OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL KAMALA D. HARRIS

California Witness Relocation and Assistance Program



Annual Report to the Legislature 2015-2016

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

Table of Contents

Executive Summary
Case Statistics
Table 1 — Case Statistics for All Chapter Funds as of June 30, 2016
Chart 1 — New Case Activity During FY 2015-2016 (Chapter 10/15)
Cases Submitted for Funding
Chart 2 — Types of Cases Submitted for Funding (FY 2015-2016)
Chart 3 — Percentage of Gang-Related Cases Funded Each Fiscal Year 4
Charges Filed on Cases
Chart 4 — Types of Charges Filed on Cases (FY 2015-2016)
Local Assistance 6
Table 2 — Local Assistance Balances as of June 30, 2016
Reimbursements for Local Agencies
Table 3 — Approved Reimbursement Claims by Chapter Fund (FY 2015-2016) 7
County Match Received by Program
Table 4 — Submitted Match Claims by Agency (FY 2015-2016)
Successful Prosecutions
Testimonials
Other Program Items of Interest
Administrative Status
Outreach and Training

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the accomplishments of the California Witness Relocation and Assistance Program (CalWRAP) during the fiscal year (FY) reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. During this reporting period, the CalWRAP managed 770 cases. This included 498 cases that were opened in FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015, and another 272 cases that were opened in FY 2015-2016. The program closed 361 cases, leaving 409 active cases.

The 272 new cases provided services to 314 witnesses and their 459 family members. During their participation in the CalWRAP, the witnesses provided testimony against 642 violent offenders. There were 199 gang-related cases with numerous others classified as high-risk (44), organized crime (9), domestic violence (8), human trafficking (7), and narcotics trafficking (5). Charges of homicide and attempted homicide were the principal charges in 70.6 percent of the cases. Assault accounted for another 11.0 percent. The remaining 18.4 percent of cases involved robbery, threats, human trafficking, narcotics, kidnapping, rape and sexual assault, fraud, home invasions, criminal conspiracy or burglary.

A total of \$4,855,000 was allocated to the CalWRAP for distribution to California district attorneys' offices in FY 2015-2016. The program expended \$819,418 as of June 30, 2016, with the remaining balance available for district attorneys to support their cases.

The program processed 699 claims for reimbursement in FY 2015-2016 totaling \$5,396,139 in authorized witness expenditures to 25 California district attorneys' offices. The distributed funds were processed pursuant to the mandatory 25 percent match requirement.

The 361 closed cases include 133 cases that were closed with reportable convictions. Thirty of these closed cases are detailed in the "Successful Prosecutions" Section of this report because they represent the varied sentences that are meted out to offenders in cases managed by the CalWRAP. The sentences range from eight months for assault to life without parole plus 35 years to life for homicide.

The CalWRAP expended \$239,506 on administrative costs in FY 2015-2016, which included personnel resources and general operating expenses. CalWRAP staff continue to provide program training to local law enforcement personnel throughout California at conferences, Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certified training courses and as requested. The CalWRAP is currently administered by the Division of Law Enforcement.

Case Statistics

During the reporting period, the CalWRAP was responsible for the administration of three FY appropriations: Chapter 10/15 (FY 2015-2016), Chapter 25/14 (FY 2014-2015), and Chapter 20/13 (FY 2013-2014). The program provided service for 770 cases, including 498 previously-approved cases and 272 new cases. Through June 30, 2016, the program closed 361 cases, leaving 409 cases active (see Table 1).

Chapter Fund	New or Existing Cases	Closed Cases	Active Cases	Witnesses	Family Members	Defendants
10/15	272	43	229	314	459	642
25/14	308	128	180	392	577	688
20/13 ⁺	190	190	0	342	553	571
Totals	770	361	409	1,048	1,589	1,901

Table 1 — Case Statistics for All Chapter Funds as of June 30, 2016

The 272 new CalWRAP cases approved during FY 2015-2016 (Chapter 10/15) provided for the relocation of 314 witnesses and 459 family members testifying against 642 defendants (see Chart 1).



Chart 1 — New Case Activity During FY 2015-2016 (Chapter 10/15)

† Chapter 20/13 closed on June 30, 2016

Cases Submitted for Funding

There were 272 new cases approved by the CalWRAP for the period of July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016, which included: 199 gang-related cases (73.2 percent), 44 high-risk crimes cases (16.2 percent) nine organized crime cases (3.3 percent), eight domestic violence cases (2.9 percent), seven human trafficking cases (2.6 percent), and five narcotics trafficking-related cases (1.8 percent); see Chart 2.



