

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS  
6 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7 AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMPOSED OF THREE JUDGES  
9 PURSUANT TO SECTION 2284, TITLE 28 UNITED STATES CODE

10  
11 RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,

15 Defendants.

16  
17 NO. 2:90-cv-0520 LKK DAD (PC)

18 **THREE-JUDGE COURT**

19 MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,

23 Defendants.

24  
25 NO. C01-1351 TEH

26 **THREE-JUDGE COURT**

27 **ORDER GRANTING IN PART**  
**AND DENYING IN PART**  
**DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR**  
**EXTENSION OF DECEMBER 31,**  
**2013 DEADLINE**

28 WHEREAS the Court has read and considered the parties' filings in response to this  
Court's January 13, 2014 Order;

29 WHEREAS defendants have represented that, in conformance with the terms of this  
order, they will develop comprehensive and sustainable prison population-reduction reforms  
30 and will consider the establishment of a commission to recommend reforms of state penal  
31 and sentencing laws;

1        WHEREAS defendants have represented that they will not appeal or support an  
2 appeal of this order, any subsequent order necessary to implement this order, or any order  
3 issued by the Compliance Officer to be appointed in conformance herewith that is consistent  
4 with the duties of the Compliance Officer as specified in this order, and will not move or  
5 support a motion to terminate the relief contained in this order until at least two years after  
6 the date of this order and such time as it is firmly established that compliance with the  
7 137.5% design capacity benchmark is durable;

8        WHEREAS this order is issued in reliance on defendants' representations; and

9        WHEREAS the Court finds that the order below is narrowly tailored to the  
10 constitutional violations identified by the *Plata* and *Coleman* courts, extends no further than  
11 necessary to remedy those violations, and is the least intrusive possible remedy.

12        IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

13        1.        The Court GRANTS defendants' request for an extension of time, but only to  
14 February 28, 2016, to comply with this Court's June 30, 2011 Order to reduce California's  
15 prison population to 137.5% design capacity.

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

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

22        3.        During the extension period, and as long as this Court maintains jurisdiction,  
23 defendants shall not increase the current population level of approximately 8,900 inmates  
24 housed in out-of-state facilities. Defendants shall also explore ways to attempt to reduce the  
25 number of inmates housed in out-of-state facilities to the extent feasible.

26        4.        The Court acknowledges that defendants intend to comply with this order in  
27 part through a combination of contracting for additional in-state capacity in county jails,  
28 community correctional facilities, and a private prison, and through newly enacted programs

1 including the development of additional measures regarding reforms to state penal and  
2 sentencing laws designed to reduce the prison population. Defendants shall also immediately  
3 implement the following measures:

10 (b) Create and implement a new parole determination process through  
11 which non-violent second-strikers will be eligible for parole consideration by the Board of  
12 Parole Hearings once they have served 50% of their sentence;

13 (c) Parole certain inmates serving indeterminate sentences who have  
14 already been granted parole by the Board of Parole Hearings but have future parole dates:

15 (d) In consultation with the Receiver's office, finalize and implement an  
16 expanded parole process for medically incapacitated inmates;

20 (f) Activate new reentry hubs at a total of 13 designated prisons to be  
21 operational within one year from the date of this order;

24 (h) Implement an expanded alternative custody program for female inmates.

25       5. Defendants will report to this Court monthly on the status of measures being  
26 taken to reduce the prison population, and on the current in-state and out-of-state adult prison  
27 populations. The first report shall be submitted on the 15th of the month following the date  
28 of this order and shall continue until further order of the Court.

1       6. The Court will appoint a Compliance Officer for the purpose of bringing  
2 defendants into compliance with any missed benchmark by ordering inmate releases. If  
3 compliance with any benchmark is not achieved within a 30-day period following the  
4 expiration of any missed benchmark, the Compliance Officer shall, within seven days, direct  
5 the release of the number of inmates necessary to achieve compliance with the missed  
6 benchmark and the measures to be followed in selecting the prisoners to be released. The  
7 authority of the Compliance Officer shall extend no further than ordering defendants to  
8 release inmates necessary to ensure defendants' compliance with any missed benchmark.

