

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
 Attorney General of California  
 2 JONATHAN L. WOLFF  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 3 JAY C. RUSSELL  
 PATRICK R. MCKINNEY  
 Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
 4 DEBBIE VOROUS, State Bar No. 166884  
 MANEESH SHARMA, State Bar No. 280084  
 5 Deputy Attorneys General  
 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
 6 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
 Telephone: (415) 703-3505  
 7 Fax: (415) 703-1234  
 E-mail: patrick.mckinney@doj.ca.gov  
 8 *Attorneys for Defendants*

Hanson Bridgett LLP  
 JERROLD C. SCHAEFER, State Bar No. 39374  
 PAUL B. MELLO, State Bar No. 179755  
 WALTER R. SCHNEIDER, State Bar No. 173113  
 SAMANTHA D. WOLFF, State Bar No. 240280  
 MEGAN OLIVER THOMPSON, SBN 256654  
 425 Market Street, 26th Floor  
 San Francisco, California 94105  
 Telephone: (415) 777-3200  
 Fax: (415) 541-9366  
 E-mail: pmello@hansonbridgett.com

9  
 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS  
 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 12 AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMPOSED OF THREE JUDGES  
 14 PURSUANT TO SECTION 2284, TITLE 28 UNITED STATES CODE

15 **RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,**  
 16 Plaintiffs,  
 17 v.  
 18 **EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,**  
 19 Defendants.  
 20

2:90-cv-00520 LKK DAD P  
**THREE-JUDGE COURT**

21 **MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,**  
 22 Plaintiffs,  
 23 v.  
 24 **EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,**  
 25 Defendants.  
 26

C01-1351 TEH  
**THREE-JUDGE COURT**  
**DEFENDANTS' AMENDED  
 APPLICATION AND [PROPOSED]  
 ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
 REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF  
 APRIL 18, 2014 DEADLINE**

1                   **DEFENDANTS’ AMENDED APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF**  
2                   **THE APRIL 18, 2014 POPULATION REDUCTION DEADLINE**

3                   Following the enactment of Senate Bill 105, Defendants filed a request in September 2013  
4 to extend the deadline to reduce the population in the State’s 34 adult institutions to 137.5% of  
5 design bed capacity to December 31, 2016. (ECF 2713/4803.) The Court directed the parties to  
6 meet and confer regarding Defendants’ request, and extended the final population reduction  
7 deadline to April 18, 2014. (ECF 2719/4831; 2746/4953; 2752/4978.) The parties engaged in an  
8 extensive meet-and-confer process which did not result in a negotiated resolution. During the  
9 meet-and-confer process, it became clear that the Court was disinclined to approve a three-year  
10 extension, and that additional measures would be needed to secure an extension. Defendants  
11 have accordingly modified the length of the requested extension to two years: the minimum  
12 length of time needed to allow new reform measures to responsibly draw down the prison  
13 population while avoiding the early release of inmates. It also became clear that the Court would  
14 require a mechanism for ensuring compliance if the State missed a population reduction  
15 benchmark. The proposed order provides for a court-appointed Compliance Officer with the  
16 authority to order the release of lower-risk inmates if an interim or final benchmark is missed.

17                   To ensure that the State does not find itself in a position of missing a benchmark,  
18 Defendants have developed several significant measures intended to protect public safety while  
19 establishing a durable framework for reducing the prison population. These measures directly  
20 address current and projected impacts on the prison population, such as increased admissions of  
21 non-violent second-strike offenders. (*See* [Proposed] Order at ¶ 3(b).) For example, Defendants  
22 have proposed a new parole determination process—modeled after Proposition 36 (2012)—  
23 through which non-violent second-strikers will be eligible for parole consideration by the Board  
24 of Parole Hearings once they have served 50% of their sentence. (*See id.*) Similarly, Defendants  
25 will finalize and implement an expanded parole process for medically incapacitated inmates and a  
26 new parole process for elderly inmates who have served at least 25 years in prison. (*See id.* at ¶  
27 3(d)-(e).) Inmates who are eligible for these parole processes will be granted parole if the Board  
28 finds they no longer pose an unreasonable risk to public safety. (*See* Governor’s Budget

1 Summary – 2014-15 at 76-77.) Defendants will also prospectively increase credit-earnings  
2 programs for non-violent second strike offenders and minimum custody inmates. (*See id.* at 77;  
3 [Proposed] Order ¶ 3(a).)

