1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, GOVERNOR OF:
4	CALIFORNIA, ET AL., :
5	Petitioners : No. 09-1233
6	v. :
7	MARCIANO PLATA, ET AL. :
8	x
9	Washington, D.C.
10	Tuesday, November 30, 2010
11	
12	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
13	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
14	at 11:10 a.m.
15	APPEARANCES:
16	CARTER G. PHILLIPS, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf
17	of Appellants.
18	DONALD SPECTER, ESQ., Berkeley, California; on behalf of
19	Appellees.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	CARTER G. PHILLIPS, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Appellants	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	DONALD SPECTER, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Appellees	37
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	CARTER G. PHILLIPS, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Appellants	76
11		
12		
13		
14	`	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(11:10 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	in Case 09-1233, Schwarzenegger v. Plata, and the
5	related cases.
6	Mr. Phillips.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF CARTER G. PHILLIPS
8	ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS
9	MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
10	and may it please the Court:
11	What this Court has under review today is an
12	extraordinary and unprecedented order issued by a three-
13	judge district court requiring the release of between
14	36,000 and 45,000 inmates, currently incarcerated in the
15	California penal system, within a 2-year period.
16	The order in this particular case is made
17	particularly remarkable because it strikes me that at a
18	minimum it is extraordinarily premature. That it may
19	come at some point in this process that an order,
20	probably substantially smaller in scope than this one,
21	may become appropriate. But if this is supposed to be
22	an order or remedy of last resort, and what the district
23	court has done here is leapfrogged a series of steps
24	that should have been taken ahead of going this
25	particular route.

- 1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: One case, Mr. Phillips,
- 2 is pending for 20 years; is that not so?
- 3 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, that's correct, Justice
- 4 Ginsburg.
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So it seems to me -- and
- 6 there were something like 70 orders from the district
- 7 court, the single-judge district court in that case.
- 8 MR. PHILLIPS: That's absolutely true,
- 9 Justice Ginsburg.
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And no -- no change. So
- 11 how much longer do we have to wait? Another 20 years?
- 12 Longer than that?
- MR. PHILLIPS: No, Justice Ginsburg. I
- 14 think, obviously, the length of time you have to wait in
- 15 some ways depends on what the state of the remedial
- 16 phase is in the particular case. And in this case and
- in recognition, frankly, of the substantial problems
- 18 that were inherent in the -- in the penal system as it
- 19 existed during the 1990s and up until the early 2000s, a
- 20 receiver was appointed, specifically in the Plata class,
- 21 but there was also connections between the receiver and
- 22 the special master even in the Coleman class before the
- 23 three-judge panel was convened.
- 24 And under those circumstances and given the
- 25 extraordinary powers that the receiver had been

- 1 accorded, what should have -- the most logical course,
- 2 if this is supposed to be a remedy of last resort, was
- 3 to allow the receiver an opportunity to implement the
- 4 extraordinary powers that were conferred upon him, and
- 5 then see -- because if it turns out that we aren't
- 6 making progress --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Excuse me. Could you
- 8 tell me -- from your briefs, I just haven't understood
- 9 what the alternative steps are. The court below talked
- 10 about some proposals like construction and said the
- 11 legislature has struck them down. There's -- the fiscal
- 12 crisis has gotten worse, so construction is really not
- 13 an option. I don't see how you wait for an option that
- 14 doesn't exist. They talked about hiring more staff, but
- 15 the conclusion was that even if you maximize the staff,
- 16 you don't have the facilities to add more staff, which
- 17 is what you need to cure the constitutional violation.
- 18 So tell me what specific steps outside of
- 19 this order should have been given time to be
- 20 implemented, because the receiver has basically said:
- 21 I've tried, and the small progress we made has been
- 22 reversed because the population just keeps growing, so
- 23 we can never get ahead of the problem.
- MR. PHILLIPS: The -- the --
- 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So slow down from the

- 1 rhetoric and give me concrete --
- MR. PHILLIPS: Sure.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- details about what
- 4 the least restricted means would have been, other than
- 5 to say, throw it back to a receiver and special master
- 6 who are saying we don't have a solution outside
- 7 of reducing overcrowding.
- 8 MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think that's a fair
- 9 characterization of what the receiver said. The
- 10 receiver said that, at any population, he would in fact
- 11 get you to the point --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Oh, counsel, that was
- one statement years ago. If that's all you're relying
- 14 on --
- MR. PHILLIPS: No, no. That's not all I'm
- 16 relying on. All I'm suggesting --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That may be your weakest
- 18 argument. Tell me -- give me concrete steps that are
- 19 least -- less restrictive.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, if you -- all you have
- 21 to do is look at what the receiver has done over the
- 22 course of the period of time since his appointment, and
- 23 particularly when the second receiver was put in place.
- 24 First of all, A.B. 900 has been enacted. There is
- 25 significant construction. There has been ground broken.

- 1 There are substantial facilities in place.
- 2 Second, the receiver has had extraordinary
- 3 success in the hiring process. They are -- we are at
- 4 close to 90 percent --
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is there in fact less
- 6 overcrowding? Because I thought that the -- what this
- 7 case was all about was the receiver has said, the
- 8 special master has said, we can't make any progress at
- 9 all until there are fewer people; we have no place to
- 10 put clinics.
- The first step, not the last step, but given
- 12 the -- given what we're dealing with here, the essential
- 13 first step is that we have fewer people so there is more
- 14 room for these health facilities, more room for staff to
- 15 operate.
- 16 MR. PHILLIPS: Justice Ginsburg, the
- 17 fundamental issue in this case seems to me as -- what is
- 18 the real cause of the constitutional violation here?
- 19 And the real cause of the constitutional violation here
- 20 has always been the culture of disregard for the inmate.
- 21 What the receiver was put in place for, the reason he
- 22 was appointed, and properly so -- this was with the
- 23 State's consent; this is not over our objection -- was
- 24 to change that fundamental culture and to provide, one,
- 25 construction, to provide increased numbers, to

- 1 provide --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Yes, but you can't -- you
- 3 can't provide construction when the State doesn't supply
- 4 the money for it.
- 5 MR. PHILLIPS: Except that since the
- 6 August 8th, 2008, period of time, you know, literally
- 7 hundreds of millions of dollars have gone to
- 8 construction specifically and more than \$4 billion have
- 9 been spent on the provision of health care in this
- 10 particular system. And a great deal of that is because
- 11 of the receiver.
- 12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Then if you -- then if
- 13 there -- if there are these great changes in
- 14 circumstances so that now they -- medical care can be
- 15 administered in something approaching a decent way, you
- 16 could go back to the single-judge district court and
- 17 say: I'm moving under 60(b). Circumstances have
- 18 changed; it's no longer the case that it's impossible to
- 19 render decent health care.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Justice Ginsburg, I don't
- 21 think we could get that relief from the single-judge
- 22 district court, unless you're asking me to actually seek
- 23 to remove the entirety of the claim. I mean, the order
- 24 that says that we have to get to 137.5 percent of the
- 25 design, the design capacity, within 2 years is a

- 1 three-judge district court decision.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So you go back to that
- 3 panel because it invited you to. It said if
- 4 circumstances change, come back.
- 5 MR. PHILLIPS: Right, but that will always
- 6 be the case, Justice Sotomayor. The fundamental
- 7 question here is: Congress shifted dramatically the
- 8 approach that you're supposed to take as a court of
- 9 equity in this context. This is supposed to be a matter
- 10 of last resort, which would mean that you would give the
- 11 receiver a full opportunity to do what the receiver --
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: The receiver said the best
- 13 statement that seemed to me to summarize it. It's in
- 14 his brief on page 9. He has about two paragraphs. And
- 15 as you read that two paragraphs, it sounds as if
- 16 overcrowding is a big, big cause of this problem, which
- 17 is horrendous, which if you think it's accurately
- 18 described in the mental case in the first page, two
- 19 paragraphs -- now, if that's a fair description from the
- 20 record, it's a horrendous problem.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well --
- 22 JUSTICE BREYER: What the receiver says is
- 23 overcrowding is a big cause of it. And then he says: I
- think we've discovered you actually can provide care,
- 25 and certainly our plan and turnaround plan believes we

- 1 can provide constitutional levels of care no matter what
- 2 the population is.
- 3 So then you look to the care and turnaround
- 4 plan and it says spend \$8 billion building more
- 5 buildings. And then the legislature rejected it. Okay?
- 6 MR. PHILLIPS: And then --
- 7 JUSTICE BREYER: Now, there we are. More
- 8 time; what's supposed to happen?
- 9 MR. PHILLIPS: No, but, Justice Breyer, the
- 10 legislature also approved a smaller but nevertheless
- 11 multibillion-dollar construction program.
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, it was 2.31 or
- 13 something like that.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I -- I mean, they
- 15 approved --
- JUSTICE BREYER: And did they approve the
- 17 2.3 -- is that in place, 2.35? Did they approve that?
- MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, they did approve that --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. So he said: We need
- 20 8 --
- 21 MR. PHILLIPS: -- and that money is being
- 22 spent.
- JUSTICE BREYER: We need 8, and they
- 24 approved 2.35.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Right, and the receiver --

- 1 JUSTICE BREYER: And is there any evidence
- 2 here that suggests that 2.35 is sufficient to cure the
- 3 constitutional violation?
- 4 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I don't know whether it
- 5 will get you there or not.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: So I take it from your
- 7 answer the answer is no, there is no evidence.
- 8 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, there is the evidence
- 9 that the receiver asked for contempt for not getting the
- 10 8 billion and withdrew that motion. So, obviously,
- 11 there is some sense in which the receiver is reasonably
- 12 satisfied with 2.35 billion as an opening gambit.
- But, again, all of this goes to what is, at
- 14 least from my perspective, the fundamental question the
- 15 court should have evaluated in the first instance, which
- 16 is: Are we ready yet to give up hope at this point?
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, what he says -- what
- 18 the receiver says about the 2.35, that it is a
- 19 significant step farther. It is certainly better than
- 20 no construction at all. However, that is not equivalent
- 21 to a conclusion that that current compromise will result
- 22 in sustainable constitutional health care at current
- 23 population density levels.
- 24 That's what he said about it. So -- so we
- 25 have his views, and I'm back to my question: What else

- 1 is supposed to happen?
- 2 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, there's --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Which was your question
- 4 initially.
- 5 MR. PHILLIPS: Justice Breyer, when the
- 6 receiver says that -- now remember, he says at current
- 7 population levels. He doesn't suggest, and his brief is
- 8 very clear, that it doesn't urge this Court to affirm
- 9 the particular order in this case.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Mr. Phillips --
- MR. PHILLIPS: Can I --
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes.
- 13 MR. PHILLIPS: -- just finish this?
- 14 And the reality is that the population
- 15 levels have dropped pretty significantly since August,
- 16 since the trial in this particular case. And given the
- 17 actions by the legislature in A.B. 18 and the actions of
- 18 the legislatures in A.B. 900, there are both a lot of
- 19 expenditures on the table and substantial reductions in
- 20 the population size. And so, therefore, even under the
- 21 receiver's --
- 22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What -- do we have
- 23 information about that substantial reduction? I mean,
- 24 in this record, it just seems to be that it's -- no
- 25 matter how many efforts have been made, the population

- 1 goes up. And now you say that the population has gone
- 2 down. From what point in time and how much has it gone
- 3 down?
- 4 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it's down to around, as
- 5 I understand it, about 147,000 from a high of around 165
- 6 to 170,000, and it has dropped, as we know, because
- 7 there has been a change in the good time credits. There
- 8 has been a significant number of transfers. I mean,
- 9 that was the purpose of the governor's proclamation
- 10 declaring an emergency.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So it's possible that
- 12 within the 2-year period, you're going to hit the mark
- if you -- that's what the lower court's --
- MR. PHILLIPS: I think it unlikely.
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's what the
- 16 three-judge panel said, which is: If you implement most
- 17 of the proposals being made, you are likely to hit the
- 18 mark. So what you're saying is you're going to do it.
- 19 And if you don't, they invited you to come back and --
- 20 you really don't think that if you hit 140 percentage,
- 21 that the court is going to order an immediate release of
- 22 the 2.5 percent over the limit it set? It's going to
- 23 ask you: What have you put into place to reach that
- 24 level over what additional period of time?
- 25 MR. PHILLIPS: I mean, there's a core sort

- 1 of federalism answer and then a basic sort of factual
- 2 point to be made here. Let me make the second one
- 3 first, and then I want to come back to the -- what you
- 4 may regard as rhetorical, but nevertheless I think
- 5 important, which is that when we made our initial
- 6 proposal to the three-judge court suggesting what we
- 7 thought would be a reasonable reduction within a
- 8 reasonable period of time, it was met with both a motion
- 9 for contempt and summary rejection out of hand,
- 10 notwithstanding that there was improvement at the
- 11 time --
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what are we fighting
- 13 about? Are we fighting about that the plan was wrong,
- or are we fighting about that you're angry that you were
- 15 told to do it in 2 years -- in 22 years, as opposed to
- 16 do it in 25 years? Is that -- is that what you're
- 17 objecting to?
- 18 MR. PHILLIPS: No. I think the -- no, this
- 19 goes to the federalism point.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can -- can you do it in
- 21 5 years?
- 22 MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know. I -- you know,
- 23 if -- if balancing all of the policies that the State
- 24 has to take into account, can it get there and is that
- 25 in the best interest of the State of California? If it

- 1 is, yes, then we can get there.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, the best interest
- 3 of the State of California, isn't it to deliver adequate
- 4 constitutional care to the people that it incarcerates?
- 5 That's a constitutional obligation.
- 6 MR. PHILLIPS: Absolutely. And California
- 7 recognizes that.
- 8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So when are you going to
- 9 get to that? When are you going to avoid the needless
- 10 deaths that were reported in this record? When are you
- 11 going to avoid or get around people sitting in their
- 12 feces for days in a dazed state? When are you going to
- 13 get to a point where you're going to deliver care that
- 14 is going to be adequate?
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: But don't be rhetorical.
- MR. PHILLIPS: I'll do my best. Thank you,
- 17 Your Honor.
- 18 (Laughter.)
- 19 MR. PHILLIPS: I mean, first of all, let's
- 20 -- you know, if you look at the receiver's 2009 death
- 21 review which came out in September 2010, it specifically
- 22 says that there has been a significant downward trend
- 23 over the past 4 years. The suicides -- the 25 suicides
- in '09 were 66 percent of the average for the preceding
- 25 3 years, and the 9 homicides were 60 percent of the

- 1 average. There have been significant improvements.
- 2 And the more important point in response to
- 3 your specific question, Justice Sotomayor, is that the
- 4 record in this case was cut off in August of 2008, and
- 5 so what we have are --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Of course, but the problem
- 7 I have with that, Mr. Phillips, is that at some point
- 8 the court has to say: You've been given enough time;
- 9 the constitutional violation still persists, as the
- 10 State itself acknowledges.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I'm not sure we've
- 12 stated that.
- 13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Overcrowding is the
- 14 principal -- overcrowding is the principal cause, as
- 15 experts have testified, and it's now time for a remedy.
- The court can't -- has to at some point
- 17 focus on the remedy, and that's what it did, and that,
- 18 it seemed to me, was a perfectly reasonable decision.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Justice Kennedy, I agree with
- 20 everything you say except -- and I even agree with the
- 21 last statement, because, you know, you needed a
- 22 significant remedy. There's no question about it. But
- 23 you got a significant remedy when the receiver was
- 24 appointed in 2005 and implemented a program in 2006. I
- 25 mean, our --

- 1 JUSTICE KAGAN: How much time do you think
- 2 the receiver needed? I mean, how much time did --
- 3 should the court have given the receiver to develop his
- 4 plan and to try to implement his plan?
- 5 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, there's no -- Justice
- 6 Kagan, there's no specific time frame. I mean,
- 7 obviously, we believe that we are entitled to a
- 8 reasonable opportunity to comply with the receiver's
- 9 orders and to bring ourselves ultimately into compliance
- 10 with the Constitution, and --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, at some point the
- 12 State itself said that if it had, I think, 7 years, it
- 13 could get down to 137.5 and didn't seem to object to
- 14 that.
- MR. PHILLIPS: No, that's --
- 16 Justice Kennedy, you know, given all of the other
- 17 constraints, et cetera -- again, there's a fundamental
- 18 difference between what you do under the hammer of a
- 19 district court order, which is what we have under these
- 20 circumstances, and what the State will do. That said,
- 21 the State is absolutely committed.
- I mean, the -- again, to go back to what is
- 23 the root cause of the constitutional violation, it's not
- 24 overcrowding. I mean, when California violated the
- 25 constitutional rights of the mentally ill in the 1990s,

- 1 the prisons weren't crowded. It was because there was a
- 2 fundamental lack of attentiveness to medical care under
- 3 those circumstances. And that's unfortunate, to be
- 4 sure. More than that.
- 5 But that was the reason. To go back to your
- 6 point, Justice Kennedy, that's why the receiver, which
- 7 is an extraordinary remedy. To confer upon a private
- 8 individual the entire authority to run the California
- 9 Department of Corrections, not just simply a facility or
- 10 anything like that, but the entire Department of
- 11 Corrections' medical and -- medical health provision, is
- 12 incredible.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: But I thought that
- 14 officer himself said: I can't do this without as a
- 15 first step reducing the population; nothing else is
- 16 going to work until we reduce the population to the
- 17 point where there is room for clinics, room for medical
- 18 personnel to operate. I mean, that was the view of the
- 19 district judge, the special master in one case, the
- 20 receiver in the other case.
- 21 Everybody -- they all agreed reducing the
- 22 population is not going to cure it, not going to make
- 23 everything perfect, but without doing that as a first
- 24 step, nothing -- there will be no cure.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, Justice Ginsburg, even

- 1 if you accept that, and I don't think that's precisely
- 2 how I would interpret what the receiver said under these
- 3 circumstances anyway, but even if you accept that, the
- 4 idea of a 137-1/2 percent design cap that has to be
- 5 implemented within fewer than 2 years is a remedy that's
- 6 neither necessary nor sufficient. It is not aimed at
- 7 the specific class. It doesn't remedy the specific
- 8 Federal rights as required by the Prisoners Litigation
- 9 Reform Act.
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I don't get the class
- 11 thing, because what -- you can't have a remedy just
- 12 limited to the class. The class wants to have clinics.
- 13 They want to have personnel who function someplace
- 14 outside of a broom closet. So you can't deal with this
- 15 problem by just dealing with the mentally ill and the
- 16 people with medical problems. You have to provide space
- 17 for facilities.
- 18 MR. PHILLIPS: I think, Justice Ginsburg,
- 19 the -- the fundamental point here is that it may
- 20 eventually be that you have to get to that stage, but if
- 21 you look at the receiver's reports since August 2008,
- 22 which consistently analyzed this issue, and they say:
- 23 And we have been able successfully to bring in very
- 24 qualified personnel, and we have significantly larger
- 25 numbers; we know there is construction in place; it may

- 1 not be as substantial as what I originally proposed; it
- 2 is nevertheless very significant.
- 3 And -- and Congress was very explicit that
- 4 the remedy of a prisoner release order should be the
- 5 remedy of last resort.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: What would I look at to
- 7 find this? It's a big record. What I did was I -- it
- 8 refers to on-line evidence, and I went and looked at the
- 9 pictures, and the pictures are pretty horrendous to me.
- 10 And I would say page 10 of the religious group's brief,
- 11 for example, shows you one of them.
- 12 And what they're saying is, it's -- it's
- 13 obvious. Just look at it. You cannot have mental
- 14 health facilities that will stop people from killing
- 15 themselves and you cannot have medical facilities that
- 16 will stop staph and tubercular infection in conditions
- 17 like this. And then you look at them.
- 18 Now, you've looked at them. I've looked at
- 19 them. And what is the answer to that? There's nothing
- 20 in here that -- the special master said \$8 billion is
- 21 the answer.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well --
- 23 JUSTICE BREYER: And they haven't come
- 24 close. So how can I -- or you if you were in my
- 25 position -- what would you say in an opinion that says

- 1 that these three judges who have 200 pages of
- 2 findings -- what would you say to -- as an answer to
- 3 what I just said?
- 4 MR. PHILLIPS: I would say that the
- 5 Prisoners Litigation Reform Act has a series of very
- 6 specific requirements that the Federal court has to
- 7 comply with, and that in deciding to go to a three-judge
- 8 district court in the first instance, you have to
- 9 examine the orders that are in place and whether those
- 10 orders have had a reasonable time within which to
- 11 operate. And --
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Yes, but the State -- the
- 13 State did not claim that either order in either case has
- 14 succeeded in achieving a remedy. You've never claimed
- 15 that.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it depends on what you
- 17 mean by --
- 18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And -- and just if I could
- 19 have your attention for a moment. I have this problem
- 20 with the case: Overcrowding is, of course, always the
- 21 cause. If I'm running a hotel -- if I'm looking at a
- 22 highway system, I need highways, what's the number of
- 23 cars? If the problem is bad service in a hotel, well,
- 24 it's the number of employees per -- per guest. I mean,
- 25 that's fairly simple.

