Shame on You Lou

As a union board member you have to have very thick skin. You get called names and told that you don’t care about the new guy or the old guy or the guy in the middle. You get told that you’re out of touch and you don’t represent the majority of the membership. You’re told that you are only doing it for yourself and you obviously have a personal agenda. Well, for the most part, board members understand that these officers are frustrated with the politics of the police department and are venting on you and it’s not personal. I get that and I accept that those things are a part of serving the members.

However, when you have members of a frat house that prefer to constantly attack rather than to step up and serve and seem comfortable misrepresenting information to police officers, I can only keep quiet for so long. At some point I have to answer their lack of experience and perspective and direct the members back to reality. Unfortunately, by responding to these lies some might think that I’m somehow giving credibility to this police fraternity. That is not my intent. My intent is to present facts and let the membership decide whether Lou Manganiello’s FOP is being truthful or not.

In an AzCentral article dated 2-11-2010 entitled, “Firefighters, police unions OK cut in pay of 3.2%,” Officer Lou Manganiello, President of the Phoenix Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police, was quoted giving several statements that I believe are a misrepresentation of information. Allow me to point a few of these issues out and you decide.

“He (Manganiello) and other unions like the Phoenix Sergeants and Lieutenants Association believe it reflects younger officers’ frustration with union politics…..” Younger officers frustrations - really. PLEA is working with the community to change the jail process (young officer issue) not Lou or the FOP or PPSLA. PLEA is fighting for more rifles, facilitated a $100,000 David Spade donation (through a PLEA Fox News interview), and is still seeking a private purchase rifle policy for patrol (young officer issue). Where’s Lou, the FOP, or PPSLA on this problem? PLEA, with the 50,000 plus members of Citizens for Phoenix coalition, is offering solutions and fighting to save 286 jobs (young officer issue) that the City wants to cut. Haven’t heard Lou, the FOP, or PPSLA on this one.

PLEA continues to work to represent all of its members equally and does what it believes is fair for all members. PLEA’s 35 years track record proves that – does Lou’s or the FOP’s? You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on?

The article continued: “In the past couple of years, we’ve gone away from this being the bingo hall,’ said Manganiello, who became a Phoenix police officer 13 years ago.” Why were you a bingo hall in the first place? Lou’s fraternity’s web site shows that they still hold Bingo every Wednesday and Thursday at 6:30pm. The next problem I have is that Lou graduated from the police academy on September 9, 1994. I’m not the greatest at math but that adds up to almost 16 years on the police department, not 13 years. I should know. Lou was in my academy class. It appears that Lou bought his prior service with the city and military because he’s in DROP. The only way to be in DROP is to have 20 years of service invested in the pension system. How does the retired President of the FOP Lodge 2 have the best interest of young officers in mind and the current PLEA board doesn’t? Also, what I find very ironic is Lou attacks PLEA, communicating that PLEA isn’t representing officers and that the PLEA board is only carrying out personal agendas. But yet Lou has no problem reaping the benefits that PLEA negotiated over the decades for Phoenix Police Officers. You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on?

PLEA members pay $21 a month for legal services; FOP members pay $25.

The article continues by stating, “PLEA members generally pay about $65 a month for legal services. The FOP offers a similar job-insurance service at $35 a month.” First, PLEA monthly dues go towards a lot more than just legal fees. Second, PLEA members pay $21 a month for legal services; FOP members pay $25. Third, PLEA’s legal representation is far superior to the FOP. PLEA covers off duty conduct which may lead to discipline. Go to www.azplea.com to view the legal representation comparison as compared to the FOP website.

Lou’s police fraternity put out information that PLEA is going to increase dues. Ladies and gentleman, THIS IS NOT TRUE. PLEA has no intention of increasing your dues and this has not even been discussed at any board meeting. The reason I know this is because I have actually been at every board meeting. In fact, if the members ratify concessions, dues will come down. It bothers me, as it should you, that Lou’s police fraternity can just say whatever it wants and there is no accountability. You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on?
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Lou’s police fraternity put out information that PLEA is going to increase dues. Ladies and gentleman, THIS IS NOT TRUE.

