



Phoenix Law Enforcement Association  
2017-2018  
Management and Supervision Survey  
(excerpt)

In partnership with



## PLEA 2017-2018 Management and Supervision Survey excerpt

### Preface:

This document contains selected excerpts from PLEA's 2017-2018 Management and Supervision survey. It contains 11 pages of information (incl. cover page).

It should be viewed as a form of a summary that provides a broad overview and will give the reader the views of the police department rank and file on a variety of issues.

This report is not the complete survey. The complete survey document includes much more detail and has individual breakout scores and verbatim comments on over 360 individual police supervisors as well as verbatim comments on a variety of topics as enumerated in the Top-Line Report (see below). The complete work product runs more than 550 pages.

This document contains the following information:

- Three-page Top-Line Report which covers survey methodology, research objectives and statistical data on a variety of topics to include working conditions, department objectives, Chief's Report Card and executive leadership.
- Police executive leadership team ratings based on average score of the seven separate character traits rated arranged by highest to lowest score
- Commander ratings based on average score of the seven separate character traits rated arranged from highest to lowest score
- Lieutenant ratings based on average score of the seven separate character traits rated arranged from highest to lowest score
- Sergeant ratings based on average score of the seven separate character traits rated arranged from highest to lowest score
- A listing of those supervisors that received no rating

## PLEA 2017-2018 Management and Supervision Survey Top-Line Report

In February 2018, the first PLEA Management and Supervision Survey was conducted.

The purpose of this survey is twofold:

- Give officers a mechanism to give anonymous and objective feedback on a variety of job-related issues
- Create an evaluation tool that allows officers to provide direct feedback on their chain of command from first line supervisor to the Chief.

Goals:

Establish a baseline measurement that will:

- Identify those supervisors viewed as high performers
- Identify those supervisors viewed as substandard performers
- Identify problem areas where management can take action

This survey was different from others conducted in the past in that members were given the opportunity to provide feedback on their Department as a whole and the supervisors they have worked with during the past year, from Sergeants to the Chief.

PLEA contracted with 911MEDIA, who assisted in the survey's design and handled the survey distribution. 911MEDIA also collected and tabulated the data and produced the final report. The survey was sent to 2,056 rank-and-file officers from the Phoenix Police Department who are also members of Phoenix Law Enforcement Association, based on email addresses on file with PLEA. A total of 1,032 officers and detectives participated, leading to a total response rate of 50.2%. These results will be included in the following summary and the actual survey report containing much more in-depth data. *Note: for the population size of the current membership, standard survey measures require a minimum of 324 responses to confidently report results.*

Consequently, the substantial completion rate obtained delivers an extremely high level of confidence (97%) with a small margin of error (2.5%). Therefore, these results are an accurate reflection across the board of the views and opinions of the rank and file of the Phoenix Police Department.

### METHODOLOGY

A web-based service known as SurveyMonkey was used to gather data. Survey participants were emailed an invitation to participate. Each invitation tracked members accessing the survey and prevented them from submitting more than one response. Forwarding the e-mail to another person also would have rendered the link inoperative. Responses were anonymous, and no identifying information was collected from participating members.

### RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The survey was composed of 184 multiple-choice questions. Most of the questions allowed for optional comments. The survey provides qualitative feedback and quantitative results to:

- Measure working conditions
- Measure department objectives
- Rate executive leadership and most recent chain of command
- Rate supervisors' character trait levels (integrity, judgment, communication, tact, dependability, effect on morale and whether they are considerate)

The following are a few factors that may have contributed to the high participation rate:

- Knowledge that a third party is administering the survey
  - a. Understanding that data collection is outsourced, respondents' fear of retaliation for participation is minimized
  - b. Automated reminders were triggered, creating awareness to generate the highest response rate possible
  - c. An optimized design that allowed the survey to be completed on a variety of devices i.e., PC, tablet or smartphone.