- 1 Now, I recognize, of course, that Congress
- 2 has -- had imposed a special duty on us. But I think it
- 3 means that overcrowding must not be ordered unless that
- 4 is the only efficacious remedy in -- in a permissible
- 5 period of time. And it seems to me there is massive
- 6 expert testimony to support that proposition on the part
- 7 of -- of the prisoners.
- 8 MR. PHILLIPS: I -- I mean, it seems to me
- 9 that, first of all, I'm not sure that's consistent with
- 10 the language. It's the primary cause of the
- 11 constitutional violation, not the primary impediment to
- 12 the implementation of a specific remedy. So I think
- 13 that's still a difficult and open question as to how to
- 14 proceed.
- But it still strikes me that the sequence
- 16 that Congress envisions and the one that would make the
- 17 most sense and ultimately the one that hopefully would
- 18 accommodate both the plaintiffs' interests and the
- 19 State's interests, and the Department of Corrections'
- 20 interests, is to allow the receiver to stay on a course
- 21 that candidly I think will in fact get you there.
- I mean, again, one of the real flaws in this
- 23 case, Justice Kennedy, is nobody doubts for a moment
- 24 that there have been very significant violations of
- 25 constitutional rights years gone by and, indeed, a

- 1 failure on the mental health side ultimately to get you
- 2 -- get to the point where we are in fact providing a
- 3 significant remedy.
- 4 The reality is, is that in the course of the
- 5 last 3 to 4 years under the guidance of the -- of the
- 6 receiver, who coordinates with the special master on the
- 7 mental health side and does it with the cooperation of
- 8 the State of California, there have been significant --
- 9 there has been significant movement in the right
- 10 direction.
- 11 And if the court had not jumped the gun and
- 12 said, look, we're not going to -- we're not going to let
- 13 that part play itself out, we are going to leap ahead
- 14 and go to a three-judge court and go to the prisons --
- 15 to the prisoner release order, this process would have
- 16 played itself out and we wouldn't be here --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: All this talk about what the
- 18 receiver may think can be done seems a little bit
- 19 perplexing to me, because the receiver did not testify
- 20 before the three-judge court; isn't that correct?
- 21 MR. PHILLIPS: That -- that is true, Justice
- 22 Alito.
- 23 JUSTICE ALITO: You were not allowed to
- 24 question him.
- MR. PHILLIPS: We were not allowed to --

- 1 JUSTICE ALITO: And now he has submitted
- 2 what is styled an amicus brief where he doesn't address
- 3 issues of law. He explains his views about -- he tries
- 4 to explain prior statements and supplement those prior
- 5 statements. Is that proper?
- 6 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, you know, I'm a
- 7 long-time believer that amicus briefs are pretty much
- 8 open season in terms of anything you want to present on
- 9 them. But I mean, obviously, I -- I --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, is that true? Can --
- 11 MR. PHILLIPS: Clearly a better system is
- 12 one in which we could --
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: Can a witness testify -- can
- 14 a witness submit an amicus brief that consists of an
- 15 affidavit?
- MR. PHILLIPS: No, Your Honor, that's
- obviously not appropriate, and one of the things we've
- 18 complained about --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: I thought the -- the --
- 20 that brief was filed because the -- there were -- in
- 21 your presentations, there were representations about the
- 22 special master, and he filed that brief to say: You
- 23 must understand this in context; I was making a speech
- 24 at the club.
- 25 So he wanted to put in context what you had

- 1 used. You had quoted his statements.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, to be sure, although,
- 3 candidly, we had -- we had referred to some of those
- 4 same statements even in the jurisdictional statement in
- 5 this litigation. This has been part of the case for
- 6 quite some time.
- 7 So I -- I don't know what motivated the
- 8 special master to file an out-of-time brief -- or I
- 9 mean, the receiver to file an out-of-time brief. But I
- 10 understand -- you know, we didn't object to it so long
- 11 as the Court was of a mind to hear from the receiver.
- But I do think the most important part of
- 13 that, though, to keep in mind in this context is the
- 14 receiver didn't ask for this Court to affirm. The
- 15 receiver simply clarified certain statements that had
- 16 been made and tried to say, as Justice Alito described,
- 17 put them into some kind of context. And that's -- and
- 18 that's fine, and we obviously don't have any quarrel
- 19 with -- with that particular presentation.
- 20 But I do think to say that the receiver has
- 21 insisted that he cannot get to a constitutionally
- 22 permissible result without the order that has been
- 23 imposed in this particular case is -- is simply not
- 24 consistent with either the record and certainly not
- 25 consistent with that amicus brief.

- 1 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, but the experts
- 2 testified to that effect.
- 3 MR. PHILLIPS: I mean, experts made the --
- 4 certainly reached that specific conclusion. But this
- 5 Court has recognized --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And the strike force and
- 7 the governor's -- governor's commission reached the
- 8 same conclusion.
- 9 MR. PHILLIPS: Well --
- 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The strike team, I think
- 11 they called them.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Right. But, again, it seems
- 13 to me that there is a very, very, very big difference
- 14 between what do you need to accomplish in order to
- 15 remedy whatever -- whatever the constitutional violation
- 16 is, recognizing in the first instance that the biggest
- 17 element of an Eighth Amendment violation is the
- 18 deliberate indifference prong, which absolutely seems to
- 19 me to have been completely eliminated by the conduct of
- 20 the State over the course of the last 3 to 4 years.
- 21 There is no evidence to support --
- JUSTICE BREYER: What specifically will
- 23 happen? I mean, at the moment, you know, we could go
- 24 through -- we have all these briefs. I mean, there are
- 25 all these experts, all the reports. Everybody is saying

- 1 you need to spend the money. And we have -- if you
- 2 really want to cure the constitutional violation, we
- 3 have the legislature rejecting 8 billion but 2, which --
- 4 2.35, and so -- and nothing, and a void, and give us
- 5 more time.
- I mean, I read the newspaper. It doesn't
- 7 seem to me California has been voting a lot of money for
- 8 new programs. The -- the -- what is it -- what is it
- 9 specifically that would happen that would cure this
- 10 problem were we to say -- I mean, a big human rights
- 11 problem -- what would we say -- what would happen if we
- were to say, no, this panel's wrong? What would happen
- 13 that would cure the problem?
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it depends I suppose on
- 15 some ways on how you --
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: A constitutional problem
- 17 which the State itself admits --
- 18 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: -- is constitutional, a
- 20 State with a governor who has said publicly that there's
- 21 this tremendous safety and health problem in the
- 22 prisons. What -- what would happen?
- 23 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, if the Court were to
- 24 conclude that the three-judge panel shouldn't have been
- 25 convened, that would be one outcome. If the Court

- 1 concludes that it was appropriate to convene it, but
- 2 137-1/2 percent is not narrowly tailored, it would be a
- 3 different one. Either way, it will go back, obviously,
- 4 to a court of equity. The receiver is in place. The
- 5 receiver has a comprehensive plan in place which he is
- 6 implementing as we speak.
- 7 I mean, you know, one of the things that --
- 8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That's one piece of it.
- 9 You said something about the 2.35 million. They didn't
- 10 come up with the 8 million, but they did come up with
- 11 2.35 billion. And then I'm just looking at this brief
- 12 for the receiver, and there's a footnote, page 11,
- 13 footnote 3, that says: No, that money isn't there; it's
- 14 dependent upon several approvals that have not yet been
- 15 secured, and such approvals ultimately may not be
- 16 forthcoming.
- 17 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I mean, 400 million of
- 18 it has already been spent. The rest of it has already
- 19 been earmarked for this particular purpose, and there is
- 20 -- and the expectation from the State of California is
- 21 that money is -- is going forward. Construction is, as
- 22 we speak, under way. And the one thing we do know is
- 23 that --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: But not the --
- 25 MR. PHILLIPS: -- every time the receiver

- 1 asks for a check he gets one.
- 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Not the 2.35 --
- MR. PHILLIPS: I'm sorry.
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I mean, I think you did
- 5 say earlier that this was a done deal, 2.35 billion.
- 6 But this is a note telling us it's not so.
- 7 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, the receiver is saying
- 8 it's not etched in stone. I understand that. But our
- 9 assumption and our expectation and our belief is that
- 10 that money is going to be used for construction. There
- 11 are projects that are finished, there are projects that
- 12 are under way, and there are project that are scheduled
- 13 to begin within the next 6 weeks, all of which will be
- 14 funded out of that \$2.35 billion.
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: On one project, the joint
- 16 legislative budget committee said, no, we're not going
- 17 to give you money for that.
- 18 MR. PHILLIPS: They asked for additional
- 19 information, to be sure. But the expectation, again,
- 20 from the governor, both this governor and the
- 21 governor-elect, is that that money will ultimately be
- 22 approved and that that facility would be built. And
- 23 we're moving along very rapidly to get that construction
- under way, because we're talking about enormous
- 25 facilities under these particular circumstances, Justice