Chart 2 — Types of Cases Submitted for Funding (FY 2015-2016)

Since the inception of the program in January 1988, the percentage of gang-related cases has averaged 76 percent. Chart 3 depicts the actual percentage of gang-related cases approved from FY 1998-1999 to FY 2015-2016.



Chart 3 — Percentage of Gang-Related Cases Funded Each Fiscal Year

Charges Filed on Cases

During the reporting period for FY 2015-2016, homicide and attempted homicide charges accounted for 70.6 percent of the 272 new cases. The remaining charges filed included 11.0 percent for assault charges; 4.4 percent for robbery; 4.0 percent for threats; 3.3 percent for human trafficking; 2.2 percent for narcotics charges; 1.8 percent for kidnapping; 1.1 percent for rape or sexual assault; 0.4 percent for fraud; 0.4 percent for home invasions; 0.4 percent for criminal conspiracy; and the remaining 0.4 percent for burglary. Chart 4 is a visual representation of the types of charges filed on the approved cases.





*No car jacking cases in FY 2015-2016.

Local Assistance

The CalWRAP's local assistance appropriation (monies available to district attorneys' offices to support witness relocation cases) for FY 2015-2016 was \$4,855,000. As of June 30, 2016, \$819,418 was expended, and the remaining balance of \$4,035,582 was allocated to support existing cases. Table 2 illustrates the status of the Chapter 10/15 fund as well as the two prior FY funds: Chapters 25/14 (FY 2014-2015) and 20/13 (FY 2013-2014) that were also administered by the program during this reporting period. The Chapter 20/13 fund closed as of June 30, 2016.

Chapter Fund	Beginning Funds	Expended Funds	Remaining Balance
10/15 (FY 15-16)*	\$4,855,000	\$819,418	\$4,035,582
25/14 (FY 14-15)*	\$4,855,000	\$3,033,415	\$1,821,585
20/13 (FY 13-14)†	\$4,855,000	\$4,072,867	\$782,133

Table 2 — Local Assistance Balances as of June 30, 2016

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

+ Chapter 20/13 closed on June 30, 2016.

Reimbursements for Local Agencies

In FY 2015-2016, CalWRAP staff processed 699 reimbursement claims totaling \$5,396,139 submitted by 25 district attorneys' offices. The approved reimbursement claims reflect a monthly average of \$449,678 that was utilized for witness or sworn law enforcement expenses.

Table 3 reflects the total expenses approved for each active chapter fund during FY 2015-2016 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, such as temporary lodging, relocation expenses, storage of personal belongings, monthly rent, meals, utilities, and incidentals. The program also reimburses expenses incurred for psychological counseling, medical care, new identities, vocational or occupational training, and travel costs for witnesses who must return to testify in criminal proceedings. Sworn law enforcement expenses may also be reimbursed for transporting or protecting witnesses. These expenses include travel, lodging, per diem, and required overtime.

Chapter Fund	Amount Approved	Claims Processed
Chapter 10/15	\$822,642	97
Chapter 25/14	\$2,404,302	346
Chapter 20/13	\$2,169,195	256
Total	\$5,396,139	699

Table 3 — Approved Reimbursement Claims by Chapter Fund (FY 2015-2016)

Table 4 on the following page lists the 25 district attorneys' offices that submitted reimbursement claims for witness expenses during FY 2015-2016 and the amount approved for each county. The \$5,396,139 in approved expenditures represents 699 reimbursement claims.

7

County Match Received by Program

The CalWRAP is mandated to report the amounts of funding sought by each agency, provided to each agency, and the county match. There were a total of 699 approved reimbursement claims. Table 4 reflects the 25 agencies that submitted match claims during FY 2015-2016.