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

13               (b) The Compliance Officer shall have access to all necessary CDCR data  
14 and personnel regarding the California prison population, including population projections,  
15 risk assessments, recidivism data, statistical data, and prisoner files, and shall receive  
16 administrative support from CDCR to the extent needed to carry out the Compliance  
17 Officer's duties. In addition, the Compliance Officer may engage the services of a part-time  
18 assistant and/or a part-time secretary upon a showing of good cause within the discretion of  
19 this Court at a rate of pay to be approved by this Court should the parties disagree. If the  
20 Compliance Officer finds good cause to question the accuracy of any data presented to him  
21 or her, the Compliance Officer shall have the authority to verify the accuracy of such data.

22               (c) The Compliance Officer shall be compensated for all work or services  
23 necessary to ensure compliance with a benchmark, should a benchmark be missed, and all  
24 work or services necessary to verify the accuracy of any data presented to him or her by the  
25 CDCR, should the Compliance Officer find good cause to question the accuracy of such data.  
26 Defendants shall reasonably compensate the Compliance Officer on an hourly basis and for  
27 reasonable expenses, and the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3626(f) shall not apply.

28

1       7. The Compliance Officer shall retain all powers, access to information, and  
2 compensation granted under this order after the final 137.5% benchmark is reached and until  
3 it is firmly established that defendants' compliance with the 137.5% benchmark is durable.  
4 During this period after compliance with the final benchmark and before such compliance is  
5 durable, if two of defendants' monthly reports, consecutive, report a prison population above  
6 137.5% design capacity, the Compliance Officer shall, within seven days, direct the release  
7 of the number of inmates necessary to bring the prison population to 137.5% design capacity.

8       8. The parties shall meet and confer to attempt to make a joint recommendation to  
9 the Court regarding the selection of the Compliance Officer and an appropriate hourly rate of  
10 compensation, which may be subject to increase annually. If the parties are not able to agree,  
11 they may each recommend up to two candidates for the Court's consideration and a proposed  
12 hourly rate. The parties shall file their recommendations, including a description of any  
13 recommended candidate's qualifications and an explanation of any proposed hourly rate,  
14 within 30 days of the date of this order. The selection of the Compliance Officer and  
15 compensation rate rests solely within the Court's discretion, and the Court will not be limited  
16 to the parties' recommendations, whether separate or joint.

17       9. To the extent that any state statutory, constitutional, or regulatory provisions,  
18 except the California Public Resources Code, impede the implementation of this order or  
19 defendants' ability to achieve the population reduction benchmarks, all such laws and  
20 regulations are waived. Although the Court does not issue a general waiver of the Public  
21 Resources Code, defendants may request waivers, as the need arises, of these statutory  
22 provisions that are tailored to specific projects.

23       10. This Court shall maintain jurisdiction over this matter for as long as is  
24 necessary to ensure that defendants' compliance with the 137.5% final benchmark is durable,  
25 and such durability is firmly established.

26       11. Defendants shall, within 60 days of the date of this order, file with the  
27 Compliance Officer under seal, the categories of prisoners who are least likely to reoffend or  
28 who might otherwise be candidates for early release (the "Low Risk List") that this Court

1 previously ordered them to create. The Low Risk List shall not be viewed by the  
2 Compliance Officer unless and until he or she is ordered to do so by this Court. Similarly,  
3 this Court will not inspect the list unless circumstances so warrant. Defendants shall file an  
4 amended list every 60 days, should changes to the list become appropriate.

5

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7

8 Dated: 02/10/14



9 STEPHEN REINHARDT  
10 UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE  
11 NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

12 Dated: 02/10/14



13 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
14 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 Dated: 02/10/14



17 THELTON E. HENDERSON  
18 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA