



Contact: Chas Moore
 1-713-459-2333
 chasmoore@austinjustice.org

Huge cost increase for marginal gains, most problems not addressed

The new police contract includes large pay increases. Under the (flawed) logic of the process, such large increases *could* have been accompanied by the kind of significant reforms that would bring Austin into line with other cities across the nation. Instead, the marginal gains keep our current failed system entirely intact. While it will be easier to make a complaint, what happens next will depend on the same "black box" system that has already failed to end the unnecessary loss of life, bring community trust, and reduce force incidents.

For marginal reforms, we are paying a significantly higher rate as follows:

Pay Type	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Base pay	1%	1%	2%	2.5%	3%
Patrol stipend		\$2400	\$3000	\$3600	\$4200
Signing bonus	\$1,000				

For patrol officers with 7 yrs of seniority who are on patrol, currently making base pay of \$77,766 (excluding overtime), the overall pay increase works as follows (based on the attached pay tables):

Pay Type	Contract Yr 7 yrs service	Year 2 7 yrs service	Year 3 7 yrs service	Year 4 7 yrs service	Year 5 7 yrs service
Base pay	\$78,544	\$79,329	\$80,916	82939	85427
Patrol stipend		\$2,400	\$3,000	\$3600	\$4200
Signing bonus	\$1,000				
Total pay	\$79,544	\$81,729	\$83,916	\$86,539	\$89,627
Percent increase	2.3%	2.7%	2.7%	3.1%	3.6%

For an individual patrol officer with seven years of service currently on patrol and making \$77,766, and including step pay increases, the salary rate (not including overtime) would increase as follows over the term of this contract:

Pay	Year 1 (8 th)	Year 2 (9 th)	Year 3 (10 th)	Year 4 (11 th)	Year 5 (12 th)
Annual pay	\$79,544	\$81,729	\$89,581	\$92,346	\$95,608
Percent increase	2.3%	2.7%	9.6%	3%	3.5%
Annual pay at theoretical 2.5% increase each year	\$79,710	\$81,702	\$83,745	\$85,839	\$87,985

Community Reform	Contract Response
1. Suspensions should not be automatically reduced to written reprimand and the chief should be able to consider all past misconduct in future discipline.	NON RESPONSIVE Art. 18, Sec. 1, Sub. (c), p. 71: Leaves automatic reduction and limits on the chief in place, but excludes from this process suspensions related to excessive force and racial profiling. There have been no 1 to 3 day suspensions for these causes, so this change has no impact on the current system.
2. The Chief should be able to discipline an officer if facts emerge after 180 days has passed.	RESPONSIVE IN PART Art. 18, Sec. 8(a), p. 74: Gives Chief 180 days from discovery date instead of incident date for actions that might meet a criminal charge definition including excessive force. Second officer in Breion King case would be under old standard and still have no consequence, so we agree this is responsive, but leaves issues.
3. History of misconduct should be included as a system of deductions from the scoring system used to promote officers.	NON RESPONSIVE No change addresses this proposal
4. Citizens should be able to make phone and online complaints, and management should be able to make a preliminary review of any evidence without a "verified" statement. <i>[likely to be in the final agreement]</i>	RESPONSIVE The new contract allows online, phone and anonymous complaints.
5. The Citizens Review Panel should be able to: 1. freely ask questions, 2. subpoena witness and evidence, and 3. listen to witnesses at the same time as the panel hears from police officers and union reps.	NON RESPONSIVE The new contract allows: 1. A CRP panelist to watch the IA interview with an officer from behind a glass but not pose questions or ensure that the interview is probative. 2. No change. The contract specifies that "the OPM shall not gather evidence, contact or interview witnesses (except the complainant as provided herein), or otherwise independently investigate...." 3. No change. The panel does not get to hear from witnesses, but only receives a presentation from IA and can review the IA materials.
6. The Office of Police Monitor should have the power to initiate investigations, even if a citizen has not filed a complaint.	RESPONSIVE The OPM can now file his own complaint through the new complaint system.

<p>7. Stop sealing records of misconduct in 143.089(g) files, as can be done through this contract. Publish and make readily available to the public internal affairs transcripts of interview with officer and all final disciplinary decisions.</p>	<p>NON RESPONSIVE The "transparency" reform in this new contract is exceedingly narrow. The OPM will be able to tell an individual (verbally only, nothing in writing) the outcome of the investigation of his or her complaint even if it does not result in a suspension, but as before, only suspensions will become public in the form of a posted suspension memo. The Chief's response to CRP recommendations can be made public as long as all information identifying an officer and the location and date of an incident is redacted.</p>
<p>8. Reports/recommendations should all be released to the public without expurgation based on the city legal's determination that other possible exceptions to the Public Information Act could be claimed.</p>	<p>NON RESPONSIVE The system of public release of panel recommendations is unchanged. All letters to the Chief will be sent to city legal and can be expurgated under any available exception to disclosure. The panel can make recommendations on a slightly expanded set of topics (training, other internal practices). These new recommendations will be public.</p>