Lou believes the reason is, “...because the current PLEA leadership has systematically alienated both management and fellow police officers.” Really, that’s an outlandish opinion and nothing more. Lou made an alarming comment: “Humorously, the current PLEA president is sometimes called, ‘Deputy Spencer.’” Well, Lou certainly knows about “systematically alienating fellow police officers.” As if being called a “Deputy” is a put down. I for one would be proud to be called a “Deputy” and would stand shoulder to shoulder with any one of our brothers in brown at the Sheriff’s office or any other agency across this great country. Yes, PLEA has successfully worked with numerous sheriff offices throughout the state. PLEA has also been successful working with management, both Police and City, to obtain member wage increases, rights to help with PSB investigations and citizen complaints, and various other issues. The same ones you enjoy, Lou.

Here’s an interesting question. Lou, why didn’t you run for the president’s position against Mark? I’ll tell you why. Because it’s easier for you to point fingers and tell everybody how bad a job PLEA is doing and that you can do it better, but yet you’ve never done it. Perhaps it’s because you don’t have the testicular fortitude to step up and get involved and affect change. I haven’t seen you at a negotiation table working for members. I haven’t seen you at an IRP helping a member. I haven’t seen you at a DRB defending members. I haven’t seen you at a Use of Force Board serving members. I haven’t seen you speak at the City Council on behalf of the members. I haven’t seen you speak at the State Legislature to protect members. I haven’t seen you pour hours into a member’s misconduct investigation. I haven’t seen you at membership meetings presenting your arguments for change. I haven’t seen you at board meetings presenting your position on issues. Lou, why do you consider your efforts at spaghetti dinners so noble, but declare the benefits, rights, and wages achieved by PLEA for all Phoenix Police Officers as worthless?

Lou writes: “Mindless political agendas and immigration lawsuits...” and “PLEA’s only method of communicating member concerns to the Phoenix Police Department is to attack it using the media.” Really, fighting for more rifles in patrol, fighting to change an immigration policy that was killing and injuring officers, fighting for DROP to stay in place for all officers (something Lou enjoys now), fighting to protect our pension from management abuse, fighting for unity for all front line officers in the State and nationally; these issues are mindless political agendas? I thought protecting members was one of the important services a union provides. As far as how we communicate with the Police Department, how would you know? You’re not involved. You’re not here to watch as we send our concerns to the Department via e-mails, letters, phone calls, certified mail, and face to face. You’re not there when we resolve countless issues on behalf of the members. You’re not here when the Department tells us, “File a grievance.” You’re not here when the news media calls for information. The media is independent and PLEA doesn’t control what they do and do not report. Lou, you’re aware of the First Amendment, freedom of the press, right? It’s been in place longer than your 13 years, I mean 16 years, I mean 22 years as a police officer. I know, I know it’s actually 16 not including your buying time to get you to DROP. Yes, it can be a real problem for police management when they’re held accountable to the public – just like police officers are. You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on?

When it comes to bar complaints against labor attorneys, the Arizona Police Association, and PLEA attorney Mike Napier, one wonders if Lou has even read the PPSLA bar complaint he so quickly defends. 17 other statewide police labor associations in the APA saw the serious problem that Lou is missing. There’s no question that Lou fails to understand that this PPSLA bar complaint puts even the FOP’s and PPSLA’s own legal plans at risk. One wonders why Lou and his fraternity land so quickly and so easily on the side of police managers. Folks, this is what FOP members deal with when supervisors have a say in the frat house. It appears that managers are already pulling Lou’s strings and giving bad information. Fellow APA members are not mindless cronies just following PLEA’s lead. That innuendo by Lou is actually a slap in the face to those other union leaders. Though Lou tells you he can work with the City and the Department, he’s clearly demonstrating that he’ll call them names and “systematically alienate” them as well. You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on?

If a member has a concern they should come to the PLEA office and talk to a board member or call a representative to let their concern be known. Officers should never blindly follow a carnival side show which is trying to sell you snake oil masked as an elixir to solve all your problems. That’s exactly what Lou’s rant is, a smoke screen to the promised land with no ability to deliver – and Lou’s unproven product cost less than PLEA! Gee, a cheap trip to nowhere. Lou’s fraternity has tried in the past and has been unsuccessful. I for one would not want someone who has never negotiated a contract for anyone, much less a union, negotiate for me. I would prefer the 35 years of past, proven experience that PLEA has provided to Phoenix Police Officer for representation service. You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on? Lou, I expected a lot more out of you than this. Being academy classmates, I thought for sure you would show me at least the respect of giving me a call and let me try to work on your issues. You claim in your article that you’re all about present freedom of the press, right? It’s been in place longer than your 13 years, I mean 16 years, I mean 22 years as a police officer. I know, I know it’s actually 16 not including your buying time to get you to DROP. Yes, it can be a real problem for police management when they’re held accountable to the public – just like police officers are. You decide, misrepresentation or no idea what’s going on?
March 1, 2010

