

PROTECTING OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EMERGENCY ACT

JUNE 4, 2025.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COMER, from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2096]

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2096) to restore the right to negotiate matters pertaining to the discipline of law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia through collective bargaining, to restore the statute of limitations for bringing disciplinary cases against members or civilian employees of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary and Purpose of Legislation	2
Background and Need for Legislation	2
Section-by-Section Analysis	3
Legislative History	3
Committee Consideration	4
Roll Call Votes	4
Explanation of Amendments	6
List of Related Committee Hearings	6
Statement of Oversight Findings and Recommendations of the Committee	6
Statement of General Performance Goals and Objectives	6
Application of Law to the Legislative Branch	6
Duplication of Federal Programs	7
Federal Advisory Committee Act Statement	7
Unfunded Mandates Reform Act Statement	7
Earmark Identification	7
Committee Cost Estimate	7
New Budget Authority and Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	7
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	7

Minority Views	10
----------------------	----

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Our Nation’s Capital Emergency Act”.

SEC. 2. RESTORATION OF EQUITABLE AND FAIR TREATMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) RESTORATION OF RIGHT TO NEGOTIATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO DISCIPLINE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS THROUGH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.—Section 1708 of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (sec. 1–617.08, D.C. Official Code), as amended by section 116(b) of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24–345), is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) RESTORATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR CLAIMS AGAINST MEMBERS OR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.—Subtitle M of title I of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24–345) is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such subtitle is restored or revived as if such subtitle had not been enacted into law.

SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

H.R. 2096 amends the D.C. Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to repeal two amendments recently made by the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24–345), including the ability of the Metro Police Department (MPD) officer union to bargain on matters of officer discipline, removal of a strict timeline under which such discipline must be carried out for alleged wrongdoing, and the creation of a public website announcing the schedule of adverse action hearings for officers.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

H.R. 2096 would overturn certain provisions in the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, which was passed by the D.C. Council on January 4, 2023. In the 118th Congress, in response to the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, the Congress voted in a bipartisan fashion to pass H.J. Res. 42, a resolution of disapproval of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act. H.J. Res. 42 was then vetoed by President Biden. Additionally, in the 118th Congress, a bill identical to H.R. 2096 was passed out of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability by a vote of 22–19.

Local D.C. residents are aware of this and have held community meetings to discuss crime, particularly carjackings.¹ Crime is also occurring right outside of Federal government buildings.² On March 21, 2025, a D.C. violence interrupter (a group of individuals serving as alternatives to traditional police charged with curbing crime in the District) was himself arrested for first degree murder in a D.C. shooting—an occurrence that calls into serious question the viability of local government alternatives to traditional polic-

¹ Sierra Fox, *Community demands Accountability for juvenile crimes at carjacking panel in Southeast*, FOX 5 (Jan. 31, 2024), <https://www.fox5dc.com/news/community-demands-Accountability-for-juvenile-crimes-at-carjacking-panel-in-southeast>.

² *MPD Investigating Man’s Overnight Crime Spree, Leaving 1 Dead and 1 with Critical Injuries*, DC.GOV (Jan. 30, 2024), <https://mpdc.dc.gov/release/mpd-investigating-man%E2%80%99s-overnight-crime-spree-leaving-1-dead-and-1-critical-injuries>.

ing.³ It is clear that the District of Columbia needs more police officers on the streets. D.C.’s businesses recognize the seriousness of the rising crime and have responded by either closing their doors or relocating to safer regions. In 2024, the District of Columbia saw the highest number of restaurant closings in its history.⁴

Meanwhile, the D.C. Council has chosen to attack their own police force, singling out the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) as the only major police union with restrictions on its ability to bargain on disciplinary matters. H.R. 2096 would restore D.C. police officers’ collective bargaining rights by restoring their ability to negotiate matters pertaining to officer discipline through the collective bargaining process. Next, it would restore the requirement for claims against MPD members or civilian employees of MPD be timely, as prolonged investigations can represent its own form of additional punishment to officers. Finally, it would remove the requirement for D.C. to publicly disclose the time and location of officers’ adverse actions hearings.

D.C. cannot afford to lose any more officers while combatting rising crime and keeping D.C. residents safe. It is the Committee’s position that these policies must be reinstated in D.C. Code in order to preserve the MPD’s ability to recruit and retain officers.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title

The short title is the “Protecting Our Nation’s Capital Emergency Act of 2025”.