- Relevance, a feeling that these matters are important, as well as the desire to contribute feedback useful to bring about positive change in the organization.
- The use of PLEA's existing member email database. This is an established delivery system. Not only is it convenient, members are also used to receiving information in this manner, and the database is constantly updated.

### **TOP-LINE RESULTS**

While demographics were not a research objective, a few selected questions were asked to understand the amount of years worked, duty locations and whether officers are uniformed or working in a nonuniformed required position. Results show that almost half of the officers that responded have between 11-20 years on the Department, are in uniform (72%) and in a precinct (60%) or bureau (40%) location that allows for direct supervisory ratings (see full report).

### **Working Conditions**

- Two-thirds (67%) of officers feel that the overall morale of the Department is unacceptable or needs improvement.
- Two-thirds (62%) also state that overall performance of the Department's leadership is unacceptable or needs improvement.
- Nearly seven out of 10 (68%) indicate the Department's overall treatment of its sworn employees is unacceptable or needs improvement.
- **Almost all officers (93%) feel the Department's manpower levels to conduct police operations safely are unacceptable or needs improvement.**

### **Department Objectives**

- Half of officers surveyed state the Department is effective in giving a clear understanding of its philosophy.
- Seventy-eight percent feel the Department's use of personnel to effectively serve the citizens of Phoenix is unacceptable or needs improvement, and 76% feel the same with the Department use of resources to effectively serve the citizens.
- **The majority of officers (93%) states that the Department's manpower levels to conduct law enforcement operations effectively are unacceptable (56%) or needs improvement (38%).**
- More than seven of 10 officers rate the efficiency of their work since the Records Management System (RMS) was fully implemented to be unacceptable or needs improvement.
- **Also rated unacceptable or needs improvement by most officers (86%) is the efficiency of the arrest process since changes were made to Central Booking.**

### **Chief's Report Card**

- Almost half of officers (48%) feel the Chief is a politician rather than a leader (22%) or manager (29%).
- Under the Chief's watch, 48% of officers strongly disagree or disagree that morale in the Department has improved.
- Only 24% of officers feel they will be treated fairly by the Chief, if involved in a use-of-force incident — 48% are neutral and 28% do not feel they will be treated fairly.
- Forty-one percent of officers state the Chief communicates information of concern to the Department in a timely manner.
- Two-thirds of officers (62%) say the Chief encourages officers to work with members of the community.
- **Only one of 10 officers agrees that the Chief ensures discipline is applied equally regardless of rank.**
- One-fourth (24%) of officers see the Chief actively fighting for increased police manpower (44% disagree or strongly disagree and 32% are neutral).
- **Most officers (70%) disagree or strongly disagree that the Chief's recently implemented transparency policy allowing for the release of officers' names as well as body-worn camera footage in the days and weeks immediately following a critical incident is a good idea.**
- Almost two-thirds (59%) believe that the Chief is unduly influenced by outside special interests and/or political entities.

**Executive Leadership**

- Only 18% of officers feel the executive leadership is leading the Department in a direction that makes Phoenix a safe place to live, while most are unsure or disagree, 41% and 42%, respectively.
- Sixty-five percent of officers do not feel that the fourth floor (executive management) has their best interests (safety, health, morale, etc.) in mind.
- Nearly four of 10 officers (38%) say that changes in the assistant chiefs are needed to make a difference in working conditions, while 43% are neutral and 19% say no changes are needed.

**Executive Leaders' Character Trait Ranking**

Each member of the Police Department's executive management team was scored individually on seven character traits: Integrity, Judgment, Communication, Tact, Dependability, Impact on Morale and being Considerate in their dealings with others.

Survey participants could evaluate each of these traits using a scale of one to five, with one being the lowest and five being the highest. Listed below is the combined average for each chief across all surveyed categories, ranked highest to lowest.

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Overall Average Score</u></b>
A/C Michael Kurtenbach	3.30
A/C John Collins	3.09
Chief Jeri Williams	2.91
A/C James Burgett	2.87
A/C Sandra Renteria	2.72
A/C Mary Roberts	2.66
A/C Louis Tovar	2.58

Detailed scoring breakouts in each category along with comments can be viewed in the main body of the survey.