Mark Spencer, President  
Phoenix Law Enforcement Association  
1102 West Adams  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Mark:

This is a note to thank you and Mrs. Malone for your recent support of the centralized Booking Pilot Program presented to the Phoenix City Council on Tuesday, February 23, 2010. As you are aware, our staff has been working on a plan to address the myriad of challenges our current booking system poses to our first responders and support staff.

The Department has partnered with end users to include the Records & Identification Bureau, PLEA, Patrol, Courts, Prosecutors, and the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office to gather information on how to improve the current process. We are hopeful that with ongoing communication and flexibility, that this pilot will be the foundation for a permanent Centralized Booking Facility. During our monthly evaluations of the pilot, we will ensure that information is shared and communicated with PLEA and concerned citizens such as Mrs. Malone.

If this program proves to be successful, and funding is provided, we are looking to civilianize a majority of the staffing positions for the permanent centralized Booking Facility. Again, thank you for your support. If there are any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at 602-262-6080 or via email at: jeri.williams@phoenix.gov.

Sincerely,

JACK F. HARRIS  
Public Safety Manager

JERI L. WILLIAMS  
Assistant Chief  
Patrol Operations South
On Wednesday February 17, 2010 the editorial staff of the Arizona Republic described the Phoenix Law Enforcement Association by writing, “PLEA has long been the city’s most recalcitrant union.” Was this a criticism or a commendation? At first blush, police officers who risk their lives on a daily basis might take offense at this description. But when one considers the history of the word, the antonyms that offset the term, and the management style of Phoenix and the police department, it might become easier to consider “recalcitrant” as a backhanded compliment. Dictionaries tell us that the word dates back to approximately 1843 and comes from a French word which literally means “kicking back.” It carried the sense of “to resist obstinately” — similar to a victim fighting off and kicking back at an attacker.

The evolution of the word as used today carries a range of meanings including aggressive, bold, gutsy, daring, challenging, resistant, indomitable, defiant, and willful. Antonyms of the word provide meaningful context for a deeper understanding. For recalcitrant, antonyms include amenable, obliging, and passive.

PLEA “kicked out” at an illegal immigration policy that was imposed on Phoenix Police Officers — a policy that was not in line with 70% to 80% of the citizens, a policy that lacked deterrence and common sense, a policy which failed to address the high cost paid by Phoenix Police Officers and the Hispanic community. The policy turned a blind eye to the rule of law and was clearly connected to the deterioration of the quality of life in our city. Yes, PLEA was recalcitrant. The Association challenged the obvious problem. At the members’ direction, we did not passively sit by while damage was being done to our cops and their communities. Chief Harris did the right thing, changed the policy, and almost as if a switch was thrown, crime dropped double-digits.

PLEA is recalcitrant with a rifle policy that currently leaves 8 out of 10 first responders without the option of personally purchasing and qualifying with a tool that provides the operator more safety, more accuracy, and less risk of harming bystanders. PLEA has an obligation to patrol officers to “kick out” and challenge the obvious problem. Your Association cannot passively sit by while the Phoenix Police Department’s current rifle policy is out of sync with the needs of front-line officers and surrounding Valley agencies.

A broken booking process that has tied up sworn officers for hours for over a decade was not an efficient way to provide service to taxpaying citizens. Those who pay the bills expect their police to be on the street, not standing in line waiting for a County Health Nurse to render a medical screening verdict for admission to a jail cell. PLEA, as a good community partner, has an obligation to “kick out” at this inefficient process and resist the waste of manpower and money it generated. Yes, the Association was indeed recalcitrant. Chief Harris did the right thing by implementing a new off-site booking pilot program in May.