District Attorney Office	Total Amount Submitted	Total Amount Approved	\$ Match Submitted
Alameda	\$54,497.67	\$54,497.67	\$32,055.33
Contra Costa	\$370,217.65	\$366,355.55	\$76,432.10
El Dorado	\$891.64	\$891.64	\$556.00
Fresno	\$34,043.00	\$34,043.00	\$8,510.76
Kern	\$28,130.90	\$28,130.90	\$9,184.64
Kings	\$62,998.29	\$62,998.29	\$21,684.74
Los Angeles	\$1,219,281.53	\$1,217,822.28	\$546,197.83
Madera	\$22,296.73	\$21,555.05	\$13,282.32
Marin	\$27,765.86	\$26,773.18	\$8,440.44
Monterey	\$517,414.98	\$517,414.98	\$76,426.86
Orange	\$143,806.38	\$143,806.38	\$69,869.27
Riverside	\$74,644.12	\$74,540.53	\$16,657.14
Sacramento	\$268,679.56	\$268,679.56	\$86,246.68
San Bernardino	\$128,350.57	\$128,246.17	\$35,549.30
San Diego	\$447,612.70	\$447,612.70	\$127,492.53
San Francisco	\$297,903.87	\$297,903.87	\$39,895.90
San Joaquin	\$47,610.77	\$43,328.59	\$17,287.52
San Mateo	\$492,698.03	\$492,698.03	\$124,430.38
Santa Barbara	\$199,100.21	\$193,943.72	\$80,261.27
Santa Cruz	\$161,425.18	\$161,268.93	\$50,739.30
Shasta	\$25,309.88	\$25,309.88	\$7,503.96
Solano	\$42,345.19	\$42,345.19	\$18,621.23
Stanislaus	\$252,440.04	\$252,440.04	\$30,491.85
Tulare	\$146,636.50	\$146,636.50	\$37,882.72
Ventura	\$347,670.22	\$346,896.23	\$115,351.85
Grand Total	\$5,413,771.47	\$5,396,138.86	\$1,651,051.93

Table 4 — Submitted Match Claims by Agency (FY 2015-2016)

Successful Prosecutions

During FY 2015-2016, 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 cases from various district attorneys' offices that concluded with a successful prosecution and had a noteworthy criminal sentence.

Alameda Co	ounty District Attorney's Office (25/14-323)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim's home was burglarized by the defendants. The victim confronted one of the defendants about burglarizing his home and then walked away. The defendant returned with a gun and killed the victim. After the witness was threatened, he and his family were relocated for their safety.		
Disposition	50 years to life, 25 years to life – 187 PC		
Contra Cost	a County District Attorney's Office (20/13-252)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim was found shot in the face and chest outside a youth center. The witness identified the defendants as the perpetrators. To ensure his continued safety, the witness and his family were relocated.		
Disposition	21 years – 192(a) PC, 186.22 PC; 3 years – 32 PC, 186.22 PC		
Fresno Cour	nty District Attorney's Office (25/14-299)		
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The victim was a gang member who was shot by a fellow gang member for refusing to fall in line with the new gang structure. The victim's family was stalked and their home was broken into numerous times after the shooting. The victim and his family were relocated for their safety.		
Disposition	25 years to life plus 19 years, 25 years to life plus 9 years – 664/187 PC, 245(a)(2)		
Kern County	y District Attorney's Office (25/14-310)		
Case Facts	Domestic violence-related assault case. The victim was attempting to end a long-term, abusive relationship with the defendant, an active gang member, when he forced entry into her residence and assaulted her. The victim was relocated to ensure her continued safety.		
Disposition	17 years - 460(a) PC, 273.5 PC, 244.5 PC		
Kings Count	ty District Attorney's Office (25/14-328)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim was shot and killed by a rival gang member in front of his girlfriend. The victim's girlfriend was stalked and assaulted numerous times in an effort to intimidate her and prevent her from talking to law enforcement. Once she agreed to testify, she was relocated for her safety.		
Disposition	Life without parole plus 25 years to life – 187 PC, 186.22 PC		
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (25/14-48)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim in this case was stabbed to death by the defendants during a robbery. The witness was tricked by the defense attorney into providing her address in open court, and she and her family were subsequently relocated for their safety.		
Disposition	Life without parole – 187 PC, 21 years – 192 PC		

Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-272)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim in this case was shot multiple times at close range by the defendant during an apparent robbery attempt. The witness' address was provided to the defendant during the discovery process. The witness and her family were promptly relocated.
Disposition	80 years to life – 187(a) PC
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-235)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim in this case was shot and killed by a gang member who exited the vehicle the defendant was driving. The defendant was in possession of the gun that was used in this crime and left it with a fellow gang member. The witness was attacked at her home by gang associates after cooperating with law enforcement. To prevent additional retaliatory violence and intimidation, the witness and her family were relocated.
Disposition	75 years to life – 187(a) PC
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-218)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. During a party, a fight broke out between female members of rival gangs, and one of the gangs decided to leave. The victim was in a vehicle attempting to leave the party when he was shot and killed by a rival gang member. The witness was driving the vehicle the victim was riding in, and after being identified as a snitch on social media and receiving threats at his residence, the witness and his family were relocated.
Disposition	Life without parole – 187(a) PC
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-207)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim and defendant were rival gang members. The victim was shot several times by the defendant as the defendant was being driven away from the victim's home by the witness. After law enforcement received information that the defendant's fellow gang members were looking for the witness to prevent her from testifying, the witness and her family were relocated.
Disposition	90 years to life – 187(a) PC
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-151)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The two victims in this case were having a money dispute with the defendant. During a meeting with the defendant in the victim's vehicle, the defendant shot and killed both victims. While awaiting trial and acting as his own attorney, the defendant admitted to a fellow inmate that he had killed the victims. During the discovery process, the witness' address became known to the defendant, and the witness and his family were promptly relocated for their safety.
Disposition	Life without parole – 187(a) PC
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-62)
Case Facts	Narcotics-related homicide case. The victim was lured from his home by the defendants under the pretense of a narcotics transaction. The victim was robbed of his narcotics and then shot and killed. One of the defendants then went to the victim's home and stole over one-hundred thousand dollars ir cash. The witness received phone threats from unknown individuals who knew his location, and he was relocated to ensure his continued safety.
Disposition	Life without parole (2 sentences) – 187(a) PC
Los Angeles	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-43)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim confronted his neighbor about drug sales and a fight ensued. The neighbor was a gang member and during the fight, a fellow gang member came to his assistance. The neighbor then shot the victim in the head and the victim died. A third gang member drove the getaway vehicle. The witness was chased by gang members who were attempting to retaliate for the witness' testimony. The witness and her family were relocated.
Disposition	80 years to life – 187(a) PC; 8 years, 4 years – 32 PC, 245(a)(1) PC

Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victims in this case were shot while standing in front of a neighbor-		
	hood market. The witness was at the home next door when the shooting occurred. After the witness was confronted by the defense attorney, defense investigator, and members of the defendant's gang, she and her family were relocated.		
Disposition	90 years to life – 187 PC; 10 years – 192(a) PC		
Madera Cou	nty District Attorney's Office (25/14-56)		
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The defendant opened fire on a vehicle he thought belonged to a rival gang member. The vehicle actually belonged to the defendant's friend who had just purchased the vehicle and was driving with his wife and 6 children. The witness confronted the defendant about the shooting in front of the victims and the defendant admitted to the crime. The witness was subpoenaed and subsequently received threats. The witness and his family were relocated.		
Disposition	Life with a minimum of 320 years – 8 counts 664/187 PC, 2 counts 264, 12022.53 PC, 186.22 PC		
Monterey C	ounty District Attorney's Office (25/14-100)		
Case Facts	High-risk homicide case. Several people got together to commit a home invasion on a drug house, however two of the people were just using this plan as a ruse to kill two of their co-conspirators. The two victims were shot multiple times at close range. The case went cold for over a year until law enforcement reopened the case. The co-conspirators cooperated and their testimony was used at trial. The defendants used their gang ties to threaten and intimidate the witnesses during court proceedings and the witnesses were relocated.		
Disposition	Life without parole (2 sentences) – 187 PC, 190.2 PC		
Riverside Co	ounty District Attorney's Office (10/15-33)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim was lured to a residence under the pretense of a drug deal, but the intention was to beat and rob the victim. The victim was beaten, hog-tied and placed in the trunk of his vehicle. The defendants drove the vehicle to a dirt field, where the victim was able to escape from the trunk and flee on foot into the field. The victim was chased and one of the defendants shot him in the back with a shotgun. The defendant yelled to the other defendants that the victim was still alive, and another defendant then took out his knife and slit the victim's throat. After the witness received several threats for his cooperation with law enforcement, he was relocated.		
Disposition	Life without parole plus 35 years to life, life without parole plus 10 years, 25 years to life – 187 PC; 35 years, 25 years, 24 years 8 months, 21 years – 192 PC; 8 years – 207 PC		
Sacramento	County District Attorney's Office (25/14-196)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim was approached by the defendants who suspected he was a rival gang member. When the victim said he was not a gang member and did not appear to be intimidated, one of the defendants shot him twice. The witness was threatened and he and his family were relocated.		
Disposition	110 years to life, 76 years to life – 187 PC; 16 years – 192 PC; 3 years – 32 PC		
San Bernard	lino County District Attorney's Office (25/14-337)		
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The victim was in her vehicle talking to a friend who was a gang member, when the defendants from a rival gang drove up and began shooting. The vehicle was hit several times. The victim was threatened, and she, her friend, and family were relocated.		
Disposition	12 years – 664/187 PC; 201 days – 245 PC		
San Diego C	ounty District Attorney's Office (20/13-302)		
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The defendants in this case were part of a gang known for committing brutal murders in which their victims were tortured before being killed. The witness was relocated to ensure his continued safety.		
Disposition	Life without parole (3 consecutive sentences) – 187 PC; 190.2 PC, 186.22 PC, 209 PC; life with out parole plus 107 years to life and 55 years – 187 PC, 186.22 PC, 190.2 PC, 12022.53 PC		

