



*Court Implementation Division  
Response to the Independent Monitor's Fourth Report Draft,  
Review Period First Quarter 2015*

The Monitor Team provided a draft copy of the "Fourth Report, Independent Monitor for the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office" dated June 17, 2015, to the MCSO Court Implementation Division. In review of the draft copy, the MCSO responds to the following areas (responses appear in bold type):

- Page 5, COURT ORDER V. POLICIES AND PROCDEURES states: *"During the review period, MCSO's electronic policy dissemination system, E-Policy, became operational; but MCSO has not as of yet used the system to publish any Order-related policies."*

**In response to this paragraph, paragraph 31 of the Order states "the MCSO shall ensure that personnel continue to be regularly notified of any new Policies and Procedures or changes to Policies and Procedures." MCSO implemented e-Policy, a system whereby it can regularly notify personnel of new or amended policies and procedures. Prior to the Order, no such system was in place to accomplish this task.**

Additionally, the *"Third Report, Independent Monitor For the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, Review Period Fourth Quarter 2014, Court Order V. Policies and Procedures,"* page 4 states: "while this training provides the vehicle for documenting receipt of these [Order-related] policies, MCSO is still developing a system to document receipt of policies which are distributed outside of Order-mandated training."

**During this reporting period MCSO did not publish any Order-related policies; however, on February 5, 2015 MCSO utilized the e-Policy system to disseminate MCSO Critical Policy, CP-1, Use of Force. The system successfully distributed, memorialized, and tracked employee compliance with the required reading of the policy; and employees acknowledged an understating of, and an agreement to, abide by the requirements of the policy. This system is designed to disseminate electronically all policies, which MCSO continues to do.**

- Page 20, paragraph 26 states: *"During this review period, MCSO Special Investigations Division submitted a memorandum indicating that the Anti-Trafficking Unit (formerly HSU) had arrested four suspects for transportation of marijuana during the months of January and February 2015. All were arrested on January 5, 2015 under the same report number. The Department report itself was not provided, as has been done with previous submissions relevant to our request for documentation in support of this paragraph, so it could not be reviewed."*

**In February 2015, the Monitor Team provided MCSO a Re-Occurring Document Request. The Monitor Team's request in reference to paragraph 26c and 26d, is a "Listing of investigative**



**reports and arrests made by the Anti-Trafficking Unit (ATU)."** In April of 2015, MCSO CID provided a list of investigative reports and arrests made by ATU for January and February of 2015, ("Response to 2015 Jan. Feb. Monthly Document Request Related to Paragraphs 26 c.d." authored by Special Investigations Division Captain Fred Aldorasi, Bates #MELC173518). The response lists one investigative report and the arrests ATU made during January and February 2015. The list contained the Investigative Report (IR), 15-000376 for the Transportation of Marijuana on January 5, 2015. The Monitor Team did not request a report sampling of the provided list.

- Page 25, paragraph 32 states: *"During this reporting period, we received...a list of the 35 closed investigations involving Patrol Operations...We reviewed the completed investigations of 20 of these closed cases. Of the 20 cases, seven (35%) had significant issues of concern. In two of the cases reviewed, the investigations had to be returned to the investigating first-line patrol supervisor for failure to adequately address all concerns."*

What the report does not mention is that the Professional Standards Bureau, as one of their many functions, conducted a review of the cases that were conducted outside of PSB. PSB determined that the two cases were deficient and returned the cases for further investigation. This is an indication that PSB is proactive in identifying deficiencies and remedying the situation.

- Page 61, paragraph 57 states: "In order to address the use of in-car recording equipment to check on whether deputies are accurately recording the stop length, MCSO developed a draft policy, EA-4, Use of Body Worn Cameras..." (and subsequent paragraphs, 61-63)

During this reporting period, the Policy Section renamed and renumbered the policy "**EA-6, Body Worn Cameras.**" It should be noted that following the reporting period, the Policy Section again renumbered the policy to **GJ-35, Body Worn Cameras**, a General Policy, to include understanding by all personnel to encompass sworn, detention and civilian employees.