- 1 Ginsburg.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Phillips, my trouble
- 3 listening to you is that it seems as though you're
- 4 asking us to re-find facts. You know, you have these
- 5 judges who have been involved in these cases since the
- 6 beginning, for 20 years in the Plata case, who thought:
- 7 We've done everything we can, the receiver has done
- 8 everything he can; this just isn't going anywhere and it
- 9 won't go anywhere until we can address this root cause
- 10 of the problem.
- 11 And that was the view of the judges who had
- 12 been closest to the cases from the beginning and the
- 13 view of the three-judge court generally. So how can we
- 14 reach a result essentially without, you know, re-finding
- 15 the facts that they've been dealing with for 20 years?
- 16 MR. PHILLIPS: The -- there -- the
- 17 fundamental problem with the fact-finding in this --
- 18 well, there are actually two fundamental problems.
- 19 First of all, remember that the receiver gets appointed,
- 20 and then 3 months later you get a motion for a
- 21 three-judge court. The three-judge court convenes
- 22 itself before the receiver has even finalized the
- 23 comprehensive plan to bring everybody into compliance in
- 24 the first instance.
- 25 So the reality is that's -- that's the

- 1 fundamental legal error I'm asking this Court to
- 2 correct. But even if you get beyond that and you're
- 3 looking at the primary cause analysis, it seems to me
- 4 that's -- that's at most -- at best, a mixed question of
- 5 law and fact, and it's the kind of standard that this
- 6 Court ought to analyze to determine in the first
- 7 instance and on an independent review whether or not the
- 8 overcrowding is, quote, "the primary cause of the
- 9 violation."
- 10 And what makes that inquiry particularly
- 11 appropriate for this Court, as opposed to simply
- 12 slavishly adhering -- deferring to the district court in
- 13 this circumstance, is that the district court
- 14 arbitrarily cut off the record in August of '08 and
- 15 there have been enormous developments since then. And
- 16 there were enormous developments --
- 17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Can you explain me
- 18 something about that? It was confusing in the briefs,
- 19 Mr. Phillips. I thought that the State had said: We
- 20 don't want the plaintiffs to tour these facilities
- 21 anymore. We don't want to have discovery go beyond --
- 22 what was it -- some date in 2008.
- I thought that it was the State that was
- 24 urging: We don't need any more discovery, we don't want
- 25 any more inspection tours.

1	So	how	could	 how	could	the	plaintiffs

- 2 submit more than they did when the State said it's
- 3 enough, 2008 should be the cutoff?
- 4 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, there's a huge
- 5 difference between not allowing formal tours and all of
- 6 the rigamarole that goes with that, which is what the
- 7 State specifically objected to. But what the State
- 8 wanted to do and what the intervenors on our side in
- 9 even greater vehemence wanted to do was to bring forward
- 10 evidence that proved that in the interim period of time
- 11 there have been, in fact, significant improvements.
- 12 As I sit here today, Justice Kennedy, you
- 13 said it's conceded that we're -- that we're in
- 14 constitutional violation. It is conceded that we have
- 15 been in constitutional violation. I don't know whether
- 16 today we are in violation.
- 17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But then don't you have
- 18 the burden? If -- if you have -- you concede that you
- 19 have been in constitutional violation, then it seems to
- 20 me you have the burden of showing that's no longer the
- 21 case. That's generally so in -- in --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, did you --
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry. Could
- 24 you answer Justice Ginsburg's question first?
- 25 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. Justice Ginsburg, I

- 1 understand what the ordinary rule would be in a -- of a
- 2 court of equity dealing with a constitutional violation.
- 3 But we're talking about an order entered under the
- 4 Prisoners Litigation Reform Act, and it's quite clear,
- 5 the statute couldn't be any plainer, that it shifts the
- 6 burden significantly onto the plaintiff when you are
- 7 going to go for a remedy as extreme as insisting that
- 8 somewhere between potentially 36,000 and 45,000 inmates
- 9 be released within a -- within a 2-year period of time.
- 10 Again, if you go back, you know, the
- 11 receiver has not -- at the time that all of this took
- 12 place, the receiver had been appointed. The receiver
- 13 had devised a plan. The receiver is currently spending
- 14 an enormous amount of money, \$4 billion on health care,
- 15 to get -- to get the system moving in the right
- 16 direction, with the right attitude, in order to bring
- 17 ourselves without question into constitutional
- 18 compliance. The truth is we haven't really had an
- 19 assessment of where we are in the constitutional
- 20 compliance spectrum.
- 21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, maybe -- you're
- 22 talking about one of the cases, but the other one -- and
- 23 it's the newer one, instituted in 2001. But what about
- 24 the one that started out in 1990?
- MR. PHILLIPS: Coleman is obviously a

- 1 much -- a much more serious problem. I don't doubt
- 2 that. But it seems -- and if the Court were to conclude
- 3 ultimately that Coleman ought to go back for another
- 4 analysis based on the problems there, I could understand
- 5 that. And it would be a very different prisoner release
- 6 order under those circumstances because then you'd have
- 7 to take out all of the evidence with respect to Plata
- 8 and let that play out.
- 9 But even that, it seems to me, would be a
- 10 mistake under these circumstances where the special
- 11 master and the receiver have been in a sense joined at
- 12 the hip in a variety of ways. And it only makes sense,
- 13 because the -- the receiver is controlling the provision
- of medical care in the CDCR and the special master is
- 15 taking care of or trying to promote a very small slice
- 16 of that.
- 17 So in the scheme of things, as you might
- 18 expect, the receiver consistently gets the ultimate
- 19 authority to make the decisions to help provide the kind
- 20 of resources, both in quality and quantity and staff and
- 21 construction and access to health care.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, this issue
- 23 about evidence -- did you proffer to the judge anywhere
- 24 in this record what the additional evidence it was that
- 25 you wanted to show? I know that the decrease in

- 1 suicides happened post-trial, so you couldn't have
- 2 proffered that pretrial.
- 3 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you run the prisons.
- 5 I presume that you could have yourself without discovery
- 6 set forth a proffer for the court that says: We had a
- 7 wait time between diagnosis and treatment that was
- 8 60 days, 90 days, 120 days in the past, and we've
- 9 reduced that down now to 2 weeks or whatever the reality
- 10 is.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why don't you -- you
- 13 keep saying we were blocked.
- MR. PHILLIPS: Because the district court --
- 15 because the district court could not have been plainer.
- 16 And when the intervenor's counsel stood up in the
- 17 opening statement and said, I want to start talking
- 18 about the beneficial changes and where the status is
- 19 today as opposed to where it was way back when, the
- 20 three-judge court, or at least one member of the
- 21 three-judge court said: We have been as clear as we can
- 22 be that we are not entertaining any evidence on that
- 23 point.
- So the notion of coming forward with a
- 25 proffer, while technically it might have been -- is

- 1 clearly a futile act, and we had already annoyed the
- 2 judges on our side by even making reference to it. So I
- 3 don't think it's an appropriate response to say that we
- 4 should have put forward more, because the truth is we
- 5 would have --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Except that the district
- 7 court invited you to proffer that evidence that went to
- 8 the appropriateness of the remedy. So you didn't have
- 9 to proffer it -- it viewed you as saying, we're no
- 10 longer violating, constitutionally violating the Eighth
- 11 Amendment. Instead, it said: We'll take whatever you
- 12 have to proffer to show that the remedy is
- 13 inappropriate.
- 14 MR. PHILLIPS: All right. But Justice
- 15 Sotomayor, there is, to my mind at least, a complete
- 16 disconnect by saying, I'm not going to tell you exactly
- 17 where the constitutional violation is today, we're not
- 18 going to get into that, we're just going to assume
- 19 there's a constitutional violation; now prove to me that
- 20 the remedy -- you know, what remedy will or will not
- 21 work under those circumstances. It seems to me the
- 22 exact opposite is the way to do it. You determine where
- 23 the constitutional violation is --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: When does -- well, we'll
- 25 get back to Justice Kennedy's --

- 1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, I see your
- 2 time is about to expire.
- 3 MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Specter.
- 5 ORAL ARGUMENT OF DONALD SPECTER
- ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLEES
- 7 MR. SPECTER: Thank you. Mr. Chief Justice,
- 8 and may it please the Court:
- 9 For 20 years, the overcrowding crisis has
- 10 caused prisoners suffering from psychosis and
- 11 life-threatening illnesses to languish in their cells
- 12 because treatment facilities have no room for them.
- 13 Prisoners are committing suicide at a rate twice the
- 14 national average, and more than two-thirds of those
- 15 suicides are preventable. The absence of --
- 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Are you talking about
- 17 current figures or past? Tell us the date of the
- 18 figures.
- 19 MR. SPECTER: Sure. That's from the trial
- 20 court's opinion, Your Honor. That's from the record.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's what I thought.
- 22 How do you address your adversary's point --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, ma'am.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- that the adequacy of
- 25 a remedy can't be measured unless you measure the state

- of the situation at the time the remedy is imposed?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, I think, Your Honor,
- 3 there was massive amounts of evidence about the
- 4 constitutional violations that existed at the time that
- 5 the remedy was imposed. And if we -- I can point to the
- 6 jurisdictional statement 1 appendix, page 30a, the court
- 7 said: "Nonetheless, as we describe below, fundamental
- 8 unconstitutional deficiencies caused primarily by
- 9 overcrowding continue to exist and" --
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: They didn't take any
- 11 evidence on the point, I thought.
- MR. SPECTER: No, Your Honor. I'm sorry,
- 13 that's not correct, with all respect. They took massive
- 14 amounts of evidence up to the day of trial about all the
- 15 conditions as they relate to the remedy. And those
- 16 conditions were --
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could you give us the
- 18 record --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Current conditions?
- 20 MR. SPECTER: -- current -- current as of
- 21 the time of the trial.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: What was -- what was your
- 23 friend talking about when he said that they rejected any
- 24 effort to show the current situation?
- 25 MR. SPECTER: Well, my friend and I have a

- disagreement, but I think Justice Sotomayor accurately
- 2 captured it. What the three-judge panel said is: Look,
- 3 we're not going to -- you can't -- this isn't the place
- 4 for you to come in and say everything's fine, it's --
- 5 everything's constitutional.
- 6 What the three-judge court did say is: We
- 7 will consider -- and they did, in fact, consider -- all
- 8 the evidence from the State. They had experts from the
- 9 State, two of the prisons, in August of 2008. Those
- 10 experts wrote reports, they testified, and they've
- 11 testified about the conditions current. And one of
- 12 them from the mental health side said --
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: This was in 2008.
- 14 MR. SPECTER: And that was the time of the
- 15 trial, Your Honor. There were -- the discovery --
- 16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: They had a -- they had a
- 17 cutoff date of some 2 months before the trial --
- MR. SPECTER: In August, and the trial
- 19 started in November.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: And that was a -- and --
- 21 but before that point, the experts that were -- had
- 22 testified were aware of the conditions that existed.
- 23 MR. SPECTER: Exactly, Your Honor. And --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And when was the remedy
- 25 imposed?