San Diego C	ounty District Attorney's Office (20/13-59)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victims in this case were targeted for being members of a rival gang. One of the victims was stabbed multiple times and the other victim was beaten to death. The surviving victim resided in rival gang territory and was relocated.
Disposition	Life plus 22 years concurrent, life plus 15 years concurrent – 187 PC, 245 PC, 664/187 PC
San Diego C	ounty District Attorney's Office (25/14-28)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The defendants arrived at the home of one of the victims and were allowed to enter. The victim and one of the defendants argued and the defendant shot the victim in his chest. The defendants left the victim's home and the victim was driven by a witness to the hospital The victim later died from his injuries. A few hours after shooting the first victim, the defendants arrived at the hotel where the second victim was staying to confront him over a \$200 drug debt. The defendant forced his way into the victim's hotel room and shot him once in the stomach. The defendants then fled the scene. The victim spent nearly 6 months in the hospital recovering from his injuries. The witnesses were threatened by fellow gang members of the defendants and were relocated for their continued safety.
Disposition	159 years to life plus 48 years – 187 PC; 4 years, 8 months – 245 PC, 32 PC, 12022 PC
San Franciso	o County District Attorney's Office (25/14-108)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. In February 2010, the Grand Jury issued an indictment after 3 months and 77 witnesses testified. The arrest of nine gang members followed, one of which cooperated with the investigation of three murders and entered CalWRAP. The witness' testimony was paramount in the successful prosecution of the listed case.
	The victim in this case was a motility van driver and drug dealer. The defendant and an accomplice approached the victim's parked van and showed the victim a gun in his waistband. The defendant and accomplice then forced entry to the van. The defendant aimed the gun at the victim while the accomplice tried to take money from the victim's pant pocket. The victim and the accomplice then wrestled and once they separated, the defendant shot and killed the victim.
Disposition	25 years to life – 187 PC
San Mateo	County District Attorney's Office (25/14-214)
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The defendants were in the process of attempting to carry out a gang-ordered hit when they were contacted by uniformed police officers responding to a report of gang-related activity. The defendants ran from the officers and the officers gave chase. During the pursuit, one of the defendants pulled out a handgun and shot at one of the officers several times. The witness was contacted in his home by the shooter immediately after the shooting, while the shooter was attempting to evade police. The witness and his family were relocated to ensure their continued safety.
Disposition	29 years – 186.22 PC, 245 PC, 212.5 PC; 10851 VC; 20 years, 4 months – 186.22 PC, 10851 VC, 11377 HS, 29800 PC; 6 years – 186.22 PC, 10851 VC
Santa Barba	ra County District Attorney's Office (20/13-225)
Case Facts	Gang-related homicide case. The victim was lured to a residence under the pretense of a narcotics sale The victim owed money to a gang and once inside the residence, the victim was beaten and stabbed by the defendants using fists, a belt, a screwdriver and a machete. The victim's body was placed in a U-Haul and driven several miles away where it was found a few days later. The witness was at the residence when the murder occurred, and was relocated for her continued safety.
Disposition	Life without parole (2 sentences) – 187 PC, 186.22 PC; 40 months, 3 years – 32 PC
Santa Cruz	County District Attorney's Office (20/13-304)
Case Facts	Gang-related attempted homicide case. The victim in this case was a former gang member who was shot at by members of his former gang for quitting the gang. The victim identified his assailants and agreed to testify against them; and he and his family were relocated.
	agreed to testify against them, and he and his family were relocated.

