

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

CALIFORNIA WITNESS RELOCATION AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM



Annual Report to the Legislature
2010-2011

CALIFORNIA WITNESS RELOCATION AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAM



California Office of the Attorney General
Kamala D. Harris
Attorney General

Division of Law Enforcement
Larry J. Wallace, Director

Bureau of Investigation and Intelligence
Christina Rogers, Assistant Bureau Chief

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Case Statistics	2
Chart 1 — Case Statistics for All Chapter Funds as of June 30, 2011.	2
Chart 2 — New Cases Approved During FY 2010-2011 (Chapter 712/10).	2
Cases Submitted for Funding	3
Chart 3 — Types of Cases Submitted for Funding (FY 2010-2011).	3
Chart 4 — Percentage of Gang-Related Cases Funded Each Fiscal Year	3
Charges Filed on Cases	4
Chart 5 — Types of Charges Filed on Cases (FY 2010-2011)	4
Local Assistance	5
Chart 6 — Local Assistance Balances as of June 30, 2011	5
Reimbursements for Local Agencies	6
Chart 7 — Approved Reimbursement Claims by Chapter Fund (FY 2010-2011).	6
Chart 8 — Submitted and Approved Reimbursement Claims (FY 2010-2011)	7
County Match Received by Program	8
Chart 9 — Submitted Match Claims by Agency (FY 2010-2011)	8
Successful Prosecutions	9
Alameda County	9
Fresno County	9
Kern County	9
Los Angeles County	9
Monterey County	10
Sacramento County	10
San Bernardino County	10
San Diego County	10
San Mateo County	11
Santa Clara County	11
Solano County	11
Sonoma County	11
Tulare County	11
Testimonials	12
Other Program Items of Interest	13
Administrative Status	13
Outreach and Training	13

Executive Summary

The 2011 California Witness Relocation and Assistance Program (CAL WRAP) Annual Report to the Legislature summarizes the fiscal year (FY) reporting period of July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011. During this reporting period, CAL WRAP serviced 770 cases: 437 previously approved cases and 333 new cases. As of June 30, 2011, the program closed 374 cases, leaving 396 active cases. The CAL WRAP currently resides within the Division of Law Enforcement's Bureau of Investigation and Intelligence.

The 333 new cases opened during FY 2010-2011 provided services for 379 witnesses and 519 family members who testified against 612 violent offenders. Of the 333 new cases, 264 were gang-related. Other case types identified were high-risk (54), domestic violence (8), narcotics trafficking (4), and organized crime (3). Charges of homicide and attempted homicide were the precipitating charges on 72.4 percent of the cases, and assault accounted for 9.9 percent. The remaining 17.7 percent of cases involved rape, kidnapping, robbery, threats, narcotics, home invasion, and criminal conspiracy.

The CAL WRAP was allocated \$4,855,000 in local assistance funds for California district attorneys' offices for FY 2010-2011. As of June 30, 2011, the program expended \$810,984, had an existing encumbrance of \$3,012,285, and an available balance of \$1,031,731 to support existing cases.

During FY 2010-2011, the program received 808 claims for reimbursement totaling \$4,337,189 in authorized witness expenditures. These claims averaged a total of \$361,432 per month, representing 32 local district attorneys' offices, and included 779 reimbursement claims that met the mandatory 25 percent match requirement. The district attorneys' offices requested \$4,238,879 in witness expenditures, of which \$4,217,822 was approved for reimbursement based on their matches.

During this reporting period, 374 witness relocation cases were closed, including 126 cases closed with reportable convictions. Twenty of these closed cases are mentioned in the "Successful Prosecutions" Section because of their noteworthy criminal sentences. The sentences range from 13 years in state prison for child abuse to 234 years-to-life for homicide.

During FY 2010-2011, the CAL WRAP expended \$332,167 on administrative costs, including personnel and reimbursement of \$60,000 for services to the Attorney General's Office of Program Review and Audits (OPRA) for staff hours rendered to perform audits of district attorneys' offices utilizing the services of the program.

The CAL WRAP staff continues to provide program training to local law enforcement personnel throughout California at conferences, Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) certified training courses, and as requested.

Case Statistics


During the reporting period, the CAL WRAP was responsible for the administration of three FY appropriations: Chapter 712/10 (FY 2010-2011), Chapter 1/09 (FY 2009-2010), and Chapter 268/08 (FY 2008-2009). The program provided service for 770 cases, including 437 previously approved cases and 333 new cases. Through June 30, 2011, the program closed 374 cases, leaving 396 cases active (see Chart 1).

