1 2 3 4 5 6	William R. Jones, Jr., Bar #001481 John T. Masterson, Bar #007447 Joseph J. Popolizio, Bar #017434 JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C. 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Telephone: (602) 263-1700 Fax: (602) 200-7801 wjones@jshfirm.com jmasterson@jshfirm.com jpopolizio@jshfirm.com			
7 8	Attorneys for Defendants Maricopa County Sheriff's Office and Joseph M. Arpaio			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA			
11	United States of America,	NO. CV10-01878-PHX-GMS		
12 13	Plaintiff, v.	JOINT AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN T. MASTERSON AND JOSEPH J. POPOLIZIO		
14 15 16	Maricopa County, Arizona; Maricopa County Sheriff's Office; and Joseph M. Arpaio, in his official capacity as Sheriff of Maricopa County, Arizona,			
17	Defendants.			
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	John T. Masterson and Joseph J. Popolizio, being first duly sworn, de and state as follows:  1. We are over the age of 18 years, are competent to testify to matters set forth in this Affidavit, and make this Affidavit from our own persknowledge.  2. We are attorneys and partners with the law firm of Jones, Skelte Hochuli, P.L.C. and represent the named Defendants.			
28	2518421.1			

- 3. October 2, 2010, we filed our appearances in this matter and began our defense of named Defendants Maricopa County Sheriff's Office ("MCSO") and Sheriff Joseph M. Arpaio in the above-entitled action. We are familiar with the history of the defense of this matter prior to our appearances and, specifically for purposes related to the cross motions for summary judgment, are familiar with the production of information, documents and facility access provided to the Department of Justice ("DOJ"), as well as the interviews of inmate and MCSO staff that the DOJ conducted as a result of the cooperation of Sheriff Arpaio and the MCSO pursuant to the DOJ's requests in furtherance of the subject Title VI investigation.
- 4. Pursuant to the DOJ's requests, the DOJ toured six MCSO detention facilities and were allowed to engage in informal discussions with MCSO personnel during those tours.
- 5. The MCSO's production of documents pursuant to the DOJ's First Request for Documents and Information has been overwhelming. This production began before and after the filing of this action and Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, has continued to date, and will continue in the future.
- 6. The MCSO has provided the DOJ all requested MCSO policies (1101 pages), documents disclosed in the *Melendres* matter (approximately 12,850 pages), 808 pages of documents in support of its LEP position paper, 11 documents associated with grievance and visitation processes, and 931 gigabytes of documentation responsive to the United States' First Request. In addition to this 13,669 pages and 931 gigabytes of documentation, MCSO produced 116 boxes of documents in response to the First Request. DOJ attorneys have reviewed the documents contained in those boxes on four occasions at the offices of MCSO's lawyers: December 17, 2010 and January 3, 4, 5, 2011. On many occasions, MCSO lawyers have made clear that the DOJ is welcome to resume its review of these documents upon reasonable notice and within normal business hours.

- 7. To assist the DOJ in its evaluation of the voluminous documentation and information that MCSO has produced, MCSO attorneys have repeatedly offered to provide the DOJ assistance to evaluate the boxed and electronic information previously provided in response to the DOJ's First Request for Documents and Information.
- 8. The scheduling of the two hundred and thirty (230) combined inmate and MCSO staff interviews was not particularly an easy task. It required reconciling the schedules of MCSO and DOJ lawyers, as well as MCSO personnel. At all times, MCSO personnel, attorneys, and paralegals facilitated as seamless an interview process as possible under the circumstances something for which the DOJ personnel openly expressed appreciation. Most importantly, the interviews that the DOJ requested all occurred.
- 9. The interview process continued according to DOJ requests and agreed upon guidelines with a few understandable limitations stemming from the necessary and expected security measures of the jails.
- 10. The DOJ conducted inmate interviews outside the presence of MCSO personnel and attorneys as the DOJ requested, on dates and times that the DOJ requested.
- 11. The DOJ has also interviewed Sheriff Joseph M. Arpaio. Although this interview was originally scheduled for January 28, 2011, the DOJ cancelled that interview because of inclement weather in Washington, D.C., and rescheduled it for February 11, 2011. The DOJ did not complete Sheriff Arpaio's interview on February 11, 2011, however, but, with Sheriff Arpaio's accommodation, it resumed and concluded on February 17, 2011. His two interviews exceeded previously agreed upon time limits.
- and will continue to occur. As the DOJ nears the conclusion of this Title VI investigation, MCSO's pledge of cooperation, among other things, most likely will appear in an agreement between the parties intended to conclude this investigation and litigation.
- 13. Since Jones, Skelton & Hochuli, P.L.C. became counsel of record on October 2, 2010, the United States has received nothing short of complete cooperation in

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

its investigation, including total access to MCSO staff, facilities, and documents, which is precisely the injunctive and declaratory relief the United States seeks in this lawsuit. In fact, in the Stipulation filed with this Court to extend the deadline for filing this Reply, the United States acknowledged that MCSO has made "great strides" in its production, so much so that it was "confident" that MCSO's summary judgment motion would eventually be mooted by MCSO's efforts, and contemplated reaching an agreement with MCSO for future information requests. (Dkt. # 52.)