Police officers who walk point and man a post by taking daily risks to protect their communities deserve to have their pensions protected from upper-level police management abuse. For PLEA to

After the service, I thanked her for sharing her beautiful talent and asked her about a word that she left out of the song. She too was disappointed that the City directed her to remove the name “Jesus” from the church hymn. Prior to this, a member contacted PLEA and was concerned that the City calendar for 2010 had replaced Pearl Harbor day on December 7 with Islamic New Year. One might wonder if other employees and citizens in the City are feeling a bit more recalcitrant with decisions like these.
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The police equipment most of us carry and use on a daily basis
we do without even thinking about it. Cops can draw a firearm
from their holster as quickly and smoothly as a business executive
draws a fountain pen from a shirt pocket. We get pretty adept at
multi-tasking because the profession demands it in order for us
to perform in a rapid and efficient manner. We learn to do things
like handle a PA or radio mic or to read from and type on an MDT
while driving. Using the MDT while driving is probably one of
the most violated policies on the department, yet it is practically
expected in order to perform the job in an efficient manner. Every-
one knows that no one is going to make a big deal about it unless it
contributes to other problems such as getting in an accident.

Our comfort level with the equipment we use can often cause
us to go south in other areas such as using law enforcement com-
puter systems for personal use. In the last couple of years PLEA
has seen several officers get sideways over misuse of the MDT.
Violations in this area have ranged from minor to flagrant. When
a frequently used tool such as an MDT is at your fingertips on a
daily basis it can be easy to forget about the rules and cross the line
before you really give thought to your actions.

In years past TOC violations were dealt with in a fairly simple
and straightforward manner. If the violation was fairly minor in
nature, the offending officer was pulled aside, given a verbal ad-
omishment maybe with a line in their monthly notes to document
the transgression and life moved on. While some TOC violations
can be a crime, rarely if ever did the department pursue criminal
investigations on matters such as this. Well…as the saying goes,
"The times, they are a changin."

Now when a TOC violation occurs it is looked at from an admin-
istrative as well as a criminal viewpoint and violations that might
have once been given a pass are now being examined criminally.
Police department policy is more restrictive than the criminal stat-
ute in that the department will discipline an officer on a TOC vi-
olation whether it rises to the level of an actual crime or not. The
going rate for a sustained TOC violation that is addressed in an
internal investigation is an 8 hour suspension for a first time of-

On the criminal side of the house, the department will look to
see if a violation of state statute has occurred. The statute that spe-
cifically deals with unauthorized access to criminal history is ARS
41-1756 which states: 1. that if a person intentionally, knowingly,
or recklessly permits unauthorized access to the Arizona criminal
justice information system or to criminal history record informa-
tion or, 2. If they use the Arizona criminal justice information
system or criminal history record information for a purpose other
than as provided by section 41-1750 or, 3. If a person releases
or procures the release of criminal history information, they have
committed a class 6 felony.

Some of the discipline handed out for TOC violations comes
about from officers who self report. It’s too bad we don’t reward
self reporting. Coming clean on your own misconduct can be a
tough thing to do; it’s just human nature. Organizationally we’ll
thank you for your integrity while we hand you your 8 hour sus-
penion. Kind of like the pet owner who comes home to find a
puddle of pee on the kitchen floor and then lures the dog back to
the scene of the crime with a treat so they can beat the hell out of
them with a rolled up newspaper.

So remember, the next time you are tempted to run that stripper
who wants to date you to check out her pace history or that plate
on the vehicle parked in front of your ex’s house to see who’s
hanging out or even running a quick 29 on a plate for a person in a
neighborhood who’s thinking of buying the used car parked down
the street, think before you press that transmit button. It could cost
you a suspension or possibly your job and criminal prosecution.
Even if the County attorney decides not to prosecute, the depart-
ment, during an internal investigation can decide that you have
committed a violation that rises to the level of a felony whether
convicted or prosecuted and use this as the basis for grounds to
terminate.

In the event that you find yourself on the receiving end of a
phone call from SID (Special Investigations Division) asking you
to come down for a chat, whether it be for a TOC violation or
any other reason, politely decline and call PLEA in order to speak
to an attorney prior to giving any kind of a statement to criminal
investigators.

By Ken Crane
PLEA Secretary

"The times, they are a changin."
DROP Questions

By Sgt. Bob Baker

Editors note: The following article on drop issues was originally written and printed by Sgt. Bob Baker for PPSLA and was submitted for reprint in the RECAP for those persons that may have had similar questions re: DROP

I have had several people ask the question, “what is better, DROP or the higher percentage in your retirement?” This question is not easy to answer due to some individual differences in each of our finances. I will provide you with some factual numbers based on a top pay officer. Obviously, the numbers will be relative through the ranks. The second question, “what are the most important years to be invested in deferred comp?”