- 1 MR. SPECTER: The remedy -- well, the final
- 2 order came -- well, the close of evidence was in
- 3 December of 2008.
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That was in the -- in the
- 5 one-judge court, in the district court, wasn't it?
- 6 MR. SPECTER: No, no. In the three-judge
- 7 court -- the three-judge court closed evidence in
- 8 December of 2008. We then argued the case after the
- 9 post-trial briefing in February of 2009. Then the court
- 10 came out with the tentative decision about 20 days
- 11 later, and then in August of 2009, it issued the
- 12 183-page opinion and the order that's at issue here.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Did -- I'm sorry.
- 14 Let me just keep track here.
- The evidence was cut off when in 2008?
- 16 MR. SPECTER: The trial closed in December
- 17 of 2008, after all the parties had submitted all their
- 18 evidence.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: All right. So --
- MR. SPECTER: Then there was post-trial
- 21 briefing for a month. Then we had argument in
- 22 February of that year. And then a few weeks later, they
- 23 issued a brief summary of their conclusions in an
- 24 attempt to get the State and the parties to settle the
- 25 case.

Official

1	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You you don't
2	dispute the statement I have it's in the response of
3	the intervenors that between October 2006 and October
4	2010, the population of the adult facilities declined by
5	14,832 inmates?
6	MR. SPECTER: Well, I I agree with my
7	friend Mr. Phillips that the population has declined by
8	about 10,000 prisoners. Most of that decline has been
9	due to a transfer to out-of-State prisons, and, true,
10	there's some some amount of it has been as a result
11	of the marginal increase in good time credits, which the
12	State elected to pursue on its own.
13	JUSTICE KENNEDY: What about the argument
14	that there was evidence that should have been admitted
15	but that was not, with reference to new construction?
16	MR. SPECTER: Well, I don't there was no
17	evidence that wasn't that was offered that wasn't
18	considered by the three-judge panel, Your Honor. They
19	considered all the evidence. Their 183-page opinion is
20	scrupulous in considering all the evidence, both that
21	supported the order and they distinguished the evidence
22	and, in fact, made credibility determinations based on
23	the evidence that that was contrary. But
24	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel
25	MR. SPECTER: Yes. I'm sorry.

- 1 JUSTICE ALITO: Can you explain what the
- 2 connection is between the 137.5 percent figure and the
- 3 constitutional violations relating to the provision of
- 4 medical care in general and treatment for -- for mental
- 5 illness?
- 6 My understanding of the 137.5 percent figure
- 7 is that that has to do with the total number of
- 8 prisoners in the -- in the system in relation to design
- 9 capacity; isn't that right?
- 10 MR. SPECTER: That's correct, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Now, what does the ruling --
- 12 that doesn't speak to the number of personnel who are
- 13 available in the system to attend to medical needs or
- 14 mental illness. It doesn't speak to the extent of the
- 15 facilities that are available for those purposes. It
- 16 seems to be -- there seems to be a disconnect between
- 17 those two. Could you explain why that is narrowly
- 18 tailored?
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor. There was --
- 20 the court made findings that 137.5 percent was the
- 21 maximum number of prisoners that -- of the capacity, of
- 22 the design capacity of the prison, that the prison could
- 23 have that would enable the State to provide -- to have
- 24 all those things that you just mentioned -- staffing,
- 25 facilities, medication management -- be effective and

- 1 reach the actual prisoners who are ill, seriously ill.
- JUSTICE ALITO: See, that's what I don't
- 3 understand. You can have a -- could you not have a
- 4 prison where the cells are somewhat crowded -- and 137.5
- 5 percent of design capacity is not --
- 6 MR. SPECTER: Right.
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: -- is not unconstitutional
- 8 in itself, is it?
- 9 MR. SPECTER: No, it remedies --
- 10 JUSTICE ALITO: You could have --
- 11 MR. SPECTER: It's a remedy, Your Honor.
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Or you could have a prison
- 13 where the -- the cells themselves are crowded, and yet
- 14 there are other facilities available for medical care
- 15 and plenty of staff to attend to those things. So
- 16 what's the connection?
- 17 MR. SPECTER: Well, that's -- that's -- and
- 18 you're right. If there were -- if the cells were
- 19 crowded but the prison had all the other facilities
- 20 available, then there might not be a problem. You have
- 21 to -- well, I hope you can understand that in this case,
- 22 the prisons were built to double-cell the prisoners, but
- 23 they weren't built to provide 200 percent of health care
- 24 needs. So as soon as they started to double-cell these
- 25 prisoners, they could meet their literal housing needs

- 1 in the space of the cell, but they couldn't meet the
- 2 needs of their health care.
- And that's why, Your Honor, the
- 4 137.5 percent figure is reasonable, because the Court
- 5 went almost a third overcrowding above what all the
- 6 experts recommended.
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: But why order the release of
- 8 around 40,000 prisoners, many of whom, perhaps the great
- 9 majority of whom, are not going to be within a class in
- 10 either of these lawsuits? Why order the release of all
- 11 those people, rather than ordering the provision of the
- 12 construction of facilities for medical care, facilities
- 13 to treat mental illness, hiring of staff to treat mental
- 14 illness? Why not go directly to the problem rather than
- 15 address what seems to be a different issue altogether?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, I have two responses to
- 17 that, and they're both a little separate.
- The first point: It's important to
- 19 understand that this is not a release order. It's a
- 20 population-crowding reduction order. The court is not
- 21 ordering the State to throw open the gates of its doors
- 22 and release people. They can reduce crowding through
- 23 more transfers to out of State. To your construction
- 24 point, if the State so chooses, it can construct new
- 25 facilities to increase the capacity. And the

- 1 three-judge panel said if you increase the capacity, you
- 2 can increase the population.
- 3 The point about --
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: If all they do is to build
- 5 more cells, they're not going to address the problem.
- 6 So I --
- 7 MR. SPECTER: Exactly. So that goes to the
- 8 second part of your question, which is: Why don't they
- 9 try other things, like ordering the prisons to hire more
- 10 doctors, ordering better medication management, all of
- 11 those kinds of things? And the answer to that is in the
- 12 appendix to the Appellee's Coleman brief, which lists 70
- discrete orders which the Coleman court, single-judge
- 14 Coleman court, tried over a period of 15 years, which
- 15 have proven singularly to be ineffective. And that's
- 16 why the court analyzed all those things; the trial court
- 17 analyzed all these things, and it made a finding of fact
- 18 that based on the statements by the special master, by
- 19 the receiver's reports, and by the general state of the
- 20 horrendous conditions which we have in these prisons,
- 21 that those discrete orders would not solve the problem.
- 22 And given the level of harm --
- JUSTICE ALITO: I -- I still don't get it.
- 24 You're saying that they were ordered to do a variety of
- 25 things that directly address the problem and they didn't

- 1 comply. So as a --
- 2 MR. SPECTER: No.
- 3 JUSTICE ALITO: In order to -- in order to
- 4 provide some kind of a remedy, we're going to order
- 5 something else that doesn't address the problem --
- 6 MR. SPECTER: No, that --
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: -- that these lawsuits aim
- 8 at addressing.
- 9 MR. SPECTER: No, Your Honor. To the
- 10 contrary, Justice Alito, we -- I think the court
- 11 believes based on the facts that it found that this
- 12 would be an effective remedy. All of the testimony that
- 13 they heard from experts from Texas, from Pennsylvania,
- 14 from Washington State -- all of whom had suffered, had
- 15 dealt with crowding in their prison systems, have said
- 16 that when you reduce the crowding, that's the critical
- 17 thing that you have to do now, because unless you reduce
- 18 the crowding, nothing else is going to work. And the
- 19 court found that that was exactly true.
- Nothing else over 20 years in one case and
- 21 over 8 years in another case has worked. And -- and
- 22 all -- as Justice Kennedy said, massive amounts of
- 23 evidence show that the primary reason it hasn't worked
- is one singular word, overcrowding; and when you reduce
- 25 overcrowding, the prison will be able to operate and

- 1 will be able to provide those services that it can't
- 2 provide now, so the doctors will have room to be able to
- 3 work, which they don't have now.
- 4 There will be less prisoners, so officers
- 5 will be able to take them from one place to another to
- 6 get treatment. There won't be so many lockdowns, which
- 7 inhibit care.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: That's a very indirect way
- 10 of addressing the problem, and it has collateral
- 11 consequences. If -- if I were a citizen of California,
- 12 I would be concerned about the release of 40,000
- 13 prisoners. And I don't care what you term it, a prison
- 14 release order or whatever the --
- MR. SPECTER: Crowding --
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: -- terminology you used was.
- 17 If 40,000 prisoners are going to be released, do you
- 18 really believe that if you were to come back here 2
- 19 years after that, you would be able to say they
- 20 haven't -- they haven't contributed to an increase in
- 21 crime --
- MR. SPECTER: Well --
- JUSTICE ALITO: -- in the State of
- 24 California? In the -- in the amicus brief that was
- 25 submitted by a number of States, there is an extended

- 1 discussion of the effect of one prisoner release order
- 2 with which I am familiar, and that was in Philadelphia;
- 3 and after a period of time they tallied up what the cost
- 4 of that was, the number of murders, the number of rapes,
- 5 the number of armed robberies, the number of assaults.
- 6 You don't -- that's not going to happen in California?
- 7 MR. SPECTER: Your Honor, this trial court
- 8 found, based on 50 pages of its opinion, based on expert
- 9 testimony not only from our experts but from the State's
- 10 experts, from the intervenors' experts, they all came to
- 11 the unanimous conclusion that there are methods that --
- 12 by which you can reduce crowding which will not increase
- 13 crime and that are safe.
- 14 The Secretary of the Department of
- 15 Corrections who was the secretary at the time of trial
- 16 so testified that he was in favor, for example, of
- 17 increasing prisoners' good time credits. That's one way
- 18 to reduce crowding.
- 19 And, moreover, there was statistical
- 20 evidence saying -- looking at all the other States that
- 21 had reduced their prison population over a period of
- 22 about 15 years, and they all came to the same
- 23 conclusion, all of those studies came to the same
- 24 conclusion, which is there's no -- there is no increase
- 25 in the crime rate. In --

