No. S232642

MAR **07** 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Deputy

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR., MARGARET R. PRINZING, and HARRY BEREZIN,

Petitioners,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,

Respondent.

CALIFORNIA DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION,
ANNE MARIE SCHUBERT, an individual and in her personal capacity,
and KAMALA HARRIS, in her official capacity as
Attorney General of the State of California,

Real Parties in Interest.

Writ Regarding Order by the Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-80002293-CU-WM-GDS, Department 24, Phone No.: (916) 874-6687, The Honorable Shelleyanne Chang, Presiding

GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE; DECLARATION OF MICHAEL NARCISO

CRITICAL DATE: FEBRUARY 26, 2016

Robin B. Johansen, State Bar No. 79084
James C. Harrison, State Bar No. 161958
REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP
201 Dolores Avenue
San Leandro, CA 94577
Phone: (510) 346-6200
Fax: (510) 346-6201

Email: rjohansen@rjp.com

Attorneys for Petitioners Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. Margaret R. Prinzing, and Harry Berezin

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

Pursuant to California Rule of Court 8.252 and California Evidence Code section 452, petitioner Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. hereby requests that the Court take judicial notice of the March 4, 2016 Order Requiring Additional Reporting from the Three-Judge Court convened from the Northern District of California, *Plata, et al. v. Brown, et al.* (No. 3:01-cv-01351-TEH) and the Eastern District of California, *Coleman, et al. v. Brown, et al.* (No. 2:90-cv-00520 KJM-KJN), attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Michael Narciso.

Exhibit 1 is an official court record and is the proper subject of judicial notice under Evidence Code section 452(d). (Forty-Niner Truck Plaza, Inc. v. Union Oil Co. (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 1261, 1277, fn. 7 [taking judicial notice of federal court orders].)

Exhibit 1 is relevant to a factual dispute between the parties concerning the importance of placing the Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act on the November 2016 ballot rather than a later ballot. In the Preliminary Opposition of Real Parties in Interest California District Attorneys Association and Anne Marie Schubert, real parties disputed whether the proposed measure was needed to address the federal mandate to reduce California's state prison population, because the prison population was already below the court-ordered benchmark of 137.5% of design capacity. In reply, petitioners explained that the State has been ordered to reduce its out-of-state prison population, and that the federal court will retain oversight until the State has established that its compliance with the population benchmark is durable.

On March 4, 2016, three days after petitioners filed their Reply Brief in this action, the three-judge court issued an Order Requiring

Additional Reporting, in which it concluded that "[a]dditional work remains for [the State] to demonstrate that they can maintain compliance with the population benchmark in the absence of court-ordered remedies" given that the in-state prison population is increasing and the out-of-state prison population still exceeds 5,000 inmates.

Based upon the above authorities, Governor Brown respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Michael Narciso.

Dated: March 7, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP

Robin B. Johansen

Attorneys for Petitioners Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.,

Margaret R. Prinzing, and Harry Berezin

DECLARATION OF MICHAEL NARCISO

- I, Michael Narciso, declare under penalty of perjury that:
- I am the paralegal at Remcho, Johansen & Purcell, LLP, attorneys for petitioners Governor Edmund G. Brown, Margaret R. Prinzing, and Harry Berezin in this case. I submit this declaration in connection with the supplemental request for judicial notice in support of the petition for writ of mandate filed by petitioners.
- Attached as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the 2. March 4, 2016 Order Requiring Additional Reporting from the three-judge court convened from the Northern District of California case, Plata, et al. v. Brown, et al. (No. 3:01-cv-01351-TEH) and the Eastern District of California case, Coleman, et al. v. Brown, et al. (No. 2:90-cv-00520 KJM-KJN). A copy of this order was obtained on March 5, 2016 from PACER through the Northern District of California's website at https://ecf.cand. uscourts.gov/.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. I have firsthand knowledge of the same, except as to those matters described on information and belief, and if called upon to do so, I could and would testify competently thereto. Executed this 7th day of March, 2016, in San Leandro, California.

muladanaca

MICHAEL NARCISO

United States District Court Northern District of California

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.

MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:90-cv-0520 KJM KJN P
THREE-JUDGE COURT

Case No. 01-cv-01351-TEH

THREE-JUDGE COURT

ORDER REQUIRING ADDITIONAL REPORTING

On February 10, 2014, this court granted defendants' request for a two-year extension in which to comply with the court's June 30, 2011 order to reduce California's in-state adult institution population to no more than 137.5% of design capacity. The two-year extension gave defendants until February 28, 2016 to meet the court-ordered reduction. Feb. 10, 2014 Order at 2 (ECF No. 2766/5060). Since receiving the extension, defendants have made laudable progress, and achieved compliance with the percentage

All filings in this Three-Judge Court are included in the individual docket sheets of both *Plata v. Brown*, No. 01-cv-01351-TEH (N.D. Cal.), and *Coleman v. Brown*, No. 2:90-cv-0520 KJM KJN P (E.D. Cal.). This court includes the docket number of *Plata* first, then *Coleman*.