Let us take the second question first since it is the easiest to answer. The years are numbered in order of importance 1-30 (or however long your career is). If your desire is to utilize the maximum 457 deduction for your entire career, and you don’t start for five years, you are now $82,500 ($16,500 X 5 years), plus compounded interest ($15,187) or $97,687 behind. This number is misleading because the years are not created equal. As we said, year number one is the most important. Year number two is second most important. So you skipped the five years your money would have grown the most, because it would have earned interest the longest.

Here is an interesting fact. If you invested the maximum amount allowed in your 457 for the first five years of your career ($16,500 a year or $82,500) your account with a modest 5% gain would be $97,687. If this amount sat in your 457 with a 5% annual gain for the remaining 25 years of your career, your total would be $300,027. If you invested the same $82,500 in your last five years of your career, here is your account with the same 5% gain, $97,687. These totals are for the same exact investment. Would you trade $82,500 for $300,027? Imagine if you had invested at the beginning and stayed in your 457 for 30 years. Use these numbers to get excited, plan and work towards your future.

The harder question is: “what is better, DROP or staying for the higher percentage of city retirement?” I am going to illustrate the question using an officer retiring with a high three of $80,000 a year, who was hired at 21 years old and lives 40 years after retiring.

Office: $80,000 @ 25 years = $4,166.67 month or $50,000 year
$50,000.00 X 40 (years after retiring) $2,000,000
$80,000 @ 20 years = $3,333.33 month, or $40,000 year
$40,000.00 X 40 (years after retiring) $1,600,000

5 years of drop = $250,000

As you can see, the higher percentage officer (25 years service and no DROP) is $150,000.00 ahead of the officer who did 5 years of DROP. There are several things to consider. The officer who utilized DROP has $250,000 sitting around somewhere. Let’s consider a couple things: This officer is only 46 years old after 25 years of service (hired 21 years old, 25 years of service). The DROP money has a 59 ½ clause (you must be 59 ½ to draw your money). Again, get assistance from your financial advisor this is not carved in stone. So, this officer is intending on investing his account for at least 13 years. The $250,000 invested for 13 years at 5% grows to $471,408. Keep in mind this is not guaranteed. Another thing to consider when making your individual decision, is the officer who utilized DROP is living on $10,000 a year less than the officer who worked 25 years and did not DROP? The DROP officer is living on approximately $830 less a month. DROP takes management. Have you managed your finances for the past 30 years or have you had trouble? Your retirement after 25 years without DROP is managed for you. This may work better for some people. Only you can answer this question. Another item to remember is that the DROP Account is a titled asset and the pension is a promised asset, in other words, the DROP Account can be left to heirs, where the pension ends with the deaths of the officer and/or his/her spouse. The last item is, in the event of an emergency, the officer with the DROP account has the ability to access cash, even if they had to pay the IRS penalty.

There are many things to consider in the DROP or percentage scenario, this only scratches the surface. Get with your financial adviser for assistance.

Watch for a new class offered through the Police Department on retirement and finance. Please forward questions to bob.baker@phoenix.gov

Technical assistance for this article was provided by Chris Hoerchler of Galloway Asset Management.

Membership meetings are the last Tuesday of each month at 7:30, 12:30, and 5:30.

Board meeting is held the 3rd Tuesday each month and members can attend at 8:30 am.

Welcome New Members

Christina Begay
Katherine Enriquez
Barry McKinley
Les Montoya
An Update from the Folks at City Benefits

Riding out market volatility

Just when you thought things had finally settled down to normalcy in the financial markets, new headlines and callouts have erupted in newspapers and on the Web, with headlines like, “Brace yourself for another wild ride” and “Investors, After Weeks of Calm, Brace for Storms.” Nationwide Retirement Solutions, the administrator of the city’s 457 and 401(a) Plans, notes that this suggests that investment markets might be in for another period of turbulence.

So what can someone who is trying to save for retirement do?

First off, stay calm. Swings are normal, expected and, frankly, necessary, to keep the economy moving, like a well-oiled machine. See the potential opportunity: It’s tempting to sit on the sidelines when the markets go topsy-turvy. But longer-term investors often see these markets as part of the natural course of things that often lead to periods of opportunity for dollar-cost averaging and staging one’s portfolio for the next bull market. Note… Past performance does not guarantee future results. Dollar cost averaging does not assure a profit and does not guarantee against loss in a declining market. Resist the urge to do something. While you should regularly assess your investment strategy, don’t let market fluctuations alone change your investment decisions. A well-developed investment strategy recognizes that market volatility is natural – one that can be planned for.