- 1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's not what
- 2 -- that is not what the three-judge district court
- 3 determined. The Prisoner Litigation Reform Act requires
- 4 that court to give substantial weight to adverse impact
- 5 on public safety.
- 6 MR. SPECTER: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And when -- and then
- 8 it said to the State, look, you come up with a plan that
- 9 gets you to 137.5 in 2 years.
- 10 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The State did --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- and the State did
- 14 not say -- emphatically did not say this is not going to
- 15 have an adverse impact on public safety.
- MR. SPECTER: Right, but the --
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If you follow the
- 18 double negative there. But -- and what the district
- 19 court said -- it didn't examine that. It said, well,
- 20 we're sure the State's not going to do anything that has
- 21 an adverse impact on public safety. I'm looking at page
- 4a of the jurisdictional statement.
- MR. SPECTER: Right. I know it.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It said -- and so it
- 25 did not make those determinations, but the PLRA requires

- 1 it to determine that what it's ordering -- or at least
- 2 give substantial weight to the public safety issue. So
- 3 isn't that a basis for overturning the remedy that's
- 4 imposed here?
- 5 MR. SPECTER: I would respectfully disagree
- 6 with that, and I'll tell you why --
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought you would.
- 8 (Laughter.)
- 9 MR. SPECTER: At least it's respectful.
- 10 (Laughter.)
- 11 MR. SPECTER: I'll tell you why I think
- 12 that. The court examined all of the methods that are
- 13 commonly used and that the governor himself has proposed
- 14 to reduce crowding. The governor himself wanted to
- 15 reduce the prison population by 37,000. That was in one
- of his legislative enactments, and the secretary of
- 17 corrections testified that those proposals were safe.
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Did he want to do it
- 19 within the 2-year period the district court ordered?
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor, he did. He
- 21 submitted legislation to the legislature for that, and
- 22 the legislature wouldn't -- wouldn't take it. And the
- 23 governor actually said, reacting to that, after a riot
- 24 at Chino which was partly -- at one of the -- Chino is a
- 25 prison in California -- a riot; he said, and the quote:

- 1 "And the politicians in Sacramento have swept the
- 2 problem under the rug."
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. Right. No,
- 4 my -- my question is specifically with respect --
- 5 MR. SPECTER: And I'll get to that.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- to the 2-year
- 7 plan --
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- and I'd like an
- 9 answer to that --
- 10 MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- because I look at
- 12 this record; I don't see that the district court did
- 13 what was required by the Act with respect to the plan
- 14 that it's ordering.
- MR. SPECTER: Right.
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It just simply said,
- 17 oh, we're sure -- I'm sure the State wouldn't do
- 18 anything to hurt public safety -- after telling the
- 19 State you've got to give me a plan in 2 years that gets
- 20 to 137.5.
- 21 MR. SPECTER: Right. Well, I think all of
- 22 the -- it didn't -- it didn't analyze the plan, because
- 23 the court was trying -- well, there was no plan.
- 24 The court, what they -- what the court did
- 25 was it said, we want to give the State the maximum

- 1 flexibility, for comity reasons, to determine how best
- 2 to remedy the constitutional violations.
- Now, on cert, then they said -- they also
- 4 said that we're sure the State can do it in a safe way,
- 5 but it's not our job --
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, they said
- 7 we're sure, because -- but --
- 8 MR. SPECTER: Because there are methods --
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- because we
- 10 trust -- I'm just quoting from 4a --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: "We trust that the
- 13 State will comply with its duty to ensure public safety
- 14 as it implements the constitutionally required
- 15 reduction."
- The State is saying it cannot meet the 137.5
- in 2 years without an adverse impact on public safety.
- 18 MR. SPECTER: Right. And the -- that's the
- 19 State's position --
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right.
- 21 MR. SPECTER: -- and had been the State's
- 22 position all along. The court's findings that a
- 23 population reduction of this magnitude were clear, and
- 24 they're not shown to be clearly erroneous here. They --
- 25 the court said point blank that we're -- we're -- we --

- 1 it's our finding that the State can reduce the
- 2 population to its current levels -- from its current
- 3 levels to 137.5 safely. They made that finding --
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, didn't
- 5 the court --
- 6 MR. SPECTER: -- and it has not been shown
- 7 to be clearly erroneous. So they didn't have to look at
- 8 particulars. In an effort to give the State the maximum
- 9 flexibility, they wanted to allow the State to choose
- 10 the methods that it wanted. If the State -- if the
- 11 court had ordered --
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, what do you mean they
- 14 can do it?
- MR. SPECTER: I'm sorry.
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of course, they could do it
- 17 safely if they built, you know, umpteen new prisons, but
- 18 that --
- 19 MR. SPECTER: But they can also do it
- 20 safely --
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that's -- you know,
- 22 that's pie in the sky. That's not going to happen.
- MR. SPECTER: No, it isn't, Your Honor,
- 24 because they can also do it safely by good time credits.
- 25 They can do it safely --

- JUSTICE SCALIA: What -- doesn't good time
- 2 credits let -- let people out who would not otherwise be
- 3 out?
- 4 MR. SPECTER: Just a -- you know, the -- the
- 5 evidence was at trial, and the court's finding about
- 6 that evidence was, and the State officials so testified,
- 7 that giving prisoners good time credits is not a threat
- 8 to public safety.
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: But --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, didn't --
- 11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Why wouldn't it have been
- 12 the better course, for the State -- excuse me -- for the
- 13 court to say, you know, the State said it can do this in
- 14 5 years --
- MR. SPECTER: Right.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: -- without any public safety
- 17 problem? So why don't we let them take those 5 years?
- 18 MR. SPECTER: Because, Your Honor, as
- 19 Justice Ginsburg and others have been saying before, the
- 20 constitutional violations have been ongoing for
- 21 20 years. We're dealing here with cases of life and
- 22 death and serious injury. And after all these years, in
- 23 -- when they -- when they heard the evidence that said
- 24 that population could be -- and they made the findings
- 25 which the State doesn't argue are clearly erroneous --

- 1 when they made those findings, that it could be reduced
- 2 safely, they had an obligation to provide a remedy that
- 3 would provide constitutionally adequate care in the
- 4 safest manner possible -- in the quickest manner
- 5 possible.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think --
- 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel --
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think Justice
- 9 Sotomayor has been patient.
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I have several
- 11 questions, but I'm -- I'm not sure why you have not been
- 12 responding to Justice -- to the Chief Justice. Didn't
- 13 the district court discuss different safe ways --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- of reducing the
- 16 population --
- 17 MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- and said we're not
- 19 imposing them because we want the State to do -- to
- 20 choose among them?
- 21 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: As I've looked at the
- 23 State's final plan, I thought that they had in fact not
- 24 only accepted all of the recommendations, but they added
- 25 a couple of additional remedies that the court had not

- 1 suggested.
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Is it a fair statement
- 4 that the district -- that the three-judge panel was
- 5 saying, if you do these things -- that's their
- 6 finding -- you can do it without affecting public
- 7 safety? Wasn't that what they were saying?
- 8 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor. If I didn't
- 9 make that clear, I meant to.
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but I thought
- 11 the --
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The second and more
- important question is going back to something that
- 14 Justice Scalia asked you, which was: You made the
- 15 statement that no one was stopped from proffering
- 16 evidence about prison conditions --
- 17 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- up till 2 months
- 19 before the trial. So what evidence was excluded?
- MR. SPECTER: Nothing. Nothing.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What point is the other
- 22 side making that they were excluded from making?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, as we said in our
- 24 briefs, Your Honor, there was no evidence that was
- 25 excluded, and, in fact, the State's witnesses testified

- 1 about conditions, some of the conditions current as of
- 2 the day of the -- of the testimony. So it was very
- 3 current, and nothing was excluded. That way, even if
- 4 the court made a ruling which was error, which we don't
- 5 believe it was, there was absolutely no prejudice.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: What is -- what is the
- 7 number? I mean, I -- I was puzzled by the same thing
- 8 that Justice Sotomayor was. I read, on page 253 of the
- 9 appendix, a conclusion where the district court said it
- 10 is our conclusion that they can reduce this by how many
- 11 people? What is it -- 30,000? It's a lot.
- MR. SPECTER: Thirty-five thousand.
- 13 JUSTICE BREYER: Thirty-five thousand. That
- 14 this could be done safely.
- MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Preceding page, whatever
- 17 that was -- I have it -- it was 253.
- 18 MR. SPECTER: Right.
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: There are about six pages
- 20 where they summarize evidence from all kinds of
- 21 criminologists that say, for example, there are 17,000
- 22 technical parole violators that are being sent to prison
- 23 who haven't committed additional crimes, and they could
- 24 perhaps be released from some of the time that they're
- 25 spending in prison. Then they go on to this good time,

- 1 which would, I guess, lead to people who are 50 years
- 2 old or 60 years old who have been in prison for 40 years
- 3 would be released at age 55 instead of age 75. I guess
- 4 there's some category there.
- 5 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: Then they had several other
- 7 things. Okay. Now, what are some facts about that?
- 8 MR. SPECTER: There was also -- and there
- 9 was also testimony that the Department of Corrections
- 10 was using a risk assessment instrument to identify the
- 11 low-risk prisoners. So --
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Isn't it true that one of
- 13 the main programs that they were -- that was cited as
- 14 providing a safeguard is evidence-based rehabilitation
- 15 programs?
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor. All the --
- 17 all the witnesses from the State, the intervenors, the
- 18 local witnesses, our experts -- they all found that
- 19 those would help reduce crime and that they would be
- 20 most effective if used in the community, but they would
- 21 be effective also if they were implemented --
- 22 JUSTICE ALITO: What's the general record of
- 23 the success of rehabilitation efforts?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, different -- you can't
- 25 say generally because different programs have different