Northern District of California United States District Court

benchmark one year early, with the population remaining below the benchmark since February 2015:

Date	In-state adult institution population	% Design Capacity	Out-of- state population	In-state private prison population (California City)	In-state contract bed capacity (MCCFs) ²
February 11, 2015	112,993	136.6%	8,828	1,973	4,218
March 11, 2015	112,106	135.5%	8,778	1,893	4,218
April 8, 2015	111,863	135.3%	8,394	1,999	4,218
May 13, 2015	111,341	134.6%	8,060	2,152	4,218
June 10, 2015	111,370	134.7%	7,726	2,308	4,218
July 8, 2015	111,168	134.4%	7,277	2,339	4,218
August 12, 2015 ³	111,485	134.8%	6,961	2,225	4,218
September 9, 2015	111,656	135.0%	6,508	2,245	4,218
October 14, 2015	112,195	135.7%	5,907	2,147	4,218
November 11, 2015	112,350	135.8%	5,447	2,071	4,218
December 9, 2015	112,510	136.0%	5,264	1,978	4,218
January 13, 2016	112,737	136.3%	5,173	1,882	4,218
February 10, 2016	112,887	136.5%	5,088	1,813	4,218

See Defs.' Monthly Status Reports (ECF Nos. 2838/5278, 2842/5289, 2846/5300, 2848/5306, 2860/5322, 2862/5331, 2864/5336, 2870/5354, 2874/5368, 2876/5379,

² Defendants' monthly reports all state that there are 4,218 MCCF (modified community correctional facility) beds "that are in various stages of activation and transfer."

The court uses the figures on page 1 of Defendants' August status report, which appear to be correct based on the weekly report available at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/WeeklyWed/TPOP1A/TPOP1Ad150812.pdf. The figures at the top of Exhibit A to the August report appear not to have been updated from the July report.

2880/5388, 2882/5400, 2886/5411). Even as the benchmark has been attained, as reflected in the above table, however, the in-state adult institution population has been gradually increasing since July 2015. Part of this growth is due to the State's commendable efforts to return inmates from out-of-state facilities, but there still remain over 5,000 inmates in out-of-state facilities. There are also approximately 5,500 inmates housed in in-state contract facilities. Moreover, defendants project that the total number of inmates will increase by over 3,600 over the next few years, which in itself threatens to push the population back over the threshold. See An Update to the Future of California Corrections: January 2016 at 25, available at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Blueprint-Update-2016/An-Update-to-the-Future-of-California-Corrections-January-2016.pdf.

The court commends defendants for achieving the required reduction in the current in-state adult institution population. It also commends the parties for working cooperatively to ensure that the court's orders are fully implemented. *E.g.*, Stip. & Order in Response to Nov. 14, 2014 Order (ECF No. 2830/5254).

At the same time, as this court has previously ordered and as defendants recognize, the court will "maintain jurisdiction over this matter for as long as is necessary to ensure that defendants' compliance with the 137.5% final benchmark is durable, and such durability is firmly established." Feb. 10, 2014 Order at 5. Additional work remains for defendants to demonstrate that they can maintain compliance with the population benchmark in the absence of court-ordered remedies. To that end, defendants shall

//

//

//

^{22 //}

⁴ As of midnight February 10, 2016, which is the source of the population data in defendants' most recent status report, there were 5,530 inmates housed in in-state contract beds, including the 1,813 inmates housed at California City. See CDCR, Weekly Rpt. of Population, Feb. 10, 2016, available at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Reports_Research/Offender_Information_Services_Branch/WeeklyWed/TPOP1A/TPOP1Ad160210.pdf.

Case 3:01-cv-01351-TEH Document 2890 Filed 03/04/16 Page 4 of 4

continue to report to the court monthly as required by the February 10, 2014 Order. Id. at 3. Defendants' monthly reports shall include a discussion of the steps defendants are taking to ensure that compliance with the 137.5% benchmark is durable. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: 03/04/16 UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS Dated: 03/04/16 ELTON E. HENDERSON NIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Northern District of California NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Dated: 03/04/16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

United States District Court

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury that:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18, and not a party to the within cause of action. My business address is 201 Dolores Avenue, San Leandro, CA 94577.

On March 7, 2016, I served a true copy of the following

document(s):

Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.'s Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice; Declaration of Michael Narciso

on the following party(ies) in said action:

Constance Lynn Lelouis
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244
Phone: (916) 322-9357

Email: connie.lelouis@doj.ca.gov (By Overnight Delivery and Email)

Thomas W. Hiltachk Brian T. Hildreth Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP 455 Capitol Mall, Suite 600 Sacramento, CA 95814 Phone: (916) 442-7757

Email: tomh@bmhlaw.com
Email: bhildreth@bmhlaw.com
(By Overnight Delivery and Email)

Non-Title Respondent

Attorneys for Real Parties in Interest California District Attorneys Association and Anne Marie Schubert Paul E. Stein
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 703-5500

Email: paul.stein@doj.ca.gov (By Overnight Delivery and Email)

Clerk to the

Honorable Shelleyanne Chang Sacramento County Superior Court 720 Ninth Street, Department 24 Sacramento, CA 95814 (By Overnight Delivery) Attorneys for Real Party in Interest Attorney General of the State of California and Kamala Harris

	BY UNITED STATES MAIL: By enclosing the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the person(s) at the address above and
	depositing the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.
	placing the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, located in San Leandro, California, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.
\boxtimes	BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: By enclosing the document(s) in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses listed. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.
	BY MESSENGER SERVICE: By placing the document(s) in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed and providing them to a professional messenger service for service.
	BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION: By faxing the document(s) to the persons at the fax numbers listed based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission. No error was reported by the fax machine used. A copy of the fax transmission is maintained in our files.

BY EMAIL TRANSMISSION: By emailing the document(s) to the persons at the email addresses listed based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by email. No electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful was received within a reasonable time after the transmission.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 7, 2016, in San Leandro, California.

Nina Leathley

(00269175-3)