4 Adopting Defendants’ proposed order will also provide the time and funds necessary to  
5 implement Senate Bill 105’s recidivism reduction provisions. (*See* Governor’s Budget Summary  
6 – 2014-15 at 74-75 & 90-91.) If the Court grants Defendants’ proposed order, \$81.1 million will  
7 be available in Senate Bill 105’s Recidivism Reduction Fund for expenditure in fiscal year 2014-  
8 15. (*Id.* at 75.) Senate Bill 105 also amends Senate Bill 678 (2009) by permanently increasing  
9 funding to county probation departments for felony diversion programs such as mental health,  
10 drug and alcohol abuse treatment, and job training. (*Id.*) Probation departments will receive an  
11 estimated \$128 million for felony diversion this upcoming fiscal year. (*Id.* at 75.)

12 If the Court grants Defendants’ request for a two-year extension by adopting the  
13 accompanying proposed order, the State will be able to implement several additional significant  
14 criminal justice reforms. These reforms will allow Defendants to comply with the population cap  
15 without sending thousands more inmates to private prisons in other states. Further, Defendants  
16 will not appeal any order concerning compliance with the population cap or subsequent orders  
17 necessary to implement Defendants’ proposed order, including an order by a Compliance Officer  
18 directing the release of inmates. Defendants respectfully request that the Court approve  
19 Defendants’ proposed order and thereby allow the State to continue to develop comprehensive  
20 and sustainable population-reduction reforms.

21 Dated: January 23, 2014

KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California

22  
23 By: /s/ *Patrick R. McKinney*  
PATRICK R. MCKINNEY  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
24 *Attorneys for Defendants*

25 Dated: January 23, 2014

HANSON BRIDGETT LLP  
26 By: /s/ *Paul B. Mello*  
PAUL B. MELLO  
27 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMPOSED OF THREE JUDGES  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 2284, TITLE 28 UNITED STATES CODE

**RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,**  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
**EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,**  
  
Defendants.

2:90-cv-00520 LKK DAD P  
**THREE-JUDGE COURT**

**MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,**  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
**EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,**  
  
Defendants.

C01-1351 TEH  
**THREE-JUDGE COURT**  
  
**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF APRIL 18, 2014  
POPULATION REDUCTION DEADLINE**

Having read and considered the parties' filings in response to this Court's January 13, 2014 Order, and good cause appearing, the Court GRANTS Defendants' request for an extension of time to comply with this Court's June 30, 2011 Order to reduce California's prison population to 137.5% of design capacity. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The deadline to achieve the ordered reduction in the in-state adult institution population to 137.5% of design bed capacity is extended to February 28, 2016. Defendants will meet the following interim and final population reduction benchmarks:

- (a) 143% of design bed capacity by June 30, 2014;
- (b) 141.5% of design bed capacity by February 28, 2015; and
- (c) 137.5% of design bed capacity by February 28, 2016.

1           2. During the extension period, Defendants may maintain but shall not increase the  
2 current population level of approximately 8,900 inmates housed in out-of-state facilities.

