1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669 City Attorney JESSE C. SMITH, State Bar #122517 Chief Assistant City Attorney SHERRI SOKELAND KAISER, State Bar #197986 PETER J. KEITH, State Bar #206482 Deputy City Attorneys 1390 Market Street, Suite 700 San Francisco, California 94102-5408 Telephone: (415) 554-3886 (Kaiser)	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	Telephone: (415) 554-3908 (Keith) Facsimile: (415) 554-6747	
7	E-Mail: sherri.kaiser@sfgov.org peter.keith@sfgov.org	
8	Attorneys for MAYOR EDWIN M. LEE	
9	ETHICS COMMISSION	
10	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
11		
12		
13	In the Matter of Charges Against	DECLARATION OF CHIEF
14	ROSS MIRKARIMI,	SAN FRANCISCO PROBATION OFFICER WENDY STILL
15	Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco.	
16		
17	I, Wendy Still, declare as follows:	
18	1. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein, except for those matters set	
19	forth on information and belief, which I believe to be true, and if called to testify, I can and will	
20	testify competently as to all matters set forth herein.	
21	I. POSITION, EXPERIENCE, QUALIFICATIONS	
22		
23	2. I am currently the Chief Adult Probation Officer for the City and County of San	
24	Francisco, and have been in that position since 2010. As the Chief Adult Probation Officer I	
25	oversee the operations the San Francisco Adult Probation Department (APD). In that position I am	
26	both a peace officer and an officer of the court. Among other things, my duties include setting	
27	department policies; making staffing decisions and overseeing staff performance; developing and	
28	overseeing the department's budget; developing	and implementing a strategic vision for the

5

11

15 16

14

1718

2021

19

2223

2425

26

2728

department; and ensuring that the department fulfills its mission. The department's mission is to supervise offenders and enforce the conditions of their release and supervision, to assist and encourage them in the path towards rehabilitation, and to protect the public by holding probationers accountable for violating the terms of their release or for reoffending. Attached as Exhibit 29 is a true and correct copy of APD's Mission, Vision, and Values. Attached as Exhibit 30 is a true and correct copy of APD's FY 2011 Annual Report.

- 3. In fulfilling my responsibilities as Chief of APD, I must maintain close working relationships with the heads of other local criminal justice agencies, and interface frequently with community based organizations including victims' rights groups, as well as with the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors.
- 4. In my capacity as Chief of APD and together with the heads of our other local criminal justice partners, I sit on local policy bodies that also share responsibility for criminal justice issues such as public safety and rehabilitation. The Sheriff and I are two of the co-chairs of the Reentry Council, which is charged with developing strategies to facilitate the successful reentry of recently released offenders. I also chair the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC). Both the CCP and the CCPEC developed and recommended the City and County of San Francisco Public Safety Realignment & Postrelease Community Supervision 2011 Implementation Plan, Public Safety Realignment, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit 31, a plan approved by the Board of Supervisors for the implementation of Realignment as required by Assembly Bills 109 and 117. The Sheriff is also a member of the Executive Committee. In addition, I am a member of the recently established San Francisco Sentencing Commission, whose mission is to make recommendations regarding sentencing reforms that would advance public safety, reduce recidivism, and utilize best practices in criminal justice. The commission's members include, among others the District Attorney as chair, the Public Defender, the Sheriff, and the Chief of Police.
- 5. Prior to holding my position as Chief Probation Officer, I worked for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation ("CDCR") for 33 years. My 26 years of correctional

experience includes operating, managing, and performing direct supervision and oversight for up to ten male and female prisons with approximately 40,000 inmates and 15,000 staff. While at CDCR, I served as Southern Regional Prison Administrator, Associate Director Female Offender Programs and Services, Deputy Director of Finance, Chief of Regulation and Policy Management, and Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Executive Project Director. I was also the Director of Rehabilitation and Activation for the Federal Medical Prison Receiver appointed by the court in the *Plata v. Schwarzenegger* litigation, reporting to the Medical Receiver while also remaining a CDCR employee.

6. I am currently a member of the California Rehabilitation Oversight Board (CROB) to which I was appointed by the California State Legislature. CROB provides oversight of the CDCR's inmate prison rehabilitation programs and reports to the legislature.