## COMMANDER RATINGS

NAME	OVERALL RATING
THOMAS, AARON J	4.31
VANDORN, THOMAS G	4.06
KENNEDY, SEAN M	3.84
MORIN JR, CHARLES P	3.81
DECASTRO, EDWARD	3.75
LOPEZ, GABRIEL L	3.51
LAROQUE, JENNIFER L	3.47
MITCHELL, KIMBERLY K	3.46
VASQUEZ, ANTHONY B	3.41
BURT, BRAD	3.37
VEACH, PAULA T	3.25
GALLAGHER, JAMES M	3.14
BURT, BRAD	3.08
VINER, DARREN E	3.00
LEE, BRIAN R	2.80
CONSOLIAN, CHARLES J	2.75
CONNOLLY, SEAN P	2.70
ALEXANDER, JEFFERY A	2.57
HARVEY, DAVID A	2.50
TUCKER, CHRISTOPHER L	2.36
HEIN, LAWRENCE D	2.32
PARRA, MICHAEL L	2.16
CARLSON, GRADEN C	2.14
CARNICLE, GREGORY S	1.76

## LIEUTENANT RATINGS

NAME	OVERALL RATING
HESTER JR, JAMES L	4.86
FREUDENTHAL, BRIAN P	4.69
RICE, JEFFREY M	4.68
FRENI, SALVATORE L	4.57
HEIMALL, MARK L	4.56
KNUEPPEL, BRYAN P	4.54
JUNAS, RYAN D	4.47
EGEA, JULIE M	4.46
CHAPMAN, BRYAN D	4.45
GONZALEZ, HECTOR F	4.39
EYRICH, CHRISTOPHER J	4.32
BOYLE, CHRISTOPHER M	4.27
SPALLA, LOWELL S	4.27
SOWERWINE, SCOTT E	4.20
CONRAD, ROBERT E	4.17
FREDERIKSEN, RUSSELL S	4.16
DILLON, WAYNE K	4.15
WHITE, JOHN W	4.14
WICKERS JR, WILLIAM F	4.12
BENZA, JEFFREY M	4.09
COLEY, BRYAN G	4.07
CLARKE, STUART S	4.06
OPFERBECK, DOUGLAS D	4.00
CLEMENTS, CHAS J	3.99
MOORE, BENJAMIN S	3.98
HANANIA, BRYAN G	3.95
TOVAR SR, MARK A	3.88
SCHWEIKERT, MARK T	3.83
WEBB, DALIN S	3.77
KNAPP III, ROBERT E	3.71
WILLIAMS, DANIEL C	3.68
LASLAVIC, DAVID S	3.60
ROSER, STEVEN W	3.57
RATH, DAVID G	3.53
BREWER, WARREN V	3.51

NAME	OVERALL RATING
ISSITT, BRIAN J	3.48
JAHNKE, SETH A	3.40
LEUSCHNER, BEN J	3.36
SAFLAR, DAVID A	3.36
OSBORN, CHARMANE M	3.33
PAGONE, ERIC B	3.25
DICK JR, JEFFREY R	3.21
WINCHESTER, ANTHONY T	3.21
HOWE, ROBERT A	3.21
DISOTELL, SHANE A	3.20
RIGGAN, BRIAN W	3.20
DIPONZIO, NICHOLAS M	3.16
ALBERTSON, DAVID D	3.11
WOODS, TIMOTHY C	3.05
ROSER, STEVEN W	3.00
GONZALES, CHRISTINA D	2.92
BATES, ROBERT L	2.91
PIERCE, JEFF W	2.88
THATCHER, BRIAN T	2.88
SAPON, EMILIEN L	2.86
ZEINER III, CLINTON E	2.82
TALLMAN, MARK P	2.79
YOUNG, JEFFERY S	2.71
SMITH, AIMEE L	2.70
ALEXANDER, BARBARA D	2.58
LOPEZ, ANTHONY J	2.55
MANGUM, JOLENE R	2.54
SIEKMANN, MATTHEW L	2.51
ALI, ASSADULAH A	2.36
BENNETT, JAMIE L	2.27
RAMIREZ, GEORGE V	1.94
MOORE, DAVID M	1.83
HOFMANN, PATRICK C	1.71
MOLLER, MYKEL J	1.64
ADAMS, DAVID R	1.61
MCCLIMANS, JEREMY L	1.56

### SERGEANT RATINGS

NAME	OVERALL RATING
ARRUBLA, GUILLERMO	5.00
AURELIUS, JASON M	5.00
AUSTIN, ANDREW T	5.00
BARRETT, ADAM H	5.00
BONNEY, HANK	5.00
BRYCE, KEVIN B	5.00
BUTCHER, LYNETTE G	5.00
CARBAJAL, ARMANDO M	5.00
CARMODY, MICHAEL P	5.00
CATALANO, BENJAMIN T	5.00
COTTO III, ROBERTO	5.00
COZAD, BRANDON J	5.00
CRAWFORD, KEVIN L	5.00
DELEON, CHARLES A	5.00
DENNISON, JONATHAN F	5.00
DOHERTY, NICHOLAS A	5.00
DOTY, MARK A	5.00
DREILING, RICHARD A	5.00
FLANAGAN, GERALD M	5.00
GARMAN-COPPOCK, SHAWN B	5.00
HERNANDEZ JR, GREGORY D	5.00
HOSFIELD, DAVID J	5.00
JOYNER III, JAMES A	5.00
KALMBACH, JOSEPH J	5.00
KIMBLE, KANE M	5.00
LUMLEY, ERIC W	5.00
LUNDBERG, DAVID J	5.00
MCCORKLE, DAVID C	5.00
MIGA, ADAM F	5.00
ORTIZ, ALEX	5.00
OTANEZ, DAVID M	5.00
POST, MARK A	5.00
ROTHSCHILD, JAMES S	5.00
SCHABRON, PHILIP A	5.00
SUTHERLIN, GEORGE C	5.00
SWEENEY, JOHN P	5.00
TOBEY, JEFFREY A	5.00
VALENZUELA, FRANCISCO	5.00
WALTERS, THOMAS M	5.00
MCCLELLAN, STEVEN P	4.95
WARD, JAMES R	4.94
BARRON, CHRISTOPHER J	4.93
JONES, ANTHONY D	4.93
COYLE, JEFFREY M	4.90
PALMER, TIMOTHY L	4.86
SUND, CHRISTOPHER J	4.83
HARKINS, ERIC R	4.82
HANSEN, BRIAN T	4.81
NEWTON, ERIC J	4.81
WALLACE, MARTIN S	4.81
COUDRET, BRIAN R	4.80
WARNER, WILLIAM B	4.80
JIMENEZ, NICHOLAS J	4.79
SCHMIDT, WILLIAM G	4.79
THORLEY, MICHAEL P	4.79
LONG, MICHAEL C	4.76
PINA III, ERNIE C	4.76
RIVERS, MARC R	4.75
VERTHEIN, MATTHEW A	4.75
LOUIS, TIMO	4.74