DOJ proposed entering into an agreement that would identify the few items that the DOJ deems left to accomplish in this Title VI investigation. Although discussions regarding a contemplated agreement date back at least to the beginning of February, 2011, and were formally acknowledged in the Stipulation filed on February 25, 2011, the United States delivered a draft of this proposed "go forward" agreement on April 13, 2011. The draft agreement outlines the tasks that the DOJ believes it has left to accomplish, including limited follow-up interviews and review of certain documents. The proposed agreement also includes a reasonable time period in which to finalize the DOJ's investigation, followed by a dismissal of this case. The MCSO is confident that it will enter into an agreement which will lead to the conclusion of the Title VI investigation and this action shortly.

FURTHER AFFIANTS SAYETH NAUGHT.

John T. Masterson

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN before me	this day of , 2011 by John T

Masterson.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

4.19.13



Joseph J. Popolizio

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN before me this day of Ar, 2011 by Joseph

J. Popolizio.

My Commission Expires:

THE	OFFICIAL SEAL
	SHELLEY COFFFY
国际公园	Notary Public - State of Arizona
	Notary Public - State of Arizona MARICOPA COUNTY
	My Comm. Expires April 19, 2013

From: JOE POPOLIZIO

Sent: Friday, February 04, 2011 8:57 AM

To: 'Sreeharsha, Kavitha (CRT)'; JOHN MASTERSON

Cc: Shapiro, Avner (CRT); Gray, Peter (CRT); Hedrick, Nicole (CRT); Aminfar, Amin (CRT)

Subject: RE: jail staff interviews

Hello Kavitha.

No thanks necessary. I am glad that all went so smoothly.

We will get back to you as soon as possible regarding this request. Hopefully, we can actually have seasonable temperatures (70 or so) when you arrive next.

Joe

Joseph J. Popolizio, Esq. Jones, Skelton & Hochuli, P.L.C 2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Phone: 602-263-1741 Fax: 602-200-7876

Email: jpopolizio@jshfirm.com

From: Sreeharsha, Kavitha (CRT) [mailto:Kavitha.Sreeharsha@usdoi.gov]

**Sent:** Friday, February 04, 2011 7:56 AM **To:** JOHN MASTERSON; JOE POPOLIZIO

Cc: Shapiro, Avner (CRT); Gray, Peter (CRT); Hedrick, Nicole (CRT); Aminfar, Amin (CRT)

**Subject:** jail staff interviews

Dear John and Joe,

Nicole informs us that last Friday and this week's interview schedule of MCSO staff was well organized. Thank you for facilitating this. I am writing to seek your facilitation of one extra day of interviews to occur on Monday Feb 14<sup>th</sup>. We would like to interview the remainder of the Detention Officers on the list we originally sent. This would still be within the number of MCSO staff we set out to interview (50) on the jail investigation. We could follow the same logistics as our first day of DO interviews on Jan 28<sup>th</sup>. I understand that these interviews took place at the Training Facility. We would not be accompanied by a consultant for these interviews. I am listing below the DOs I believe Nicole did not interview on Jan 28. We would like to interview 8 of these 9 below. It sounds like the DO interviews are a little easier to organize because they are shorter and we are of course flexible as to order but would probably interview one per hour from 9am-6pm with a lunch break. Since I will be in Phoenix all of next week, I would appreciate your confirmation of this extra day but our COB today so I can go ahead and make my travel plans.

Durango:

Bevin Gillespie Hiatt Acosta Santiago-Rivera

Estrella: Alarcon Pritchard Ramirez Stewart

Many thanks,

### Kavitha Sreeharsha

Attorney Advisor
Federal Coordination and Compliance Section
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
202-616-8430

1 2 3 4 5 6	William R. Jones, Jr., Bar #001481 John T. Masterson, Bar #007447 Joseph J. Popolizio, Bar #017434 JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C. 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Telephone: (602) 263-1700 Fax: (602) 200-7801 wjones@jshfirm.com jmasterson@jshfirm.com jpopolizio@jshfirm.com		
7 8	Attorneys for Defendants Maricopa County Sheriff's Office and Joseph M. Arpaio		
9	UNITED STATES DIS	TRICT COURT	
10	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
11	United States of America,	NO. CV10-01878-PHX-GMS	
12	Plaintiff,	AFFIDAVIT OF SERGEANT	
13	V.	JAMES SEIBERT	
14	Maricopa County, Arizona; Maricopa County		
15	Sheriff's Office; and Joseph M. Arpaio, in his official capacity as Sheriff of Maricopa County, Arizona,		
16 17	Defendants.		
18	STATE OF ARIZONA )		
19	) ss. County of Maricopa		
20	County of Maricopa )		
21	Sergeant James Seibert, being f	irst duly sworn, deposes and states as	
22	follows:		
23	1. I am over the age of 18 years, am competent to testify to the matters		
24	set forth in this Affidavit, and make this Affidav	it from my own personal knowledge.	
25	2. I am a Sergeant with t	the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office	
26	("MCSO") and have been employed for approximation	nately 24 years.	
27	3. As the Title VI investigation	on moved forward in January 2011, DOJ	
28	attorneys and jail consultants continued to interv	view inmates in the Maricopa County Jail	
	2518451.1		

system. I coordinated the inmate interviews that occurred 2010 and 2011 pursuant to the requests of the Department of Justice ("DOJ").

- 4. To facilitate the DOJ's inmate interview process, MCSO provided the DOJ with inmate rosters from which the DOJ selected interviewees.
- 5. MCSO also reserved legal visitation rooms for the DOJ to conduct these inmate interviews.
- 6. MCSO did not limit the length or the number of these inmate interviews, nor did it limit the availability of any inmate for interview.
- 7. In the infrequent event that an inmate whom the DOJ randomly selected was unavailable, the unavailability was due to circumstances such as a previously scheduled medical visit or work shift of the particular inmate.
- 8. On one occasion, on the morning of January 25, 2011, an inmate at Durango jail appeared for an interview, but needed a Spanish interpreter. As the DOJ did not have an interpreter present as it had for other interviews, the inmate's interview was postponed until that afternoon when an interpreter could be present.
- 9. The interview process continued according to DOJ requests and agreed upon guidelines with few understandable limitations stemming from the necessary and expected security measures of jails.
- 10. The DOJ conducted inmate interviews outside the presence of MCSO personnel and attorneys as the DOJ requested, on dates and times that the DOJ requested.
  - 11. The DOJ conducted 59 inmate interviews in January 2011 alone.
- 12. Thus, to date, the DOJ has conducted a total of 145 inmate interviews in furtherance of their Title VI investigation, and all occurred with the assistance and cooperation of MCSO personnel and attorneys.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

Sergeant James Seibert

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN before me this day of April, 2011 by ant James Seibert. Sergeant James Seibert. My Commission Expires: April 20, 2013 OFFICIAL SEAL
DEBRA A. GERDY
Notary Public • State of Arizona
MARICOPA COUNTY
My Comm. Expires April 20, 2013 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	William R. Jones, Jr., Bar #001481 John T. Masterson, Bar #007447 Joseph J. Popolizio, Bar #017434 JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C. 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Telephone: (602) 263-1700 Fax: (602) 200-7801 wjones@jshfirm.com jmasterson@jshfirm.com jmasterson@jshfirm.com Attorneys for Defendants Maricopa County Sheriff's Office and Joseph M. Arpaio	
9	UNITED STATES DIS	TRICT COURT
10	DISTRICT OF A	ARIZONA
11	United States of America,	NO. CV10-01878-PHX-GMS
12	Plaintiff,	AFFIDAVIT OF LIEUTENANT
13	v.	DORIS CULHANE
14	Maricopa County, Arizona; Maricopa County	
15	County, Arizona,	
16		
17	Defendants.	
18	STATE OF ARIZONA )	
19	County of Maricopa ) ss.	
20	Lieutenant Doris Culhana, haina	first duly sworn, deposes and states as
21	follows:	msi day sworn, deposes and states as
22		urs, am competent to testify to the matters
23	set forth in this Affidavit, and make this Affidav	•
24		the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
25	("MCSO") and have been employed for approximately	•
26		011, MCSO coordinated the interviews of
27	both detention and patrol staff from an array of	
28	2518447.1	. was, assignments as the propagation of

Justice ("DOJ") requested in furtherance of its Title VI investigation. I assisted in coordinating those interviews.

- 4. Like the inmate interviews, the DOJ selected those staff members to interview, and MCSO made the selected staff members available.
- 5. In all, the DOJ requested and conducted 85 staff member interviews, including interviews of 53 command staff (i.e., personnel holding the rank of Sergeant and above).
- 6. The 53 command staff included 5 administrative, 31 detention, and 17 patrol staff members. On the detention side, the DOJ interviewed 4 Chiefs, 6 Captains, 18 Lieutenants, 1 Sergeant, and 18 Detention Officers; the DOJ also interviewed 2 civilian supervisors and 1 civilian employee.
- 7. On the law enforcement side, the DOJ interviewed 5 Chiefs, 8 Captains, 2 Lieutenants, 2 Sergeants, 2 Volunteer Posse Members, and 11 Deputies.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

Lieutenant Doris Culhane

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN before me this 26 day of April, 2011 by

Lieutenant Doris Culhane.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