## II. OVERVIEW OF APD

- APD is charged with supervising and monitoring criminal offenders who are ordered by the Court to serve probation as part of their sentence. As part of their responsibilities, probation officers must meet regularly with the probationers on their caseload to determine if they are adhering to the terms and conditions of their probation, and meeting all affirmative, such as attending Batterer's Intervention Programs, parenting classes or substance abuse counseling. At regularly scheduled status hearings, probation officers must report back to the court on how well a probationer is performing on probation. Should a probation officer determine that a probationer is performing unsatisfactorily or is failing to adhere to the conditions of probation, the officer will alert the court and may move to modify or revoke that individual's probation. For example, if probationers fail to comply or their compliance is not satisfactory, e.g., the fail to participate meaningfully in a court-order program, the court can revoke probation and send them to jail or prison, or modify their probation to make the conditions more restrictive, for instance, by imposing electronic monitoring.
- 8. While on probation, offenders must comply with and fulfill the terms and conditions ordered by the court. Probationers remain out-of-custody as long as they comply. Probation

officers are responsible for monitoring offender's compliance with the terms and conditions ordered by the court.

- 9. APD has a specialized unit assigned to supervise offenders on probation for crimes involving domestic violence ("DV"). Attached as Exhibit 32 is a true and correct copy of APD's supervision protocols for this specialized DV unit. The DV unit has 10 dedicated officers: 8 deputy probation officers, one supervising probation officer, and one officer that staffs the domestic violence court. APD has a separate unit for supervision of these offenders because they are typically a more difficult population to manage, requiring greater monitoring. DV offenders tend to be manipulative and quicker to become violent. This population also has a high rate of substance abuse which typically results in unpredictable behavior and volatility.
- 10. Immediately after a sentencing hearing ends with a DV offender being sentenced to probation, APD's Court Liaison officer sets an appointment with the offender to attend orientation at the APD's offices and to be assigned a probation officer. Attached as Exhibit 33 is a true and correct blank copy of the notice form the DV probationer receives at the sentencing hearing.
- 11. During their orientation, DV probationers are given a "Probationer Guide" written in easy to understand language which explains what is expected of them and what the consequences could be for violating probation or re-offending. Attached as Exhibit 34 is a true and correct copy of that guide.
- 12. As part of their probation, all DV probationers are required to attend a year long weekly Batterer Intervention Program ("BIP") approved by APD. Attached as Exhibit 35 is a true and correct copy of the list of BIPs approved by APD. One of these programs, called "PREP" is run by Community Works West, a community based organization ("CBO") which also operates several anti-violence programs both in custody and post custody and for survivors of violence with grant funding from the SFSD.

## III. COLLABORATION BETWEEN APD AND SFSD

13. In order to facilitate the flow of the San Francisco criminal justice process, representatives of APD and the San Francisco Sheriff's Department ("SFSD") must work cooperatively and coordinate closely with each other. For example, when offenders plead or are

28 an intermedia

found guilty of committing criminal violations, APD and SFSD must coordinate to provide access to these individuals so that probation can conduct the presentencing investigations required by the Court. When APD probationers are arrested for violating probation, SFSD is responsible for booking these offenders and holding them in custody. There is also significant operational need for collaboration regarding inmates leaving custody and entering probation or mandatory supervision, as well as for coordination of post custody programs and services.

- 14. In addition to the day to day working collaboration involving movement of offenders and custody, APD and SFSD also work together on additional programs, including, as an example, a gender responsive blueprint for women in the criminal justice system, including inmates and probationers. APD depends on SFSD to do criminal history background checks in connection with APD's hiring process. APD also makes use of electronic monitoring services that are contracted through SFSD, and APD work orders funds to SFSD for those services. APD and SFPD also work together to coordinate on applications for grant funding and on reentry and rehabilitation programs.
- 15. With the advent of criminal justice realignment ("Realignment"), effective October 1, 2011, cooperation and collaboration between APD and SFSD is now more critical than ever. The state's realignment legislation shifts much of the fiscal and operational responsibility for incarceration and post-release supervision of convicted offenders from state to county. As a result, SFSD is now responsible for housing an increased number of offenders sentenced to serve time for less serious criminal violations, as well as for housing parolees serving time on revocations. APD also has significant new supervision responsibilities, and now must also supervise a higher risk population of offenders *after* they complete their sentences in jail or prison.
- 16. In an effort to more effectively supervise and serve this new higher risk population, APD and SFSD are now collaborating to establish a "Reentry Pod" at the SF jail so that soon-to-be-released prison inmates can be transferred locally 60 days prior to release to allow APD probation officers time necessary to establish meaningful contact with the inmates prior to their release.
- 17. APD and SFSD are also working closely together to facilitate "flash incarceration", an intermediate sanction authorized by statute that allows probation agencies to jail certain

categories of offenders for up to 10 days, during which they must remain in custody in the local jail. By statute, flash incarceration may be imposed by APD without court hearing and is intended as a swift response to deter non-compliant behavior before it becomes serious.

18. Changes in the sentencing laws as a result of realignment now dictate that many convicted offenders will have "split sentences" and will serve their time locally in county jail rather than in prison, with a subsequent period of supervised release known as "mandatory supervision" under the supervision of APD, rather than state parole authorities. The time is now critical for APD and SFSD to work closely to develop strategies for cooperative case management for these offenders, such as sharing information gathered from offenders' Risk and Needs Assessments, and ensuring continuity in the programming an offender receives both in custody and post-release.