NAME	OVERALL RATING
JORDAN, DAVID W	4.71
RINCON, SAUL	4.71
ROSANDER, NICHOLAS M	4.71
WANG, JIA-YUAN	4.71
JOU, WILLIAM C	4.68
GILLIGAN, LISA M	4.67
INFANGER, ANTHONY L	4.67
PENN, MICHAEL M	4.67
FAY JR, TERRENCE M	4.67
PAWLICK, JANA C	4.67
KOSHINSKI, JEREMIAH D	4.66
ABOUSSAFY, CHRISTOPHER S	4.64
VIRGIL, MARCUS E	4.64
POLITTE, KEITH A	4.63
TOWNSEND, GATES G	4.62
BANUELOS JR, FRANCISCO J	4.61
SCHUH, JEFFERY A	4.61
ALEXANDER, ANDREA L	4.60
WARREN, ROBERT C	4.60
BRYANT, RONALD D	4.57
DAVIS, LARRY J	4.57
JAHNKE, JASON A	4.57
NICKEL, MARTIN D	4.57
ROSE, KEVIN J	4.57
STEPHENSON, DEREK W	4.57
KARTCHNER, BEN A	4.54
COCHRAN, ERIC W	4.52
ROBIDOUX, JASON L	4.51
HOWELL-MALDONADO, HEATHER L	4.50
KULWIN, MITCHELL	4.50
MALONEY, DONALD M	4.50
ZILLES II, MICHAEL J	4.50
CALDERON, CHRISTINE A	4.48
SEITTER II, DAVID C	4.48
DENNY JR, TIMOTHY O	4.43
DOHERTY, KEITH	4.43
RIMSZA, BRIAN A	4.43
GRIFFIN JR, ROBERT W	4.38
PEREZ, PAUL G	4.38
CLARK, JOSHUA M	4.36
MCBRIDE, PATRICK M	4.34
SMELTER, JOSEPH A	4.34
WEBBER, KENNETH B	4.34
JAKEMER, JEFFREY P	4.33
BARRICKLOW, BRIAN E	4.33
ESPERUM, BRIAN M	4.33
GREEN, MICHAEL A	4.33
IVANKOVICH, BRETT D	4.33
TREJO, PATRICK B	4.32
BREITZMAN, AMY M	4.29
HOOD, DARIN L	4.29
KOTECKI, PATRICK J	4.29
MANNING, WILSON E	4.29
MCBRIDE, DOUGLAS R	4.29
PARKS, STACEY E	4.29
REITER, HARRY R	4.29
CAIN, SCOTT C	4.26
GOMBAR, GARY	4.26
SCHERER, ROBERT J	4.25
RODARME, ROBERT D	4.24



**SERGEANT RATINGS (continued)**

NAME	OVERALL RATING
WILSON, WILLIAM A	4.24
BACKUS, JOHN R	4.20
MARTIN, BILL J	4.20
BAILEY, BRIAN	4.19
SYREK, MICHELLE L	4.19
REED, BRADFORD G	4.18
BRINK JR, VERNON P	4.14
DAVIS, JASON W	4.14
MONTOYA, DAVID J	4.14
SANDERS, RICHARD J	4.14
TASSIN, CHRISTOPHER J	4.14
SHEHAN, MICHAEL	4.10
WEISHAAR, PAUL E	4.10
BEST, PETER C	4.10
HILLMAN, TROY A	4.10
MAIOCCO JR, RICHARD P	4.10
PERREIRA, FRANCIS S	4.10
CRAIG, THOMAS C	4.09
LEISTER, THOMAS A	4.09
WONG, STEVEN	4.08
HOGAN, RYAN F	4.07
KIEFFER, CHRISTOPHER A	4.07
MICSUNESCU, PETER	4.07
PALMER, JANTRA A	4.05
STEELE, DOUGLAS L	4.05
LANNING JR, MICHAEL D	4.05
SMITH, TIMOTHY P	4.03
BUSCHER, JASON D	4.00
CALLE, JOSHUA T	4.00
EGGERT, DAVID R	4.00
GAGE, JOSEPH E	4.00
VASQUEZ JR, ROBERT M	4.00
WELSH, KENNETH R	4.00
KAMP, TYLER A	3.95
KAUFFMAN, MILO K	3.94
CLINTON, ALEX V	3.94
KORUS, BRYAN L	3.91
HUSKISSON, BRADLEY R	3.90
RAUCH, MICHAEL D	3.90
EHRLER, MARIE A	3.86
HOEVE, MICHAEL T	3.86
JORJANI, ARDAVAN	3.86
DAVILA JR, EDGAR D	3.83
CLARK, SEAN T	3.82
FRIZZELL, KELLY N	3.81
HURTADO JR, ANTHONY	3.81
BALTZER, RANDALL L	3.76
WAGAMAN, JACQUELYN M	3.76
RUSSO JR, DANIEL J	3.75
GANZ, WAYNE B	3.74
ALTSOBA, ALEXANDER J	3.71
SIMONICK, NATALIE L	3.71
STANSBERRY, GREGORY W	3.71
WOOD, JUSTIN P	3.71
GANDARA, GILBERT A	3.67
GUSTAFSON III, WALTER F	3.67
GREENLEE, JAMES A	3.66
PANKOWSKI, ANTHONY J	3.66
BARKER, JERRY W	3.64
DRAUGHN, BRET A	3.64