Chart 1 — Case Statistics for All Chapter Funds as of June 30, 2011

Chapter Fund	New or Existing Cases	Closed Cases	Active Cases	Witnesses	Family Members	Defendants
712/10	333	54	279	379	519	612
1/09	318	201	117	418	692	670
268/08†	119	119	0	464	734	777
Totals	770	374	396	1,261	1,945	2,059

The 333 new CAL WRAP cases approved during FY 2010-2011 (Chapter 712/10) provided for the relocation of 379 witnesses and 519 family members testifying against 612 defendants (see Chart 2).

Chart 2 — Case Activity During FY 2010-2011 (Chapter 712/10)



† Chapter 268/08 closed on June 30, 2011.

Cases Submitted for Funding

There were 333 new cases approved by the CAL WRAP for the period of July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011. These cases included: 264 were gang-related (79.3 percent), 54 were for high-risk crimes (16.2 percent), 8 were for domestic violence (2.4 percent), 4 were narcotics trafficking-related (1.2 percent) and 3 were organized crime-related (0.9 percent); see Chart 3. Since the inception of the program in January 1998, the percentage of gang-related cases has averaged 76 percent each year. Chart 4 depicts the actual percentage of gang-related cases approved from FY 1998-1999 to FY 2010-2011.

Chart 3 — Types of Cases Submitted for Funding (FY 2010-2011)






Chart 4 — Percentage of Gang-Related Cases Funded Each Fiscal Year



Charges Filed on Cases

During this reporting period, homicide and attempted homicide charges accounted for 72.4 percent of the 333 new cases for FY 2010-2011. Of the remaining charges filed, 9.9 percent involved assault charges; 6 percent were for threats; 3 percent involved robbery; 2.4 percent were for criminal conspiracy charges; 2.4 percent were for narcotics charges; 1.5 percent involved crimes of rape; 1.5 percent involved kidnapping charges and, the remaining 0.9 percent involved home invasions. Chart 5 is a visual representation of the types of charges filed on approved cases for FY 2010-2011.

Chart 5 — Types of Charges Filed on Cases (FY 2010-2011)*



*No fraud cases in FY 2010-2011.

Local Assistance

The CAL WRAP's local assistance appropriation (monies available to district attorneys' offices to support witness relocation cases) for FY 2010-2011 was \$4,855,000. As of June 30, 2011, \$810,984 was expended, \$3,012,285 remained encumbered, and the remaining balance of \$1,031,731 will be allocated to support existing cases. Chart 6 illustrates the status of the Chapter 712/10 fund as well as the two prior FY funds: Chapters 1/09 (FY 2009-2010) and 268/08 (FY 2008-2009) that were also administered by the program during this reporting period. The Chapter 268/08 fund closed as of June 30, 2011.

Chart 6 — Local Assistance Balances as of June 30, 2011

Chapter Fund	Beginning Funds	Current Encumbered Funds	Expended Funds	Balance
712/10 (FY-11)*	\$4,855,000	\$3,012,285	\$810,984	\$1,031,731
1/09 FY 09-10)*	\$4,855,000	\$1,107,783	\$2,966,063	\$781,155
268/08 (FY 08-09)†	\$4,855,000	\$0	\$4,825,676	\$29,324

* Although there is an available balance, these funds are for continued support of existing cases.

† Chapter 268/08 closed on June 30, 2011.

Reimbursements for Local Agencies

In FY 2010-2011, the CAL WRAP staff processed 808 reimbursement claims totaling \$4,337,189 submitted by 32 district attorneys' offices. The approved reimbursement claims reflect a monthly average of \$361,432 utilized for allowable witness or sworn law enforcement expenses.

Chart 7 reflects the total expenses approved for each active chapter fund during FY 2010-2011 and the total number of reimbursement claims processed for each year's appropriation. Reimbursements are for various services required by relocated witnesses and family members that include temporary lodging, relocation expenses, storage of personal belongings, monthly rent, meals, utilities, and incidentals. The program also reimburses expenses incurred for providing psychological counseling, medical care, new identities, vocational or occupational training, and costs accrued when witnesses must return for testimony in a criminal proceeding. Sworn law enforcement expenses may also be reimbursed while transporting or protecting a witness to include travel expenses, lodging, per diem, and required overtime.

Chart 7 — Approved Reimbursement Claims by Chapter Fund (FY 2010-2011)

Chapter Fund	Amount Approved	Claims Processed
Chapter 712/10	\$810,984	186
Chapter 1/09	\$2,044,203	393
Chapter 268/08	\$1,482,002	229
Total	\$4,337,189	808

Chart 8 on the following page lists the 32 district attorneys' offices that submitted reimbursement claims for witness expenses during FY 2010-2011 and the amount requested and approved for each county. The \$4,337,189 in approved expenditures represents 808 reimbursement claims.

Chart 8 — Submitted and Approved Reimbursement Claims (FY 2010-2011)*

District Attorney Office	Reimbursements Submitted	Reimbursements Approved
Alameda	\$22,597.54	\$22,597.54
Contra Costa	\$147,220.37	\$147,220.37
El Dorado	\$2,053.11	\$2,053.11
Fresno	\$82,585.77	\$82,585.77
Humbolt	\$28,543.85	\$28,543.85
Kern	\$143,989.94	\$143,989.94
Lake	\$34,819.49	\$34,819.49
Los Angeles	\$984,533.07	\$966,583.23
Marin	\$37,386.58	\$37,386.58
Mendocino	\$2,850.00	\$2,850.00
Merced	\$7,316.89	\$7,316.89
Monterey	\$419,360.83	\$419,953.96
Napa	\$34,572.85	\$34,572.85
Orange	\$12,562.41	\$12,562.41
Riverside	\$74,476.18	\$72,405.63
Sacramento	\$84,810.37	\$84,548.45
San Bernardino	\$174,608.69	\$174,334.98
San Diego	\$523,401.18	\$523,307.43
San Francisco	\$478,069.52	\$478,069.52
San Joaquin	\$54,999.31	\$54,999.31
San Mateo	\$231,870.37	\$231,870.37
Santa Barbara	\$11,908.18	\$11,908.18
Santa Clara	\$318,044.02	\$318,044.02
Santa Cruz	\$50,874.96	\$50,874.96
Shasta	\$26,962.56	\$26,962.56
Siskiyou	\$3,303.66	\$3,303.66
Solano	\$44,600.35	\$44,600.35
Sonoma	\$51,126.69	\$51,126.69
Stanislaus	\$15,788.92	\$15,788.92
Sutter	\$1,809.36	\$1,809.36
Tulare	\$96,901.73	\$96,901.73
Ventura	\$154,296.66	\$154,296.66
Total	\$4,358,245.41	\$4,337,188.77

*Some reimbursements also fell under the local match requirement.

County Match Received by Program

The CAL WRAP is mandated to report the amounts of funding: sought by each agency; provided to each agency; and the county match. Thirty-two agencies that submitted claims fell under this match requirement during FY 2010-2011. The total amount approved represents 779 reimbursement claims. Chart 9 reflects the 32 agencies that submitted match claims during FY 2010-2011.

Chart 9 — Submitted Match Claims by Agency (FY 2010-2011)

District Attorney Office	Total Amount Submitted	Total Amount Approved	25% Match Required	\$ Match Submitted
Alameda	\$22,597.54	\$22,597.54	\$5,649.39	\$9,697.36
Contra Costa	\$142,293.40	\$142,293.40	\$35,573.35	\$40,819.39
El Dorado	\$2,053.11	\$2,053.11	\$513.28	\$513.28
Fresno	\$82,585.77	\$82,585.77	\$20,646.44	\$20,660.19
Humboldt	\$28,543.85	\$28,543.85	\$7,135.96	\$7,524.48
Kern	\$140,340.70	\$140,340.70	\$35,085.18	\$39,256.72
Lake	\$34,819.49	\$34,819.49	\$8,704.87	\$8,808.98
Los Angeles	\$976,165.45	\$958,215.61	\$244,041.36	\$388,402.82
Marin	\$37,386.58	\$37,386.58	\$9,346.65	\$9,845.51
Mendocino	\$2,850.00	\$2,850.00	\$712.50	\$1,002.26
Merced	\$7,316.89	\$7,316.89	\$1,829.22	\$1,830.00
Monterey	\$368,655.80	\$368,248.93	\$92,163.95	\$44,344.81
Napa	\$34,572.85	\$34,572.85	\$8,643.21	\$8,643.22
Orange	\$12,562.41	\$12,562.41	\$3,140.60	\$3,140.75
Riverside	\$74,476.18	\$72,405.63	\$18,619.05	\$18,280.09
Sacramento	\$84,810.37	\$84,548.45	\$21,202.59	\$39,720.32
San Bernardino	\$174,608.69	\$174,334.98	\$43,652.17	\$38,803.35
San Diego	\$521,354.10	\$521,260.35	\$130,338.53	\$138,839.84
San Francisco	\$448,366.74	\$448,366.74	\$112,091.69	\$87,064.60
San Joaquin	\$54,999.31	\$54,999.31	\$13,749.83	\$47,092.05
San Mateo	\$211,162.54	\$211,162.54	\$52,790.64	\$53,125.29
Santa Barbara	\$11,980.28	\$11,980.28	\$2,995.07	\$6,814.00
Santa Clara	\$318,711.81	\$318,711.81	\$79,677.95	\$77,922.57
Santa Cruz	\$50,874.96	\$50,874.96	\$12,718.74	\$13,408.75
Shasta	\$26,962.56	\$26,962.56	\$6,740.64	\$8,364.64
Siskiyou	\$3,303.66	\$3,303.66	\$825.92	\$826.37
Solano	\$44,600.35	\$44,600.35	\$11,150.09	\$13,186.50
Sonoma	\$51,126.69	\$51,126.69	\$12,781.67	\$28,328.33
Stanislaus	\$15,788.92	\$15,788.92	\$3,947.23	\$4,574.70
Sutter	\$1,809.36	\$1,809.36	\$452.34	\$1,216.19
Tulare	\$96,901.73	\$96,901.73	\$24,225.43	\$24,368.84
Ventura	\$154,296.66	\$154,296.66	\$38,574.17	\$38,576.28
Total	\$4,238,878.75	\$4,217,822.11	\$1,059,719.69	\$1,225,002.48

Successful Prosecutions

During FY 2010-2011, the program solicited conviction information from local law enforcement agencies after the closure of their cases. Many client agencies responded with reportable convictions. The following examples demonstrate 20 cases from various district attorneys' offices that concluded with a successful prosecution and had a noteworthy criminal sentence.

Alameda County District Attorney's Office (1/09-350)	
Case Facts	Attempted homicide case. The witness was present when one of the three defendants shot at a police officer as he was driving by and assisted law enforcement in identifying this defendant. The next day, a relative of the shooter and an enforcer lured the witness back to the area of the shooting and shot him multiple times at point blank range for cooperating with police. The witness survived his injuries and agreed to testify regarding both incidents. In an effort to further intimidate the witness, the defendants' associates filled the court room during the witness's testimony.
Disposition	Life (2 sentences), plus 29 years plus 6 months, and 5 years – 664/187 PC, 12022.53(d) PC, 12022.53(c) PC, 245(d)(2) PC, 12021(a)(1) PC & 11351.5 H&S
Fresno County District Attorney's Office (268/08-278)	
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The victim, a gang associate, was abducted, beaten, and then placed in a closet for hours before being driven to an isolated area where she was stabbed and left for dead. The witness survived her injuries. It is believed the two defendants, both gang members, thought the victim was an informant and held her responsible for another gang member's arrest.
Disposition	18 years & 15 years state prison – 664/187 PC, 207(a) PC, 211 PC
Fresno County District Attorney's Office (1/09-30)	
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The witness was an incarcerated gang member who disrespected his gang and was targeted to be killed. He was lured into a cell where five fellow gang members assaulted him and left him for dead. He survived his injuries and testified against several gang members on two other cases – one homicide, and one attempted homicide.
Disposition	17 years, 15 years, 4 years state prison – 664/187 PC, 186.22(b)(1), 245(a)(1) PC, 12022.7(a) PC
Kern County District Attorney's Office (268/08-353)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim was shot for no apparent reason during a home invasion robbery. The robbery took place during a party and was planned out and executed by four known gang members. At the murder victim's funeral, gang members drove by and yelled at the witness, who was present during the home invasion, in an attempt to discourage him from testifying. The court hearings were attended by many gang members in an attempt to further intimidate the witness.
Disposition	Life without parole, 28 years to life, 26 years to life, 16 years to life – 245 PC, 192 PC & 212.5 PC
Kern County District Attorney's Office (1/09-09)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. Four defendants, known local gang members, suspected a fellow gang member was an informant and lured him to a residence where they shot and stabbed him to death. Witnesses would not come forward due to fear of gang retaliation, until one witness was interviewed while in custody on an unrelated charge. After testifying, the witness was released from custody and relocated.
Disposition	25 years to life, 16 years (2 sentences) & 2 years 8 months state prison – 187 PC, 8 PC, 192 PC, 192(a)(1) PC, 186.22(A) PC & 32 PC
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (268/08-141)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide. The defendant, a local gang member, was looking for retaliation when he drove by a group of people playing football in a rival gang's territory. The defendant shot into the group several times, striking and killing the victim. The witness was playing football during the shooting and provided information to law enforcement regarding the homicide. When the defendant's father went to the witness's home and made death threats, the witness and his family were relocated.
Disposition	60 years to life – 187 PC

Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (268/08-44)	
Case Facts	High-risk child abuse case. The two defendants in this case are members of a local street gang. Over a two month period, the suspects physically abused, tortured and starved the five-year-old victim. The witness was a family member of one of the suspects and provided information to law enforcement that lead to the arrest of the defendants. Fearing retaliation from the gang, law enforcement relocated the witness for her safety.
Disposition	13 years state prison – 273(a) PC
Monterey County District Attorney's Office (712/10-07)	
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide. The victim, a gang associate, was in a parked vehicle at his apartment complex when known gang members approached in another vehicle and blocked the victim's vehicle. One of the gang members then fired multiple shots at the victim's vehicle, hitting him. The victim survived his injuries and was relocated after jailhouse notes were intercepted between the defendant and his girlfriend, instructing fellow gang members to kill or intimidate the witnesses in this case.
Disposition	102 years to life – 664/187 PC with 186.22 PC
Sacramento County District Attorney's Office (01/09-87)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide. The victim, a known gang member, and the witness were both attending a house party when a rival gang arrived and a gunfight ensued. The victim was shot and killed during the gunfight. The witness was able to identify the shooter and was later assaulted by the shooter's family and associates in retaliation for her testimony in the preliminary hearing. The witness and her family were relocated to ensure their safety.
Disposition	25 years state prison – 187 PC
San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office (712/10-221)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim in this case got into a fight with two known gang members. After losing the fight, one of the gang members recruited additional gang members to return and exact revenge, resulting in the murder of the victim. The witness was one of the gang members who participated in the original fight, but refused to return, and was not part of the resulting murder.
Disposition	61 years to life – 187 PC, 245 PC
San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office (712/10-10)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The defendant, a local gang member, became enraged when he was told of an argument between two fellow gang members and members of a rival gang. The witness was in the backseat of the car when the defendant shot at the rival gang member's car and another car, killing one of the occupants.
Disposition	212 years to life – 187 PC (6 counts)
San Diego County District Attorney's Office (1/09-01)	
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The defendant was assaulted by rival gang members and was looking for retaliation. The witness was walking with friends when the defendant drove by demanding to know their gang affiliation. The defendant believed the witness and his friends were part of the gang that assaulted him earlier in the day. The witness was shot twice in the leg, but survived his injuries. After reporting the crime, the witness and his family were relocated based on the gang's history of retaliatory violence.
Disposition	234 years to life – 664/187 PC
San Diego County District Attorney's Office (1/09-219)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. While walking down the street, two teenagers were approached from behind by local street gang members regarding their gang affiliation. When the victims stated they were not gang members, one of the defendants produced a handgun and shot and killed the victim. The witness was threatened on different occasions by members of the defendant's family, making it crucial that she and her family be relocated for their safety.
Disposition	50 years to life (2 sentences) – 187 PC

San Mateo District Attorney's Office (268/08-358)	
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. Three gang members participated in a home invasion robbery where they restrained three victims with zip-ties while ransacking the home in search of guns and narcotics. When their search proved unfruitful, one of the defendants shot each of the three victims. All three victims survived their injuries, and one agreed to testify.
Disposition	25 years to life, 46 years state prison – 664/187 PC, 186.22 PC, 245(a) PC, 460(a) PC
Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office (712/10-16)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The defendants, members of a local street gang, conspired to commit four murders and numerous attempted murders in an act of retaliation. The witness, who was not a gang member, was a former roommate of one of the defendants and had knowledge critical to the investigation. The witness provided information to law enforcement that proved crucial in solving these crimes.
Disposition	Life without parole and 50 years to life – 187 PC
Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office (268/08-156)	
Case Facts	Gang-related narcotics case. Three of the defendants were high ranking members of a large nationwide gang and were arrested and prosecuted for conspiracy to sell controlled substances for the benefit of the gang, extortion, assault with a deadly weapon, and attempted murder. The witness was a former member of the gang and agreed to testify and provide information concerning the day-to-day operations, and activities related to large scale narcotic distribution. The witness was instrumental in receiving dozens of convictions in this case, including "three-strike" sentences for several of the defendants.
Disposition	149 years to life and 14 years state prison – 186.22 PC, 182/11379 PC, and 182/245 PC
Solano County District Attorney's Office (1/09-262)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim, a fifteen-year-old male, was struck in the back of the neck by a bullet during a drive-by shooting in which one gang was shooting at rival gang members. The witness was in one of the suspect vehicles and agreed to testify against his fellow gang members. The witness and his family received threats from his gang for assisting the prosecution and also from the gang of the murdered boy. The witness was relocated and later successfully testified at trial resulting in two convictions for murder.
Disposition	15 years to life (2 sentences) – 187 PC, 12022.53(d) PC, 186.22 PC
Sonoma County District Attorney's Office (712/10-49)	
Case Facts	Homicide case. The defendant, a local street gang member, attacked and killed a business owner in an industrial park after attempting to steal property from the location. The witness is the ex-girlfriend of the defendant, and had knowledge related to the homicide. After the witness's identity was revealed during the trial, two unknown assailants broke into the witness's home and threatened her with bodily harm if she testified. As a result of these threats, the witness was relocated to ensure her safety.
Disposition	Life without parole – 187 PC, 211 PC & 459 PC
Tulare County District Attorney's Office (268/08-208)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The defendants are members of a local street gang. The defendants conspired to murder one of their own gang members for failing to participate in gang activities. One of these activities included killing another rival gang member. After driving to a rural area and shooting the victim multiple times, the defendants drove to the witness's home, where they discussed the murder and displayed the murder weapon. After cooperating with law enforcement, the witness received death threats and was subsequently relocated.
Disposition	Life without parole (2 sentences) – 187 PC & 186.22 PC
Tulare County District Attorney's Office (268/08-11)	
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The two witnesses were acquaintances of the victim and were present during the fatal stabbing that law enforcement believes was an act of gang retaliation. The witnesses later identified the four suspects responsible for the crime leading to their arrest. After cooperating with law enforcement, the witnesses' residence was shot at by unknown suspects. Law enforcement believed the witnesses and their family would be further targets of retaliation if not relocated.
Disposition	21 years, 13 years, 6 years, and 5 years in state prison – 192 PC, 245 PC, 186.22 PC & 12022 PC

Testimonials

The program solicits information from local law enforcement agencies after the closure of their cases requesting comments or suggestions concerning the CAL WRAP, its policies, or procedures. Of the comments received from these agencies during FY 2010-2011, many contained positive responses regarding the exceptional services of program staff, the witness services provided, and the continued need to provide these services to testifying witnesses. The following comments highlight the testimonials received during the past year.

Kern County District Attorney's Office

"CAL WRAP staff are terrific; they're always there to help!"

Kern County District Attorney's Office

"If there were ever a case that could justify why the program is so crucial, this one speaks out. Triple murder, gang member known to have committed other murders; without this program witnesses would not have felt safe to testify. Thank you."

"Bottom line - cases could not, would not, be prosecuted without the assistance of the CAL WRAP program. Many thanks to the CAL WRAP staff!"

Lake County District Attorney's Office

"CAL WRAP has always handled our cases in an efficient and timely manner. We find that CAL WRAP staff are a pleasure to work with and process our requests quickly."

San Diego County District Attorney's Office

"CAL WRAP made the prosecution of this case possible."

San Francisco County District Attorney's Office

"The services provided by CAL WRAP were great and it allowed this young witness to permanently relocate with her four children."

"The CAL WRAP program is a tremendous asset to the criminal justice system."

Sonoma County District Attorney's Office

"I have been thoroughly impressed with the program and the accessibility of CAL WRAP staff. My questions are answered promptly and claims are processed in a reasonable amount of time. Thank you!"

Sutter County District Attorney's Office

"We are very glad to have these services available - keep up the great work!"

Tulare County District Attorney's Office

"As always, your involvement and assistance made the difference in this case. Thanks for all your hard work."

Other Program Items of Interest

Administrative Status

In FY 2010-2011, the CAL WRAP expended \$332,167 on administrative costs. In addition to personnel resources and general operating expenses, expenditures also included the cost of local agency audits. The cost of local agency audits for FY 2010-2011 was \$60,000.

The program currently operates with one full-time Associate Governmental Program Analyst, one full-time Staff Services Analyst, and one full-time Office Technician.

Outreach and Training

During FY 2010-2011, CAL WRAP staff participated in several training venues for law enforcement personnel. The lead analyst provided training on the policies and procedures of the program for the California District Attorneys Association and for the Department of Justice Advanced Training Center. The CAL WRAP staff continues to provide training to local district attorneys' offices on request.