d1-11ea-8f85-03319e6d7439.html

²⁰ On July 30, 2020, the Council of the District of Columbia passed B23-0826, the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2020, which reserves disciplinary matters for management and prohibits negotiation of these in police collective bargaining agreements. The FOP filed suit on August 5, 2020 to challenge B23-0826.

APPENDIX B

STATES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS BILLS OF RIGHTS

ARIZONA

Arizona Revised Statute, Public Officers and Employees, §§ 38-1101 *et seq.*

<https://www.azleg.gov/arsDetail/?title=38>

ILLINOIS

Illinois Compiled Statutes Annotated, Local Government, §§ 725/1 *et seq.*

<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=736&ChapterID=11>

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Code Annotated, Local Government, §§ 14-52-301 *et seq.*

<https://law.justia.com/codes/arkansas/2012/title-14/subtitle-3/chapter-52/subchapter-3/>

IOWA

Iowa Code Annotated, Public Services and Regulations, §§ 80F *et seq.*

<https://www.legis.iowa.gov/publications/search/document?fq=id:1081090&pdid=1075975&q=80F#80F.1>

CALIFORNIA

California Annotated Code, Government, §§ 3300 *et seq.*

https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=4.&title=1.&part=&chapter=9.7.&article=

KENTUCKY

Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated, Executive Branch, § 15.520

[Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated, Executive Branch, § 15.520](http://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Law.aspx?d=98276)

DELAWARE

Delaware Code Annotated, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, §§ 9200 *et seq.*

<http://delcode.delaware.gov/title11/c092/>

LOUISIANA

Louisiana Statutes Annotated, Public Health and Safety, §§ 40:2531 *et seq.*

<http://legis.la.gov/legis/Law.aspx?d=98276>

FLORIDA

Florida Statutes Annotated, Public Officers, Employees, and Records, §§ 112.532 *et seq.*

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=0100-0199/0112/Sections/0112.532.html

MARYLAND

Maryland Annotated Code, Public Safety, §§ 3-101 *et seq.* (amended by MD Senate Bill 793, Chapter 25 (2019))

<http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/laws/StatuteText?article=gps§ion=3-101&enactments=false>

MINNESOTA

Minnesota Statutes Annotated, Criminal Procedure, Peace Officers Privacy of Communications, § 626.89

<https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=626.89>

TENNESSEE

Tennessee Code Annotated, Prevention and Detection of Crime, §§ 38-8-301 *et seq.*

<https://law.justia.com/codes/tennessee/2017/title-38/chapter-8/part-3/>

NEVADA

Nevada Revised Statutes Annotated, Public Officers and Employees, §§ 289.020 *et seq.* (amended by NV Senate Bill 242, Chapter 430 (2019))

<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-289.html>

TEXAS

Texas Statutes and Codes Annotated, Local Government, §§ 143.051 *et seq.* and 143.123

<https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/LG/htm/LG.143.htm>

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico Statutes Annotated, Law Enforcement, §§ 29-14-1 *et seq.*

<https://law.justia.com/codes/new-mexico/2011/chapter29/article14/>

VIRGINIA

Annotated Code of Virginia, Commonwealth Public Safety, §§ 9.1-500 *et seq.* (amended by VA House Bill 2656, Chapter 489 (2019) and Senate Bill 616, Chapter 958 (2020))³

<https://vacode.org/9.1/5/>

OREGON

Oregon Revised Statutes Annotated, Public Officers and Employees, § 236.350 *et seq.*¹

<https://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/236.360>

WEST VIRGINIA

Annotated Code of West Virginia, Municipal Corporations, §§ 8-14A-1 *et seq.*

<http://www.legis.state.wv.us/wvcode/Code.cfm?chap=08&art=14A>

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island General Laws Annotated, State Affairs and Government, §§ 42-28.6-1 *et seq.*²

<http://webserver.rilin.state.ri.us/Statutes/TITLE42/42-28.6/INDEX.HTM>

WISCONSIN

Wisconsin Statutes Annotated §§ 164.01 *et seq.*

<https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/164>

¹ On June 30, 2020, Oregon enacted [House Bill 4201](#), which establishes a joint committee comprised of lawmakers from both chambers of the legislature. The joint committee will explore policies that aim to (i) increase transparency in use of force by police officer investigations and complaints, (ii) reduce the prevalence of serious physical injury or death caused by the use of force by police officers, (iii) enhance independent review of the use of deadly force by police, and (iv) increase transparency generally in policing and reform the use of force by police. The joint committee is required to provide legislative recommendations by December 31, 2020.

² On June 18, 2020, the Rhode Island Senate passed [Senate Resolution 2867](#), which establishes a legislative task force to review and provide recommendations on policies pertaining to the Rhode Island Law Enforcement Officers Bill of Rights. The task force is required to report its findings and recommendations by February 9, 2021. In addition, Rhode Island [House Bill 8036](#), which would reform the state's Law Enforcement Officer Bill of Rights and provide greater accountability in the disciplinary process, was introduced on June 18, 2020.

³ On June 11, 2020, Virginia's Governor Ralph Northam issued an [amended executive order](#) to continue the "Commission to Examine Racial Inequity in Virginia Law." The commission will review Virginia's laws that have, or could have, the effect of enabling or promoting racial inequity or inequality, including in the public safety and criminal justice systems. On June 15, 2020, the Commission's Vice Chair and students from the University of Virginia School of Law [submitted policy recommendations](#) for the Commission to consider, including to amend or repeal the grievance procedures of the state's Law Enforcement Officer Bill of Rights.