Section 2. Restoration of equitable and fair treatment of law enforcement personnel of District of Columbia

Subsection (a) restores the D.C. law enforcement officers’ right to collectively bargain on matters pertaining to discipline. Subsection (b) restores the requirement for timely disciplinary actions regarding claims against members or civilian employees of MPD. The subsection also removes the requirement for a public website to provide the time and place for adverse action hearings against officers.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

H.R. 2096, the Protecting Our Nation’s Capital Emergency Act of 2025, was introduced on March 14, 2025, by Representative Andrew Garbarino (R–NY). The following Representatives are cosponsors of the bill: Pete Stauber (R–MN), Andy Biggs (R–AZ), and John Rutherford (R–FL). The bill was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The Committee considered H.R. 2096 at a business meeting on May 21, 2025, and ordered the bill as amended favorably reported by a recorded vote.

³DC violence interrupter arrested for deadly shooting, NBCWASHINGTON (Mar. 25, 2025), <https://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/dc-violence-interrupter-arrested-for-deadly-shooting/3874237/>.

⁴Jeff Clabaugh, *Half of DC restaurants say business is down, many may close, survey finds*, WTOPNEWS (Mar. 19, 2025), <https://wtop.com/business-finance/2025/03/half-of-dc-restaurants-say-business-is-down-many-may-close/>.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On May 21, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill, H.R. 2096, favorably reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, by a roll call vote of 23–18, a quorum being present.

ROLL CALL VOTES

In compliance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following roll call vote occurred during the Committee's consideration of H.R. 2096:

The roll call vote was on favorably reporting H.R. 2096. The bill was agreed to in a recorded vote of 23–18.

ROLL CALL

Vote on: Final Passage – H.R. 2096, the Protecting Our Nation's Capital Emergency Act

Date: 5/21/2025

VOTE #: 6

Republicans	Aye	No	Present	Democrats	Aye	No	Present
MR. COMER (KY) <i>(Chairman)</i>	X			MR. CONNOLLY (VA) <i>(Ranking Member)</i>			
MR. JORDAN (OH)				MS. NORTON (DC)		X	
MR. TURNER (OH)	X			MR. LYNCH (MA)		X	
MR. GOSAR (AZ)	X			MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY (IL)		X	
MS. FOXX (NC)				MR. KHANNA (CA)		X	
MR. GROTHMAN (WI)	X			MR. MFUME (MD)		X	
MR. CLOUD (TX)	X			MS. BROWN (OH)		X	
MR. PALMER (AL)	X			MS. STANSBURY (NM)		X	
MR. HIGGINS (LA)	X			MR. GARCIA (CA)		X	
MR. SESSIONS (TX)	X			MR. FROST (FL)		X	
MR. BIGGS (AZ)	X			MS. LEE of PENNSYLVANIA (PA)		X	
MS. MACE (SC)	X			MR. CASAR (TX)		X	
MR. FALLON (TX)	X			MS. CROCKETT (TX)		X	
MR. DONALDS (FL)				MS. RANDALL (WA)			
MR. PERRY (PA)				MR. SUBRAMANYAM (VA)		X	
MR. TIMMONS (SC)	X			MS. ANSARI (AZ)		X	
MR. BURCHETT (TN)	X			MR. BELL (MO)		X	
MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA (GA)	X			MS. SIMON (CA)		X	
MS. BOEBERT (CO)	X			MR. MIN (CA)	X		
MRS. LUNA (FL)	X			MS. PRESSLEY (MA)		X	
MR. LANGWORTHY (NY)	X			MS. TLAIB (MI)		X	
MR. BURLISON (MO)	X						
MR. CRANE (AZ)	X						
MR. JACK (GA)	X						
MR. MCGUIRE (VA)	X						
MR. GILL (TX)	X						

Roll Call Totals:

Ayes: 23

Nays: 18

Present:

Passed: X Failed:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

During Committee consideration of the bill, Representative James Comer (R-KY), Chairman of the Committee, offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute that made a certain technical change to the bill. The amendment in the nature of a substitute passed by voice vote.

LIST OF RELATED COMMITTEE HEARINGS

In accordance with House Rule XIII, clause 3(c)(6), (1) The following hearing was used to develop or consider H.R. 2096:

On March 11, 2025, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement held a legislative hearing titled “Enhancing Federal, State, and Local Coordination in the Fight Against Criminal Illegal Aliens” with Joseph Humire, Executive Director, The Center for a Secure Free Society; the Honorable Bob Gaultieri, Sheriff, Pinellas County, Florida; and Kerry E. Doyle, Former Principal Legal Advisor, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(2) The following related hearing was held:

On March 11, 2025, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement held a legislative hearing titled “Enhancing Federal, State, and Local Coordination in the Fight Against Criminal Illegal Aliens” with Joseph Humire, Executive Director, The Center for a Secure Free Society; the Honorable Bob Gaultieri, Sheriff, Pinellas County, Florida; and Kerry E. Doyle, Former Principal Legal Advisor, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

STATEMENT OF OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII and clause (2)(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the Background and Need for Legislation section above.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In accordance with clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s performance goals or objectives of this bill are to restore the ability of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) to negotiate matters pertaining to the discipline of law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia, to restore the statute of limitations for resolving disciplinary cases against members or civilian employees of the MPD, and for other purposes.