- 1 records. But do we --
- 2 JUSTICE ALITO: What did Congress think when
- 3 it enacted the -- the Sentencing Reform Act?
- 4 MR. SPECTER: I don't know, Your Honor.
- 5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I have this question, and
- 6 this goes just to remedy.
- 7 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I recognize the district
- 9 court has to be given considerable discretion.
- 10 It shows the 137.5 figure because it's
- 11 halfway between 145 and 130.
- 12 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: I think that certainly the
- 14 Prison Litigation Reform Act means that you have to, if
- 15 you -- if there's going to be a release order, it must
- 16 be releasing the minimum amount --
- 17 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- that will effect the
- 19 purposes of the remedy order. There was substantial
- 20 expert opinion that 145 -- 145 percent would be
- 21 sufficient. Isn't -- doesn't the evidence indicate to
- 22 you that at least 145 ought to be the beginning point,
- 23 not 137.5?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, I -- I --
- 25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: That there was no -- and I

- 1 understand --
- 2 MR. SPECTER: May I make this --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: There were more -- correct
- 4 me if I'm wrong -- there were more experts that
- 5 testified that 145 would work than there were that 130
- 6 was necessary.
- 7 MR. SPECTER: No, I -- I respectfully
- 8 disagree with the record, Your Honor. The 145 figure
- 9 came from a report by the former governor, Deukmejian,
- 10 and a group that he organized, and they said that they
- 11 could operate a crowded system at 145 percent of
- 12 capacity. And that figure was high, the district court
- 13 found, because it didn't take into account health care
- 14 needs.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: And --
- 16 MR. SPECTER: It didn't take into account
- 17 health care needs, which is the issue here. And our
- 18 experts testified that, because it didn't take into
- 19 account health care needs, 130 percent was the -- was
- 20 the better number. It's the number that the strike team
- 21 had thought of, the -- the administration's own strike
- 22 team. It is the number that these professional experts
- 23 believed would be sufficient to remedy the population.
- 24 And back to my answer to Justice Alito's
- 25 question is the health care facilities themselves were

- 1 built to provide services to only 100 percent of --
- 2 health care services to only 100 percent of the
- 3 prisoners. So --
- 4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But the experts --
- 5 MR. SPECTER: -- 137 --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The experts that -- who
- 7 were testifying were quite aware of the fact that
- 8 overcrowding related to the constitutional violations.
- 9 That was their whole theory.
- 10 MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And any number of them
- 12 suggested that 145 would be sufficient.
- MR. SPECTER: I think there might have been
- only one; one expert suggested 145. Most of -- I think
- 15 most -- the majority of the experts suggested 130. The
- 16 court found -- and it has not been challenged here as
- 17 clearly erroneous -- that the weight of the evidence
- 18 went to 130. They wanted to do what you're saying,
- 19 which was minimize the intrusion, maximize the
- 20 population. So to -- even though they -- the court had
- 21 ample basis to issue an order saying it should be 130,
- 22 they said in an abundance of caution and to give -- to
- 23 give the State the benefit of the doubt and to make
- 24 sure, we're going to bump it up an extra 7.5 percent.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: I see no evidence in the

- 1 record that the State -- that the -- pardon me -- that
- 2 your clients said that 145 wouldn't work.
- 3 MR. SPECTER: I think --
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Maybe you can
- 5 answer.
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Did the expert who
- 7 qave --
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Maybe you can
- 9 answer, counsel, please.
- 10 MR. SPECTER: Thank you. My recollection of
- 11 the testimony was that our experts said it had to be --
- 12 get down to 130 in order for the other remedies to be
- 13 effective, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The expert who gave the
- 15 145?
- MR. SPECTER: Pardon me.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The expert who gave the
- 18 145 --
- MR. SPECTER: There was no expert -- well,
- 20 there was one expert who said maybe in the best of
- 21 circumstances it could get to 145. All the others
- 22 talked about 130 percent.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Let's go to the one who
- 24 has used the 145 figure.
- MR. SPECTER: He was a psychologist, Your

- 1 Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: He was a what?
- MR. SPECTER: He was -- he was a
- 4 psychologist who has expertise in prison health care.
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And did he say that at
- 6 145 you could deliver health care safely?
- 7 MR. SPECTER: He was equivocal on that
- 8 point. He thought -- he said that at the outer reaches
- 9 it might be true.
- 10 But I want to emphasize that the district
- 11 court has allowed the State to come back in at any time
- 12 to modify its order and to modify this percentage point
- if the circumstances changed. So, since the --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Specter, there --
- 15 there has been at least two significant changes. One is
- 16 the good time credit. The California legislature did
- 17 pass the law that upped the good time credits and also
- 18 addressing the probationers and the parolees --
- 19 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- and the technical
- 21 violators to divert them from the system. Do you have
- 22 any information about what effect that legislation that
- was passed January?
- MR. SPECTER: It was passed, I think, last
- 25 year. I think it went into effect in July of last year,

- 1 I believe, if that's what -- what you're referring to.
- 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So, do we -- do we know
- 3 at all what effect it has had?
- 4 MR. SPECTER: It has had a marginal effect
- 5 on reducing the population. There have been no reports
- 6 that it has led to an increase in crime.
- 7 But to get back to my earlier point and your
- 8 point, Justice Kennedy, about the -- the remedy and that
- 9 it should be the least intrusive possible. This order
- 10 is set to take effect over a 2-year period, and during
- 11 that 2-year period, if Mr. Phillips is correct that the
- 12 conditions are constitutional and that they can deliver
- 13 services at 145 percent, then the State is free to come
- in and make a motion to -- to bring those changed
- 15 circumstances to the court. And, if anything, this
- 16 court has been incredibly sensitive to the -- to the
- 17 needs and desires of the State, and it -- it was
- 18 extremely reluctant to enter this order in the first
- 19 place, and it would -- and it would bend over backwards
- 20 to give the State discretion while attempting to --
- 21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I -- I don't see a finding
- 22 by the three-judge court that 145, is it, would not be
- 23 an efficacious remedy. I know that it --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I know that it would for

- 1 137.
- 2 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor. I don't
- 3 think -- I don't think it's explicitly said 145, but I
- 4 think it discussed the 145 figure in the context of the
- 5 -- of the fact that it didn't provide for health care
- 6 services. So it discounted that a little bit and went
- 7 down about 7 percent. But it came close to that figure,
- 8 I believe.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Can I ask you a
- 10 hypothetical question that I know is not your case? But
- 11 let's say you had the district court entering an order
- 12 saying you have to bring it down to 137.5 in 2 years.
- 13 That will, as a practical matter, result in the release
- 14 of 40,000 prisoners. The State comes back and makes a
- 15 showing supported by experts saying, look, if you give
- 16 us 4 years, we can reach the figure without releasing
- 17 any prisoners.
- 18 Do you think it would violate the Prison
- 19 Litigation Reform Act for the district court to say:
- 20 No, I want this done in 2 years, not 4 years, and we'll
- 21 just have to deal with the fact there are going to be
- 22 40,000 prisoners out on the streets.
- 23 MR. SPECTER: Well, the Prison Litigation
- 24 Reform Act requires the court to give substantial weight
- 25 to --

Official

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS:	Right.
--------------------------	--------

- 2 MR. SPECTER: -- the public safety
- 3 implications of its decision. So, under those
- 4 circumstances, it's -- under those hypothetical
- 5 circumstances, there's always the possibility that, in
- 6 those cases, the degree of public safety problems might
- 7 outweigh the harm.
- 8 That -- as you said, that's not this case.
- 9 They found that we could do it. And they -- the
- 10 three-judge panel found that the State could reduce the
- 11 population safely. And there was no suggestion in -- in
- 12 the record that this 2- or 4-year period would make that
- 13 much of a difference.
- 14 You have to put the 40,000 or 35,000 figure
- in context. California releases 120,000 prisoners every
- 16 year on parole. That's a lot of prisoners. And the
- 17 findings of the district courts are, even when
- 18 California increases the number of parolees in the
- 19 communities, that doesn't increase the crime rate.
- JUSTICE ALITO: What's the recidivism --
- 21 what is the recidivism rate for those parolees?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, it depends on the risk
- 23 of the parolees. The high-risk ones --
- JUSTICE ALITO: In general, what is the
- 25 recidivism rate?

Official

- 1 MR. SPECTER: Well, overall, the risk is
- 2 around 70 percent, but if you -- for low-risk prisoners,
- 3 the risk is 17 percent who re-violate, and --
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry. I
- 5 couldn't -- what was the first --
- 6 MR. SPECTER: The first number, when you
- 7 take all parolees, all together, it's 70 percent.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Seven-zero?
- 9 MR. SPECTER: Seven-zero, because -- within
- 10 3 years. That's what -- the situation we have now, and
- 11 that's the situation that the governor, the secretary,
- 12 the court described as a failure. With parole reform,
- 13 you could reduce that number in many ways, and the court
- 14 described how you could do that. But for the low-risk
- 15 prisoners --
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: But for the -- for the
- 17 low-risk prisoners, it's 17 percent?
- 18 MR. SPECTER: Seventeen percent, and
- 19 California has a risk-assessment instrument which the
- 20 court found could be used to make sure that what
- 21 happened in Philadelphia doesn't happen again. If I
- 22 understand it --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I understood that of
- 24 the low-risk -- if only the low-risk people are
- 25 released, around 3,000 of them are going to commit

- 1 another crime.
- 2 MR. SPECTER: They -- but they don't have to
- 3 be released. First, I want to make sure I emphasize the
- 4 point that this is a crowding-reduction measure. You
- 5 don't have to release 35,000 prisoners.
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: They -- they don't have to
- 7 be released if you can build enough cells --
- 8 MR. SPECTER: Or you can divert, or you can
- 9 improve the parole system so that parole violators don't
- 10 commit so many crimes, if you offer rehabilitation
- 11 alternatives, if you provide a number of -- diversion
- 12 into the community. There are a number of other options
- 13 short of releasing prisoners.
- 14 And the 70 percent figure includes the --
- JUSTICE ALITO: The 17 percent figure -- and
- 16 the 17 percent figure goes to exactly my concern. This
- 17 is going to have -- it seems likely this is going to
- 18 have an effect on public safety. And the experts can
- 19 testify to whatever they want, but you know what? If
- 20 this order goes into effect, we will see.
- MR. SPECTER: But the --
- JUSTICE ALITO: We will see, and the people
- 23 of California will see: Are there more crimes or are
- 24 there not?
- 25 MR. SPECTER: Well, based on the experience

- in other jurisdictions, the court found we wouldn't.
- 2 And I want to just -- I want to clarify one
- 3 point, Your Honor: The 70 percent figure includes --
- 4 doesn't always include crimes. It includes lots of
- 5 technical parole violators, people who have missed their
- 6 appointments, for example. So it's not as grave as some
- 7 of the figures that are -- been thrown by the -- by the
- 8 other side.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there any likelihood --
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is -- is there any other
- 11 case where the prison reduction has been done under the
- 12 PLRA, or is this the first -- the first one?
- MR. SPECTER: It's the first one to reach
- 14 this Court, obviously. There have been a few others
- 15 that have been resolved by consent, as I understand it,
- 16 or not appealed, but just a few.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there any evidence on --
- 18 I -- I see their suggestions that the technical parole
- 19 violators go elsewhere --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: -- that the elderly and
- 22 infirm prisoners --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- some of them be
- 25 released.