## IV. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF ROSS MIRKARIMI'S PROBATION

- 19. On March 12, 2012, Ross Mirkarimi pled guilty to the crime of false imprisonment, a violation of Penal Code section 236. Attached as Exhibit 36 is a true and correct copy of the transcript of his plea hearing. Attached as Exhibit 37 is a true and correct copy of the minute order from that hearing.
- 20. One week later, on March 19, 2012, the court held a sentencing hearing in Mr. Mirkarimi's criminal matter. Attached as Exhibit 38 is a true and correct copy of the transcript of that hearing. Attached as Exhibit 39 is a true and correct copy of the minute order from that hearing.
- 21. Attached as Exhibit 40 is a true and correct copy of the terms and conditions of probation for Mr. Mirkarimi, who is considered a domestic violence offender. Mr. Mirkarimi has been assigned a probation officer from our domestic violence unit, Andrea Wright, who is also APD's liaison to the domestic violence court.
- 22. Pursuant to the terms and conditions of his probation, Mr. Mirkarimi is ordered to serve three years on probation as well as one day in county jail with credit for time served. During his probation, he must participate for at least 52 weeks in a Batterer's Intervention Program ("BIP") and perform 100 hours of community service. A protective order remains in effect that prohibits Mr. Mirkarimi from having any contact with his wife, Eliana Lopez, and from possessing any

firearms. Attached as Exhibit 41 is a true and correct copy of the original protective order entered against Mr. Mirkarimi as well as the subsequent modifications to it.

- 23. During the period the DV probationer is in the Batterer Intervention Program, his participation will be closely monitored by BIP staff, who will report back to his probation officer and the court regarding his attendance and the quality of his participation. Should a probationer's participation be unsatisfactory, the BIP would be required to report it. Based on such a report, the court may modify the terms of probation to those view less favorably by the probationer or revoke his probation altogether.
- 24. During his DV probation, a probationer must meet regularly with his probation officer and is subject to unannounced home visits by that officer. Should a DV probationer miss an appointment without explanation or should his probation officer or *any* peace officer come into possession of knowledge that the DV probationer violated any of the terms and conditions of his probation, he would be subject to immediate arrest and detention in the county jail. His probation officer would then, return the probationer back to court requesting to modify or revoke the terms of his probation, which could lead to the DV probationer being resentenced to serve time in county jail.

## V. DIFFICULTIES PRESENTED BY HAVING A SHERIFF ON DV PROBATION

25. If a probation officer under my supervision pled guilty to a charge of false imprisonment in connection with a domestic violence incident, I would terminate that officer. Committing the crime of false imprisonment reflects a lack of judgment and a lack of emotional control. As part of their supervision duties, probation officers must go out in the field and conduct unannounced site visits to their clients' homes. In my opinion, continuing to employ a probation officer who commits conduct such as false imprisonment would represent an unreasonable risk to the safety of our probation clients who must allow these officers into their homes. Furthermore, breaking the law in such a manner would represent an irreconcilable conflict for a probation officer, whose principle duty is to hold offenders under their supervision accountable for violating the law.

- 26. In my opinion, Mr. Mirkarimi's role as the head of one criminal justice agency while simultaneously being subject to the supervision and monitoring of another also represents an irreconcilable conflict. Mr. Mirkarimi would be responsible for the custody of criminal offenders while at the same time he *is* a criminal offender currently serving a term on probation. Should Mr. Mirkarimi violate the terms of his probation he would have to be arrested and detained in the very jail he oversees, and ultimately he could be re-sentenced to serve time in that jail on the basis of his criminal conviction.
- 27. Furthermore, having to interact with Mr. Mirkarimi as the head of another criminal justice agency as well as a probationer subject to supervision and monitoring by APD puts APD in an untenable position. Every time Mr. Mirkarimi requests that his probation be modified, for instance to allow him to resume contact with his wife, my agency must make a good faith recommendation to the court to grant or deny that request, while at the same time having to interact with him as the Sheriff to coordinate our criminal justice services.
- 28. I am also troubled by the fact that a probationer who is also the Sheriff would have enormous institutional power to negatively impact the work of the APD. The Sheriff has access to highly confidential APD information, including copies of confidential background investigation reports that were completed by his department. The Sheriff could also decide to curtail the critical collaborations between our agencies. Although in the past I have had a good relationship with Mr. Mirkarimi and do not mean to imply that he actually would take any such action, the very potential for such actions illustrates the fundamental conflict that arises if a probationer serves as Sheriff.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 8th day of June, 2012, in San Francisco, California.

WENDY STILL