If you have questions about handling market volatility, contact one of your local Nationwide representatives at 602-266-2733.

Investing involves risk, including possible loss of principal.

Information from plan service representatives is for educational purposes only and is not intended as investment advice.

---

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL NAPIER, P.C.

MICHAEL NAPIER has been representing Phoenix officers for over 32 years. Mr. Napier is one of the most experienced labor and personal injury attorneys in Arizona. Mr. Napier has represented hundred of officers before administrative bodies throughout Arizona, and has assisted critically injured officers and the survivors of the officers in obtaining compensation for their injuries and losses.

JANET FELTZ was admitted to practice in Arizona in 1985. Prior to joining the firm in 2005, she served as an administrative hearing officer for twenty years in disciplinary and other employment matters on behalf of merit boards and commissions throughout the State. She also served as an administrative law judge for the Arizona Department of Economic Security from 2001 – 2005.

ANTHONY COURY has focused his 9 years of practice primarily on personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits in which he has served as plaintiffs’ counsel. He has experience in cases dealing with dram shop liability, negligence, governmental claims and products liability including service as counsel on the litigation team for Phoenix Police Officer Jason Schechterle.

KATHRYN BAILLIE was born and reared in Phoenix, Arizona, completing her undergraduate degree at Arizona State University. She served as a J.A. for the Third Circuit Court and then worked as a Public Defender in the Commonwealth of Kentucky before joining the Law Office of Michael Napier, P.C. She has worked with Michael Napier on personal injury and wrongful death cases, dram shop liability, negligence, administrative, disciplinary, and other employment matters.

In addition to the full services provided to PLEA members to protect their careers, the Law Offices of Michael Napier P.C. provide the following:

- Personal injury recovery (on or off duty); experienced representation at a reduced fee;
- Reduced fees for matters not covered by the PLEA legal plan;
- Free probate of officer’s estate for line-of-duty death; Free consultations to members on any matter, and
- Referrals to attorneys or specialists for matters not handled by the firm.

2525 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle • Suite 130
Phoenix, AZ 85016
(602) 248-9107 • www.napierlawfirm.com

---

DATES TO REMEMBER & BENEFITS TO MEMBERS

Rep from Aflac will be in the PLEA Office the second Wednesday of each month.
Call Aflac Office @ 602.870.1122

Hester, Heitel & Associates Exclusive group insurance offers to PLEA Members only for homeowners, and auto and liability.
Please call Mark or Loretta at 602.230.7726

Tom Jonovich
Financial & Retirement Planning Sessions
3rd Thursday each month at PLEA Office 10am - Noon

Rep from Nationwide will be in the PLEA Office the 4th Thursday of each month to assist with Deferred Comp, 401(a), or PEHP and updating your beneficiary. Call Kathleen Donovan @ 602.266.2733, x 1161.
Representation Committee

Chairperson
Dave Kothe

Vice Chairpersons
Jerry Gannon and Ken Crane

Representatives
Tim Baiardi • Kent Barnes • Ken Barton
John Buckner • Brent Bundy • Bob Furneaux • Greg Gibbs
Bret Glidewell • Scott Gomez • Bryan Hanania
Gary Hotchkiss • Steve Huddleston • Barry Jacobs
Michael London • John McTernan • Terry Mills •
Anthony Navas • JR Pool • Dave Sampson
Scott Sayban • Rick Simonick • Frank Smith
Kevin Smith • Jason Smith • Stu Sterling • Rusty Stuart
Tom Tardy • Mike Walsh • James Ward

If You Have A Grievance

FIRST:
Attempt to resolve the matter informally with your supervisor.

SECOND:
If you cannot resolve this with your supervisor, contact one of the representatives above.

REMEMBER:
There are time limits to initiate a written grievance.

If You Are Being Investigated

RECORD:
All interviews once you have been given an NOI.

COPY:
All memos or paperwork related to the investigation.

TRUTHFULLY:
Answer all questions related to the investigation.

If you are called by Professional Standards Bureau or any police supervisor regarding an investigatory interview or interrogation, you may have PLEA representation during that interview. Call for representation as soon as possible. For your convenience, a PLEA board member and representative are available 24/7.
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