NAME	OVERALL RATING
FIELDS, SARA M	3.64
MARTIN, DONALD E	3.64
NEVILLE, ROBERT F	3.64
COSENZA, RICHARD E	3.62
COUTTS, SEAN J	3.61
CUSSON, JOHN M	3.57
SEARS, BRUCE L	3.57
CLEMENT, JEFFREY C	3.52
BURTON, SEAN J	3.50
ROCKWOOD, BRYANT D	3.50
WESLEY, MICHAEL D	3.50
HUNNICUTT, CHADWICK C	3.48
EISENTRAUT, KYLE A	3.46
COMBS, MICHAEL G	3.45
HUMBLES, MARK J	3.45
KIM, PAUL J	3.43
MILLER, DALE D	3.43
PALMER, RANDOLPH G	3.43
PATENGE, JENNIFFER R	3.43
RICHARDS, BRYAN S	3.43
BROWN, DEMETRIUS	3.38
CUSSON, DAVID P	3.36
ROGOFF, SANDOR J	3.36
FARRIOR, JEFFREY M	3.33
BACHORSKI, BRIAN M	3.33
LUND, DARIN S	3.33
ROBERTS, PHILLIP G	3.29
JENKINS, JOSHUA J	3.22
RYAN, CHAD	3.21
HAMMEL, ERIC P	3.21
HERNANDEZ, HERMINIA M	3.20
CHAPMAN, JEFF A	3.19
SPROSS, JAMES M	3.19
GREEN, JEFFREY A	3.18
CHIAPPO-WEST, GIOGI	3.14
SMITH, MARK J	3.14
FIOLA, JEREMIAH J	3.11
ROBERTS, STEPHEN W	3.11
RIDDLE, JEFFREY M	3.08
FORTUNE, MERCEDES A	3.05
BENNETT, PETER C	3.04
GABOURY, ANDREW T	3.04
COPE, JAMES J	3.00
ROBERTS, JOSEPH R	3.00
WATTS, KEVIN A	3.00
DAVIS, DONALD W	2.90
SINGER, JASON A	2.90
LAIRD, MARK C	2.86
LEE, MICHAEL T	2.86
STIMAC, JENNIFER A	2.86
WILLIAMS, RALPH M	2.83
STEINBERGER, ALLISON J	2.81
MEELHUYSEN, MICHAEL J	2.79
HERNANDEZ, JUAN	2.77
ABERNATHY JR, JESSE E	2.76
MIASO, KERRI E	2.75
WIEGERT, JERRY E	2.67
OHRN, ASHLEY R	2.67
HOLLAND JR, TROY L	2.57
BUCHANAN, ERIC W	2.50

**SERGEANT RATINGS (continued)**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>OVERALL RATING</b>
OEHLER, JOHN W _____	2.50
CARLSON, BLAKE E _____	2.48
HOUGH, DAVID E _____	2.48
LEYVAS, RICK J _____	2.43
STALLMAN, SCOTT A _____	2.42
STANOWICZ, STEVEN M _____	2.31
REAUME, STEVEN C _____	2.29
PHAN, TU C _____	2.24
WYCKOFF, ERIC D _____	2.19
FERNANDEZ, BRIAN K _____	2.07
WINFIELD, JASON A _____	2.06
COLE, VINCENT J _____	1.95
KING, JEREMY G _____	1.88
BENTIVEGNA, LOUIS D _____	1.83
BUTLER, MATTHEW M _____	1.71
REBIC, BRAD M _____	1.71
WILSON, CHERYL L _____	1.71
PREWITT, JUSTIN D _____	1.68
FORCE, ELISABETH R _____	1.64
HEIN, MICHAEL A _____	1.57
CORCORAN, MICHAEL W _____	1.43
MILLER, MARY L _____	1.43
BRADLEY, GARY D _____	1.34
MCMICHAEL-GOMBAR, STEFANI A _____	1.00