APPLICATION OF LAW TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Section 102(b)(3) of Public Law 104–1 requires a description of the application of this bill to the legislative branch where the bill relates to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services and accommodations. This bill does not relate to employment or access to public services and accommodations in the legislative branch.

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

In accordance with clause 3(c)(5) of rule XIII no provision of this bill establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92–463 (5 U.S.C. 1004(b)), the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Committee finds that this Committee Print does not direct the establishment of an advisory committee.

UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to section 423 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974* the Committee has included a letter received from the Congressional Budget Office below.

EARMARK IDENTIFICATION

This bill does not include any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee includes below a cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974*.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of House rule XIII, the Committee adopts as its own the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

**SECTION 1-617.08 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICIAL CODE**

§ 1-617.08. Management rights; matters subject to collective bargaining

(a) The respective personnel authorities (management) shall retain the sole right, in accordance with applicable laws and rules and regulations:

(1) To direct employees of the agencies;

(2) To hire, promote, transfer, assign, and retain employees in positions within the agency and to suspend, demote, discharge, or take other disciplinary action against employees for cause;

(3) To relieve employees of duties because of lack of work or other legitimate reasons;

(4) To maintain the efficiency of the District government operations entrusted to them;

(5) To determine:

(A) The mission of the agency, its budget, its organization, the number of employees, and to establish the tour of duty;

(B) The number, types, and grades of positions of employees assigned to an agency's organizational unit, work project, or tour of duty;

(C) The technology of performing the agency's work; and

(D) The agency's internal security practices; and

(6) To take whatever actions may be necessary to carry out the mission of the District government in emergency situations.

(a-1) An act, exercise, or agreement of the respective personnel authorities (management) shall not be interpreted in any manner as a waiver of the sole management rights contained in subsection (a) of this section.

(b) All matters shall be deemed negotiable except those that are proscribed by this subchapter. Negotiations concerning compensation are authorized to the extent provided in 1-617.16.

[(c)(1) All matters pertaining to the discipline of sworn law enforcement personnel shall be retained by management and not be negotiable through bargaining, including substantive or impacts-and-effects bargaining.

[(2) This subsection shall apply to any collective bargaining agreements entered into with the Fraternal Order of Police/Metropolitan Police Department Labor Committee after September 30, 2020, and to any collective bargaining agreements automatically renewed on or after September 30, 2020.]

SUBTITLE M OF TITLE I OF THE COMPREHENSIVE POLICING AND JUSTICE REFORM AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022

[Subtitle M—OFFICER DISCIPLINE REFORMS

[SEC. 117. Section 502 of the Omnibus Public Safety Agency Reform Amendment Act of 2004, effective September 30, 2004 (D.C. Law 15-194; D.C. Official Code § 5-1031), is amended as follows:

[(a) Subsection (a-1) is repealed.

[(b) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

[(b) If the act or occurrence allegedly constituting cause is the subject of a criminal investigation by the Metropolitan Police Department or any law enforcement or prosecuting agency with jurisdiction within the United States, the Office of the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, or the Office of the Attorney General, or is the subject of an investigation by the Office of the Inspector General or the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, the 90-day period for commencing a corrective or adverse action under subsection (a) of this section shall be tolled until the conclusion of the investigation.”

[(c) A new subsection (c) is added to read as follows:

[(c)(1) MPD shall publish, on a publicly accessible website, a schedule of adverse action hearings for cases in which the proposed discipline is termination.

[(2) The schedule shall include:

[(A) The date, time, and location of the hearing;

[(B) The name and badge number of the subject officer; and

[(C) A summary of the alleged misconduct or charges against the subject officer.”

[SEC. 118. Section 6-A1001.5 of Chapter 10 of Title 6 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations is amended by striking the phrase “reduce the penalty” and inserting the phrase “reduce or increase the penalty” in its place.]

* * * * *

MINORITY VIEWS

Committee Democrats strongly oppose H.R. 2096, which would repeal provisions of a law duly enacted by the District of Columbia (D.C.), because we strongly support local D.C. self-government.

DENIAL OF DEMOCRACY IN D.C.

The principles of no taxation without representation and consent of the governed helped launch the American Revolution and are enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. Yet, D.C. residents, who pay all federal taxes, have no voting representation in Congress, and Congress has plenary authority over D.C.¹

The Majority claims Congress has a constitutional duty to legislate on local D.C. matters. That is false, and Republicans choose to legislate on local D.C. matters when they think they can score political points.

Despite giving Congress plenary authority over D.C., the Framers expected Congress to establish a local government for D.C.² Indeed, Congress has established various forms of local government for D.C. since 1802.³ The Supreme Court has held that “there is no constitutional barrier to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power.”⁴

In 1973, Congress passed the D.C. Home Rule Act, which established an elected chief executive (the D.C. Mayor) and an elected legislature (the D.C. Council) for D.C.⁵ The purpose of the D.C. Home Rule Act is to, among other things, “grant to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia powers of local self-government” and “relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters.”⁶ H.R. 2096 contravenes the purpose of the D.C. Home Rule Act. Both D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser and the D.C. Council oppose H.R. 2096.⁷

POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

The merits of H.R. 2096 are beside the point, because we support D.C. home rule, but we will address them nonetheless. Police officers are entrusted with extraordinary authority to protect public

¹ U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 17.

² “[A] municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them.” Library of Congress, *Federalist Nos. 41–50* (online at <https://guides.loc.gov/federalist-papers/text-41-50>).

³ Congressional Research Service, *Governing the District of Columbia: Overview and Timeline* (Jan. 29, 2024) (online at www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF12577).

⁴ *District of Columbia v. John R. Thompson Co., Inc.*, 346 U.S. 100, 109 (1953).

⁵ Pub. L. No. 93–198 (1973).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Letter from District of Columbia Mayor Muriel Bowser to Rep. James Comer, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rep. Gerald Connolly, Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (May 21, 2025); Letter from Council of the District of Columbia to Rep. James Comer, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rep. Gerald Connolly, Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (May 20, 2025).

safety. The vast majority of police officers exercise that authority honorably and bravely. However, there must be accountability and transparency for instances in which police officers violate their oath of office.

Following the devastating murder of George Floyd, D.C. enacted the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (CPJRAA), which, in pertinent part, made it easier for the police department to discipline police officers for violating their oath of office. H.R. 2096 would repeal police officer discipline provisions in the CPJRAA.

H.R. 2096, as introduced, includes a purpose section. According to the introduced version of H.R. 2096, the purpose of the bill is “to combat the rise in violent crime in our Nation’s Capital by eliminating policies which place law enforcement personnel of the District of Columbia at risk and discourage them from serving, ensuring that such personnel will be treated equitably and fairly and the recruitment and retention of such personnel shall be increased.” We are not surprised that H.R. 2096, as ordered to be reported, does not include that purpose section, since it is inaccurate.

Violent crime is not rising in D.C. In 2025, violent crime in D.C. is down 22%, compared to the same period in 2024.⁸ In 2024, violent crime in D.C. was the lowest in over 30 years.⁹

The D.C. police department is not alone in having difficulty recruiting and retaining police officers. Police departments across the country are having difficulty with recruitment and retention, and this difficulty predates the police accountability and transparency legislation enacted across the country in the aftermath of the murder of George Floyd.¹⁰ A survey conducted in 2019 found that “the challenge of recruiting law enforcement is widespread and affects agencies of all types, sizes, and locations across the United States.”¹¹ That survey also found that “the difficulty in recruiting law enforcement officers and employees is not due to one particular cause. Rather, multiple social, political, and economic forces are all simultaneously at play.”¹²

The actual purpose of H.R. 2096 is to make it harder for the police department to discipline police officers who violate their oath of office. Before the CPJRAA, the police department had been forced to rehire a significant number of police officers it had fired for crimes and official misconduct.¹³ D.C. also had to provide millions of dollars in back pay to police officers it was forced to rehire,

⁸Metropolitan Police Department, *District Crime Data at a Glance* (online at www.mpd.dc.gov/dailycrime) (accessed May 28, 2025).

⁹Office of the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, *Violent Crime in D.C. Hits 30 Year Low* (Jan. 3, 2025) (online at www.justice.gov/usao-dc/pr/violent-crime-dc-hits-30-year-low#:text=WASHINGTON%20-%20Total%20violent%20crime%20for,Graves.).

