

Exhibit 59



Thomas K. Irvine
Security Title Plaza
3636 N. Central Ave., Suite 1200
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 650-2000
Facsimile: (602) 264-7033
www.polsinelli.com

August 12, 2010

E-Mail (Phyllis.Thomas@usdoj.gov) and First Class Mail

Hon. Thomas E. Perez
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20003

Re: Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, Arizona
August 3, 2010 Notice of noncompliance

Dear Mr. Perez:

This firm represents Maricopa County, Arizona and its management (Maricopa County). This letter is prompted by your August 3, 2010 *Notice of noncompliance with the obligation to cooperate with the Department of Justice investigation pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964* (Notice Letter) addressed to counsel for the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office (MCSO). This letter is also prompted by the August 5, 2010 response sent to you by a lawyer for MCSO.

Maricopa County desires to cooperate in any way possible with the DOJ investigation referenced in the Notice Letter. As a recipient of Title VI funds, Maricopa County believes it has an obligation to cooperate. Maricopa County is distressed, disappointed and concerned by MCSO's, a subrecipient, noticed failure to cooperate. Maricopa County is equally distressed, disappointed and concerned by MCSO's August 5, 2010 response which in no way is appropriate or adequate.

As an initial matter, Maricopa County believes that virtually all of the dedicated line staff of MCSO desire to comply with Title VI and this dispute in no way implicates or questions that desire or the professionalism, if properly managed, of those dedicated women and men. Maricopa County reached this same conclusion when it recently resolved, over the objection of MCSO management and counsel, a significant DOL wage and hour investigation which resulted in nearly \$2 million being paid to MCSO staff. This Title VI issue, as with the DOL issue, concerns the management of MCSO.

Mr. Thomas E. Perez
Assistant Attorney General
August 12, 2010
Page 2

Maricopa County will attempt to provide any of the information DOJ has requested of MCSO. Please provide us with those requests in order for Maricopa County to determine which, if any, of the documents it already has available. Maricopa County also has subpoena power. Maricopa County will subpoena the documents that it does not have from MCSO pursuant to that power in order to comply with its legal duties as a recipient. As a subrecipient, MCSO must comply.


Maricopa County management is also notifying MCSO that it may not expend any public funds, including on outside counsel, to resist any DOJ Title VI inquiry. Maricopa County will not pay those bills as resisting a Title VI inquiry is outside the scope of the employment of any elected or appointed official.

Maricopa County wants to discuss these matters with DOJ. Due to Maricopa County's unfamiliarity with the DOJ inquiry currently being resisted by MCSO there may be additional assistance that Maricopa County can provide.

Maricopa County tenders its full cooperation as a recipient of Title VI funds and will assist in the MCSO inquiry. The tragedy of all of this is the waste of precious tax dollars by MCSO in resisting a lawful inquiry. Maricopa County can express no opinion or offer any conclusion as to the result that will be reached at the conclusion of the inquiry. Just as with the DOL inquiry, however, Maricopa County is hopeful that there will be no adverse findings as to MCSO but if there are, the problems must be cured immediately. Maricopa County, therefore, wants this inquiry expedited for the benefit of thousands of very decent MCSO employees who do not deserve to serve under a cloud, the taxpayers and in order to comply with the letter and spirit of the law.

Sincerely,

Polsinelli Shughart PC



Thomas K. Irvine

TKI:jd

cc: Alexandra J. Gill
Robert N. Driscoll
Richard M. Romley
Clarisse McCormick
Hon. Dennis K. Burke
Maricopa County