Below is a list of supervisors who did not receive any ratings in the survey.

## COMMANDERS

ORENDER, DENNIS E

## LIEUTENANTS

CHARRIER, KIM D  
FIELDS, JEFFREY G  
GIAMMARINO, MICHAEL J  
JOHNSON, JAYSON F  
MARTOS, STEVE M  
REESE, ALLISEN D  
ROSER, STEVEN W (Bureaus) - Previous Only  
TAYLOR, PAUL J  
TORTORICI, PATRICK T

## SERGEANTS

ANGELO, ANTHONY P  
AUSTIN, CHAD R  
AUSTIN, DAVID W  
BRITT, THOMAS M  
BUFFA, LEO R  
CALDWELL, LAINN M  
CHALMERS, ROY R  
CLINE, TADD M  
CLOVIS JS, CARL G  
CUNNINGHAM, DONALD V  
DICINO, TERRI L  
DIEDRICK, LANCE E  
DOBRANSKY, ERIK W  
DONEGAN, SEAN J  
DURKA, ROBERT E  
DWYER, MICHAEL S  
ELMORE, DEREK S  
FLORES, RALPH J  
FULLETON, MICHAEL F  
GAMEZ, HECTOR  
GARCIA, PATRICK H  
GOEHRING, THEODORE T  
HANSON, MATHEW S  
HERNANDEZ, JOE L  
HERNANDEZ, RODRIGO R - Previous Only  
HESTER II, JERRY W  
HILL JR, DAVID A  
HILLHOUSE, GREGG S  
HOWARD, JONATHAN W  
HUDSON, EMERY E  
HUDSON, KAREN L

## SERGEANTS (continued)

JOHNSON, KEVIN D  
JOHNSON, SYLVESTER G  
KASKAVAGE, MICAH J  
KINCANNON, MARK T  
LAKE, DAVID A  
LEWIS, VINCENT C  
LOWE, JARED A  
MAROTTA, FRANK D  
MATTSON, SEAN A  
MCCARTHY, CRISTA A  
MCCAULEY, SCOTT G  
MILHONE, BRIAN D  
MINER, ERIC L  
MULLIGAN, STEPHEN P  
MURPHY, TODD J  
MYERS, LEIF A  
NELSON, ROSEMARY D  
NORTHUP, WILLIAM C  
ONG, STEPHEN C  
PERKINS, JERAD H - Previous Only  
PFOHL, ALAN R  
PORTER, STEVE K  
REED, STEPHEN J  
REILLY, TERRANCE P  
ROBERTS, FREDERIC B  
ROMO, ANGEL R  
RUTLEDGE IV, THOMAS J  
SCOTT, LORI A  
SCRANTON, CHRISTOPHER J  
SHAY, TIMOTHY D  
SLAUGHTER, DONALD J  
SMITH, JAMES M  
STEPHENSON, GINA R  
STEVENSON, HOWARD M  
STUSSY, JOSEPH C  
SYWARUNGSYMMUN, BENJAMIN H  
THOMPSON, FLOYD A  
TORNBERG, CASEY  
VASQUEZ, MARCO A  
WARNER JR, RONALD J  
WEISS, LOIS A  
WESTOVER, GREGORY A  
WHITLOCK, ARRON D  
WILLIAMS, ANDREW J  
WUNDERLE, DAREN J  
ZOPF, ERIC T  
ZURCHER, ERIC P