3           3. The Court acknowledges that Defendants intend to comply with this Order in part  
4 through a combination of contracting for additional in-state capacity in county jails, community  
5 correction facilities, and a private prison, and through newly-enacted programs and the  
6 development of additional measures to reduce the prison population. Defendants shall also  
7 promptly implement the following measures:

- 8           (a) Increase credits prospectively for non-violent second-strike offenders and  
9           minimum custody inmates. Non-violent second-strikers will be eligible to earn  
10           good-time credits at 33.3% and will be eligible to earn milestone credits for  
11           completing rehabilitative programs. Minimum custody inmates will be eligible to  
12           earn 2-for-1 good-time credits to the extent such credits do not deplete  
13           participation in fire camps where inmates also earn 2-for-1 good-time credits;
- 14           (b) Create and implement a new parole determination process through which non-  
15           violent second-strikers will be eligible for parole consideration by the Board of  
16           Parole Hearings once they have served 50% of their sentence;
- 17           (c) Parole inmates serving indeterminate sentences who have already been granted  
18           parole by the Board of Parole Hearings but have future parole dates;
- 19           (d) In consultation with the Receiver's office, finalize and implement an expanded  
20           parole process for medically incapacitated inmates;
- 21           (e) Finalize and implement a new parole process whereby inmates who are 60 years of  
22           age or older and have served a minimum of twenty-five years of their sentence  
23           will be referred to the Board of Parole Hearings to determine suitability for parole;
- 24           (f) Activate new reentry hubs at a total of 13 designated prisons to be operational  
25           within one year from the date of this Order;
- 26           (g) Pursue expansion of pilot reentry programs with additional counties and local  
27           communities; and
- 28           (h) Implement an expanded alternative custody program for female inmates.

1           4. Defendants will report to the Court monthly on the status of measures being taken to  
2 reduce the prison population. The first report shall be submitted on the 15th of the month  
3 following the date of this Order and shall continue until further order of the Court.

4           5. The Court will appoint a Compliance Officer for the sole purpose, if necessary, of  
5 bringing Defendants into compliance with any missed benchmark by ordering inmate releases.  
6 The Compliance Officer's duties and authority will be strictly limited to identifying and ordering  
7 the release of lower-risk inmates. The Compliance Officer will have no monitoring or oversight  
8 duties, may not direct CDCR to implement any prison population reduction reforms, and will not  
9 issue any reports or express any views concerning the impact of the inmate population level. If  
10 compliance with any benchmark is not achieved within a 60-day period following the expiration  
11 of any missed benchmark, the Compliance Officer shall, within seven days, direct the release of  
12 the number of inmates necessary to achieve compliance with the missed benchmark.

13           (a) In selecting inmates for release, the Compliance Officer shall consider public  
14 safety by minimizing any risk of violent re-offense. The Compliance Officer shall  
15 not be authorized to order the release of condemned inmates or inmates serving a  
16 term of life without the possibility of parole;

17           (b) The Compliance Officer shall have access to all necessary CDCR data and  
18 personnel regarding the California prison population, including population  
19 projections, risk assessments, recidivism data, statistical data, and prisoner files,  
20 and shall receive administrative support from CDCR to the extent needed to carry  
21 out the Compliance Officer's duties; and

22           (c) The Compliance Officer shall not be compensated for any work or services unless  
23 and until a benchmark has been missed, and compensable services or work will  
24 cease as soon as compliance with the missed benchmark has been achieved  
25 through releases done at the Compliance Officer's direction or additional measures  
26 taken by Defendants. Defendants shall reasonably compensate the Compliance  
27 Officer on an hourly basis, and the provisions of 18 U.S.C. section 3626(f) shall  
28 not apply.

1 Within 60 days of this Order, Plaintiffs and Defendants shall each submit a list of two candidates  
2 to serve as Compliance Officer. The Court shall appoint the Compliance Officer from the  
3 candidates submitted.

4 6. To the extent that any state statutory, constitutional, or regulatory provisions, except  
5 the California Public Resources Code, impede the implementation of this Order or Defendants'  
6 ability to achieve the population reduction benchmarks, all such laws and regulations are waived.  
7 Although the Court does not issue a general waiver of the Public Resources Code, Defendants  
8 may request waivers, as the need arises, of these statutory provisions that are tailored to specific  
9 projects.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
STEPHEN REINHARDT  
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE  
NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

16 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
THELTON E. HENDERSON  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

28