Shasta Cour	nty District Attorney's Office (20/13-169)		
Case Facts	High-risk homicide case. This case involves the murder of three victims. The first victim interrupted the burglary of a residence on a property with several structures. The victim was tied up and later walked into another structure on the property and shot in the back of the head. The structure the victim was in was then set on fire. The second victim confronted the defendants while they were on this property. As the victim was being shoved with a shotgun to the ground by one of the defendants, the gun went off and the victim was killed. The victim's body was then carried into a residence on the property and set on fire. The third victim was killed several days later at a defendant's residence. The victim's body was placed in his pickup and driven to a remote area, and then set on fire. The witness knew the defendants and was present during one of the murders. The witness was relocated to ensure his continued safety.		
Disposition	150 years to life – 3 counts 187(a) PC; 31 years 4 months – 2 counts 192(a); 2 counts 212.5(a); 2 counts 459 PC; 2 counts 451(b); 245(a)(2)		
Shasta Cour	nty District Attorney's Office (20/13-162)		
Case Facts	High-risk homicide case. This case involves the murder of two victims. The first victim was a neighbor of the defendant and was beaten and stabbed to death with a splitting maul. The second victim was nearby sitting in his truck when the defendant began attacking him. The victim managed to drive a short distance before crashing, but the defendant again approached the victim and continued beating the victim with a splitting maul. The defendant then set the victim's truck on fire. The witness was relocated for his continued safety.		
Disposition	50 years to life – 2 counts 187(a) PC		
Solano Cou	nty District Attorney's Office (25/14-296)		
Case Facts	High-risk carjacking case. As the victim/witness was collecting items from her vehicle parked in her driveway, the defendant approached her with a gun. The defendant searched the victim's pockets and stole items including the keys to her vehicle. The victim was able to run away from the defendant and after seeing her vehicle drive away, she returned home and notified law enforcement. The defendant was apprehended later that day after a vehicle pursuit. After the witness was threatened by the defendant's associates, she and her family were relocated for their safety.		
Disposition	16 years and 8 months – 215(a) PC, 2800.2(a) CVC, 666.5 PC, Strike for prior enhancement		
Stanislaus C	county District Attorney's Office (20/13-237, 25/14-97)		
Case Facts	Gang homicide case. One of the victims in this case was not paying drug sales taxes to the gang and as a result, the gang shot caller ordered the victim to be killed and two defendants went to the victim's house and shot the victim, his 10-year-old son, and a friend. The son and friend died from their injuries The witnesses in this case were threatened and they and their families were relocated.		
Disposition	Life without parole (3 sentences) – 2 counts 187(a) PC, 246 PC; Life without parole – 2 counts 187(a) PC		

Testimonials

The program solicits information from local law enforcement agencies after the closure of their cases requesting comments or suggestions concerning the CalWRAP, its policies, or procedures. The comments received from these agencies during FY 2015-2016 contained many positive responses regarding the services of program staff, the witness services provided, and the continued need to provide these services to testifying witnesses. The following are a few of the testimonials received during the past year.

Contra Costa County District Attorney's Office

- "This is yet another gang case which we could not prosecute unless we had the assistance provided by CalWRAP. Due to case complications, the defendants were found guilty of Manslaughter, with gang enhancements. All three subjects were sentenced to prison. CalWRAP continues to provide invaluable assistance to our office and CalWRAP staff is very responsive to any of our requests."
- "...CalWRAP provided invaluable assistance to our prosecution of an extremely violent gang member. Because the CalWRAP witness was available to testify at trial, both defendants agreed to plead guilty. ...the main culprit, was sentenced to 21 years in prison. This would not have occurred but for CalWRAP."
- "...the program has always met all of our needs, and has proven time and again to be essential to our efforts to combat violence in Contra Costa county particularly when prosecuting gang members."

Monterey County District Attorney's Office

"Without the CalWRAP Assistance, we couldn't have been able to secure this witness' testimony by relocating [the witness] for security purposes. [The witness] was a vital part of the investigation. After [the witness'] testimony at the jury trial we secured a guilty verdict for first degree murder."

Shasta County District Attorney's Office

"CalWRAP has been an asset for our office. Witnesses and victims have been kept safe. We have even received a "thank you" from witnesses."

Other Program Items of Interest

Administrative Status

In FY 2015-2016, the CalWRAP expended \$239,506 on administrative costs, which include personnel resources and general operating expenses.

The program continues to operate with one full-time Associate Governmental Program Analyst and one full-time Staff Services Analyst.

Outreach and Training

During FY 2015-2016, CalWRAP 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. CalWRAP staff also continue to provide training to local district attorneys' offices upon request.