¹⁰International Association of Chiefs of Police, *The State of Recruitment & Retention: A Continuing Crisis for Policing* (www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2024-11/IACP_Recruitment_Report_Survey.pdf) (accessed May 28, 2025).

¹¹International Association of Chiefs of Police, *The State of Recruitment: A Crisis for Law Enforcement* (online at www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/239416_IACP_RecruitmentBR_HR_0.pdf) (accessed May 28, 2025).

¹²*Id.*

¹³Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, *36 Fired MPD Officers Reinstated; Receive \$14 Million in Back Pay* (Oct. 6, 2022) (online at www.dcauditor.org/report/mpd-personnel-settlement-report/).

and D.C. paid millions of dollars to resolve claims alleging police officer misconduct.¹⁴

H.R. 2096 would repeal four police officer discipline provisions in the CPJRAA.

First, H.R. 2096 would repeal a provision that removed police officer discipline from collective bargaining. Several states, including states represented by Republican Members of the Committee, prohibit collective bargaining by police officers.¹⁵ The CPJRAA maintained the right of police officers to collectively bargain, except over discipline, and maintains the civil service protections and due process rights of police officers.

Collective bargaining by police officers has been widely criticized for protecting police officers from discipline for crimes and official misconduct. A Republican staff report for the Joint Economic Committee said that “[c]ollective bargaining plays a significant role in shielding police officers from the consequences of their misconduct.”¹⁶ A law review article conducted an empirical examination of police union contracts, concluding, “This [a]rticle’s findings are consistent with the hypothesis that police union contracts sometimes establish problematic internal disciplinary procedures that serve as barriers to accountability.”¹⁷

Second, H.R. 2096 would reinstate a 90-day statute of limitations on the police department to commence discipline. The CPJRAA repealed that provision because 90 days was not enough time in some cases to commence discipline. Adjudicators had overturned discipline in some cases because the police department had exceeded 90 days to commence discipline, and there is no statute of limitations for commencing discipline against most other D.C. government employees.¹⁸ The home state of Rep. Andrew Garbarino, the sponsor of H.R. 2096, has an 18-month statute of limitations to commence discipline against police officers.¹⁹

Third, H.R. 2096 would repeal a provision that gave the police chief the authority to increase the discipline proposed by a police trial board, which consists of police officers. Before the CPJRAA, the police chief could only impose or reduce the proposed discipline or order a new trial. The CPJRAA increased the discipline power of the police chief and reduced the discipline power of the police trial board, which may be more inclined to protect their fellow police officers from discipline.²⁰

¹⁴Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, *36 Fired MPD Officers Reinstated; Receive \$14 Million in Back Pay* (Oct. 6, 2022) (online at www.dcauditor.org/report/mpd-personnel-settlement-report/); *The Hidden Billion-Dollar Cost of Repeated Police Misconduct*, Washington Post (May 9, 2022) (online at www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/interactive/2022/police-misconduct-repeated-settlements/).

¹⁵*Ballotpedia, Public-Sector Union Policy in the United States, 2018-2023* (online at www.ballotpedia.org/Public-sector-union-policy-in-the-United-States,2018-2023).

¹⁶Joint Economic Committee, *Accountability for Bad Apples: Police Reforms to Restore Faith in Institutions* (Mar. 2021) (online at www.jec.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/e54f6c37-017c-49c2-ad0b-de12bcc48978/3-21-police-reform.pdf).

¹⁷Stephen Rushin, *Police Union Contracts*, 66 Duke L.J. 1191, 1239 (2017) (online at <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3890&context=dlj>).

¹⁸Council of the District of Columbia Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety, *Report on Bill 24-0320, the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022* (Nov. 30, 2022) (online at https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47448/Committee_Report/B24-0320-Committee_Report1.pdf).

¹⁹N.Y. Civil Service Law § 75(4) (online at www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/CVS/75).

²⁰*D.C. Police Tried to Fire 24 Current Officers For ‘Criminal Offenses.’ A Powerful Panel Blocked Nearly Every One, Documents Show*, DCist (Dec. 18, 2021) (online at www.dcist.com/story/21/12/18/dc-police-panel-blocked-mpd-firings/).

Finally, H.R. 2096 would repeal a provision that required the police department to publish on a public website a schedule of police officer discipline hearings, which are open to the public.

CONCLUSION

We strongly oppose H.R. 2096 and any other effort to undermine the will of D.C. residents and their locally elected representatives. Instead of interfering in local D.C. matters, Congress should grant D.C.'s statehood petition.

STEPHEN F. LYNCH,
Acting Ranking Member.

