



OFFICE OF THE MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
301 WEST JEFFERSON, 8TH FLOOR
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
(602) 506-3411 (FAX) 506-8102



RICHARD M. ROMLEY, COUNTY ATTORNEY

JAMES H. KEPPEL, CHIEF DEPUTY

November 25, 1992

Honorable Stephen D. Neely
Pima County Attorney
32 N. Stone, Suite 1400
Phoenix, AZ 85701-1412

Dear Steve:

As you are aware, APAAC authorized the creation of the Public Integrity Task Force this last week in Tucson. Being the co-chair of the northern half of Arizona, I have selected my committee, as follows:

Richard M. Romley, Maricopa County Attorney, Co-Chair
Charles R. Hastings, Yavapai County Attorney
Terence C. Hance, Coconino County Attorney Elect
Kerry G. Wangberg, Phoenix City Prosecutor

I shall be arranging meetings with my members to develop specific procedures on how to address matters that will come before this task force. I look forward to working with you as a fellow co-chair on these difficult and complex issues, and if I can be of any assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,


Richard M. Romley
Maricopa County Attorney

RMR/pb

cc: Charles Hastings
Terence C. Hance
Kerry G. Wangberg
William A. Holohan

January 20, 1993

Due to the number of people who have expressed willingness to participate in the Public Integrity Task Force concept we will simply divide the state into north and south.

The northern task force, chaired by Rick Romley, will include:

Apache County
Coconino County
Graham County
Maricopa County
Mohave County
Navajo County
Yavapai County
Phoenix City Prosecutor

The southern task force, chaired by Steve Neely, will include:

Cochise County
Gila County
Greenlee County
Pima County
Pinal County
Santa Cruz County
Yuma County
Tucson City Prosecutor (*R. Wm. Call*)

As Steve Suskin is APAAC Chairman, he will be available to either task force. Similarly, the Attorney General, who receives many complaints suitable for PITF consideration, is free to work with either task force.

Most of the prosecutors have already expressed willingness to participate. If you do not wish to be involved, please contact Neely or Romley, as appropriate.

A copy of the PITF resolution is included. If relevant issues arise, we urge you to utilize a task force approach. In the long run, we will all benefit.

Thank you.

**PUBLIC INTEGRITY TASK FORCE RESOLUTION
APAAC**

Whereas political figures and other high profile persons under investigation or prosecution frequently allege ulterior motives and attack the methods of law enforcement officials.

And whereas there is no formal procedure to guarantee manpower and/or technical assistance for prosecutorial and police agencies throughout the state in conflict of interest, near-conflict, high profile, and public corruption cases.

Be it, therefor, resolved that the Arizona Prosecuting Attorneys Advisory Council does hereby create the APAAC Public Integrity Task Force for the purpose of:

- 1. Securing and coordinating, at the request of the relevant agency head, prosecutors and/or investigators from other jurisdictions to act in conjunction with, or independently of, the requesting agency to safeguard the public interest in both the integrity of the case and the reputation of the agency from any negative impact from false accusations by an accused, an accused's attorney, or other adversarial party or organization.**
- 2. Scheduling and conducting, at the request of the relevant agency head, inquiries using a multi-jurisdictional team to verify the lawful conduct of the public's business.**
- 3. Providing technical, legal, or other assistance, as requested and appropriate, at any stage of an inquiry, investigation or other proceeding undertaken by the Task Force.**

Dated this 18th day of November 1992.

PUBLIC INTEGRITY TASK FORCE

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

GUIDELINES

A. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

The Arizona Prosecuting Attorney's Advisory Counsel created the Public Integrity Task Force so as to provide a forum to which elected prosecuting attorneys could refer and request review of allegations of breach of the public trust by elected public officials, public employees, persons compensated by public funds, and other matters of significant public interest. Upon completion of review the Public Integrity Task Force may recommend continued investigation, prosecution or summary disposition of the matter.

The Public Integrity Task Force shall consist of the Northern Arizona Subcommittee and the Southern Arizona Subcommittee. Jurisdiction of the subcommittees are set forth in the jurisdiction section.

Each subcommittee of the Public Integrity Task Force may be comprised of elected prosecuting attorneys or their designees from no more than four (4) separate and distinct jurisdictions. The Attorney General or his designee may be requested to participate as a member of the Task Force for the purpose of reviewing matters involving multi county jurisdiction or State wide import.

This multi-jurisdictional approach to the review of allegations of breach of the public trust ensures an impartial, decision making process.

B. JURISDICTION:

The Public Integrity Task Force Northern Arizona Subcommittee has jurisdiction to consider requests for review from prosecuting attorneys of the following counties: Apache, Coconino, Graham, La Paz (shared jurisdiction with Southern Arizona Subcommittee), Maricopa, Mohave, Navajo, Yavapai, Phoenix City Prosecutor. The Public Integrity Task Force Southern Arizona Subcommittee has jurisdiction to consider requests for review from prosecuting attorneys of the following counties: Cochise, Gila, Greenlee, La Paz (shared jurisdiction with Northern Arizona Subcommittee), Pima, Pinal, Santa Cruz, Yuma, Tucson City Prosecutor.

C. CRITERIA FOR CASE REFERRAL:

The Public Integrity Task Force may review those matters which involve substantial public interest, complex breaches of public trust, or matters in which the originating prosecuting attorney has an actual or apparent conflict of interest. The initial decision as to whether or not to refer matters for review by the Task Force remain exclusively within the jurisdiction of the originating prosecuting attorney.

D. CASE REVIEW PROCEDURE:

1. Request for review and accompanying documents may be forwarded to the appropriate Chair of the Public Integrity Task Force Subcommittee.
2. Upon receipt, the request for review may be assigned a review number and indexed.
3. The Chairman of the Public Integrity Task Force Subcommittee may request that a preliminary review be undertaken by investigative and/or prosecutorial personnel.
4. Upon conclusion of the preliminary review, if requested, a factual analysis of the matter referred may be drafted for review by the appropriate Task Force Subcommittee Members.
5. The preliminary factual analysis may be forwarded to the appropriate Task Force Subcommittee Members for review. Said review shall be undertaken by no less than a majority of the subcommittee.
6. The reviewing subcommittee task force members may confer and after discussion determine whether to request additional investigation by an investigative agency, and/or recommend prosecution by a prosecutorial agency, or inform the referring prosecuting attorney that criminal prosecution was not warranted.
7. If further investigation is recommended, the investigative agency shall upon completion of such

investigation present its findings to the reviewing subcommittee task force members.

8. Upon receipt of the final investigative report and a review of same, the subcommittee task force members may either recommend prosecution and refer the matter to a prosecutorial agency or may recommend that criminal prosecution is not warranted and so inform the referring prosecuting attorney.
9. The Public Integrity Task Force Subcommittee may meet by telephone conference call participated in by no less than a quorum of subcommittee members.