- 1 MR. SPECTER: Right.
- 2 JUSTICE BREYER: The good time credits for
- 3 older people would have effect, be increased, and also,
- 4 halfway houses and other kinds of prison facilities
- 5 which used to be called less -- less physically
- 6 restrictive punishments, or taking the money you save
- 7 and building new prisons. Okay, that seems to be the
- 8 gamut.
- 9 Is there any evidence, statistically or
- 10 otherwise -- because it used to be that States did rely
- on halfway houses, that relied upon -- they relied upon
- 12 certain camps -- prison camps --
- 13 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: -- for example, and some of
- 15 them were pretty tough. And there were a whole range of
- 16 what used to be called intermediate punishments.
- 17 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 18 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Is there any
- 19 statistical evidence on the part -- on the point that is
- 20 -- that Justice Alito raised --
- 21 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor, there's --
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- as to whether these did
- 23 or did not result in higher crime rates?
- MR. SPECTER: Well, the evidence was, and
- 25 the court found -- and, again, it's not clear error --

- 1 that these programs were not -- were more effective than
- 2 prison in reducing recidivism, and they were less
- 3 expensive. And -- and that's part of the reason why the
- 4 three-judge panel concluded that a reduction in the
- 5 prison population wouldn't increase crime.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, one of the
- 7 thing that concerns me about this type of institutional
- 8 reform litigation --
- 9 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- is that the State
- is responsible for a lot of different things.
- 12 MR. SPECTER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And what happens
- 14 when you have this case, another district court ordering
- 15 the State to take action with respect to environmental
- 16 damage, another court saying, well, you've got to spend
- 17 this much more on education for disabled, another court
- 18 saying you've got to spend this much more on something
- 19 else? How does the State sort out its obligations?
- 20 Does it say --
- 21 MR. SPECTER: We would prefer --
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- well, I'll spend
- 23 more money to build prisons, but I'll violate this other
- 24 district court order saying I have to spend more money
- 25 to build water treatment plants?

- 1 MR. SPECTER: Well, Your Honor, in this
- 2 particular case --
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I know you like your
- 4 particular case --
- 5 (Laughter.)
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- and you want the
- 7 State to say this is where I'm going to put my money.
- 8 MR. SPECTER: No, we're not --
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But the point is
- 10 it's a budget prioritization that the State has to go
- 11 through --
- 12 MR. SPECTER: Right.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- every day, and
- 14 now it's being transferred from the State legislature to
- 15 Federal district courts throughout the State.
- 16 MR. SPECTER: Well, I believe the Federal
- 17 courts have an obligation to enforce the Constitution
- 18 and the laws of the United States.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, no. I believe
- that as well, counsel.
- 21 (Laughter.)
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What I'm saying is
- 23 that you have conflicting orders from different district
- 24 courts telling them you've got to comply with the
- 25 Constitution by spending 8 billion here; and another

- 1 court saying, I've got another constitutional problem of
- 2 my own, and you've got to spend 8 billion over there.
- 3 What is the State supposed to do in that situation?
- 4 MR. SPECTER: Well, my simple answer to your
- 5 question, Your Honor -- and I don't mean to be
- 6 flippant -- but they're -- they have an obligation to
- 7 follow the Federal law, constitutional law and other
- 8 laws. And if they're not, then the Federal court has an
- 9 obligation to impose a remedy.
- 10 In this particular case, the State has a
- 11 choice. It can either incarcerate 140,000 prisoners in
- 12 a system built for 80,000, or it can incarcerate a -- a
- 13 lesser number. If it chooses to incarcerate 148,000
- 14 prisoners in a space built for 80, it's going to incur
- 15 certain obligations. And we believe, as I said in
- 16 answer to Justice Breyer's question, the State could
- 17 choose to use less restrictive punishments, alternative
- 18 punishments, get a better bang for their buck, have more
- 19 public safety.
- But that's -- if we -- if the court imposed
- 21 that kind of a rule, then the State would be here saying
- 22 it's -- it's violating comity provisions and making
- 23 policy choices for the State which it shouldn't. I
- 24 believe in this case, the court gave the State the
- 25 maximum degree of flexibility to make all the policy

- 1 choices surrounding -- surrounding the incarceration of
- 2 these prisoners. You just -- the Constitution prevents
- 3 the State from incarcerating somebody and then not
- 4 providing them the basic medical care they need to
- 5 escape from the prison and not die before their sentence
- 6 is out. And that's what we have here.
- 7 Thank you.
- 8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If you take the State's
- 9 concession that it can meet a goal in 5 years and the
- 10 Federal court order is 2 years, we're talking about 3
- 11 years. Is there any indication of how fast the State's
- 12 remedy would click in? Are we talking maybe about a
- 13 5 percent differential for the last 3 years, or --
- MR. SPECTER: Well, there are a lot of
- 15 things the State can do quickly. For instance, it can
- 16 reform its parole system; it cannot re-incarcerate
- 17 technical parole violators. It can --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: No, no. I'm saying,
- 19 assuming --
- MR. SPECTER: Yes.
- 21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Compare what the State
- 22 concedes that it will do with what the court has ordered
- 23 it to do.
- MR. SPECTER: The State -- well, I just want
- 25 to remind you that the governor proposed to the

- 1 legislature that he reduce the prison population; he
- 2 said it could be done safely by the same amount, roughly
- 3 37,000 prisoners, in 2 years. So what the court found
- 4 was basically what the governor had believed was safe.
- 5 The 5-year -- the 5-year period is longer,
- 6 and the 5-year period is longer because it takes time to
- 7 construct the facilities that the -- that the State
- 8 wants to construct. I believe that's the major
- 9 difference between the two remedies. But the other
- 10 methods -- the good time credits, parole reform,
- 11 diversion -- those can be implemented very quickly, and
- 12 those substantial reductions can be accomplished safely
- 13 in that amount of time.
- 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So should the court have
- 15 said 2 years for everything but construction? Wouldn't
- 16 that have been a more narrowly tailored remedy?
- 17 MR. SPECTER: Well, the State --
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Except that they --
- MR. SPECTER: Well, I was --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- there was going to be
- 21 no construction adequate, because there was no money.
- 22 MR. SPECTER: Right. And the State has --
- 23 has not really put up the money to construct those new
- 24 prisons. This case has been ongoing since 2006, and
- 25 they've hardly constructed anything. Even if it was a

- 1 more narrow remedy, the court found that construction
- 2 wouldn't be a viable alternative.
- 3 My time is up.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 5 Mr. Phillips, you have 3 minutes left.
- 6 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF CARTER G. PHILLIPS
- 7 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS
- 8 MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 9 Just a few points. First of all, with
- 10 respect to the state of the record and what was
- 11 proffered and what was not proffered, if you look at the
- 12 joint appendix at 2085, there's a specific proffer that
- 13 is made by the intervenors in that context -- or I
- 14 mean -- I'm sorry. There's a specific proffer made by
- 15 the State of the --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. What page
- 17 was that?
- MR. PHILLIPS: 2085. That's volume 6 of the
- 19 -- and it is at that point where the plaintiffs, the
- 20 intervening plaintiffs say we'd like to put on evidence
- 21 of constitutional violations. And Judge Karlton says:
- 22 Twice this court has said we will not receive that
- 23 evidence. You've made a clear -- as clear a record as
- 24 you can; please don't waste our time.
- 25 And then later, at 2338, which is again in

- 1 volume 6, where we enter Mr. Dezember, who is the
- 2 assistant secretary of CDCR in charge of health care, he
- 3 specifically said -- I've read the -- I've read the
- 4 Dezember declaration, and it will not be received to the
- 5 extent that it says the State is in compliance.
- 6 So we've made our efforts --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry --
- 8 MR. PHILLIPS: -- and we were rebuffed.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I don't know what the
- 10 declaration said. Is the actual declaration in the
- 11 record somewhere?
- 12 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, I believe the actual
- 13 declaration is in the record, Justice Sotomayor.
- 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Phillips, sorry, but on
- 16 a -- on a different subject. Does the State stand by
- 17 its representation that it can do this without any
- 18 public safety impact in 5 years?
- MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. I mean, we made that
- 20 submission to the court, and we -- we believe that we
- 21 could comply with it. That said --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: That remains true --
- MR. PHILLIPS: We --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: -- notwithstanding budget --
- MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it's --

- JUSTICE KAGAN: -- economic differences,
- budget differences?
- 3 MR. PHILLIPS: Look, I mean, the plaintiffs'
- 4 counsel talks about all of the things that you can do,
- 5 and if you -- if you look at 70a of the -- the
- 6 jurisdictional statement appendix, it specifically says
- 7 there's a line; above the line we can implement, and
- 8 that will get you about 16,000 inmates, and below the
- 9 line you need legislation in order to implement these
- 10 things. But the reality is that anytime you say you're
- 11 going to release 30,000 inmates in a very compressed
- 12 period of time, I guarantee you that there's going to be
- 13 more crime and people are going to die on the streets of
- 14 California. I mean that -- there's no way out of that
- 15 particular box.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But if there were 5 years,
- 17 you think you could do it without any public safety
- 18 impact in the way that you told the court you could?
- 19 MR. PHILLIPS: I think so, but I'm still
- 20 concerned, because the district court in this specific
- 21 says -- said: We have not evaluated the -- the safety
- 22 impact of each of the State's -- of the elements of the
- 23 State's proposed plan.
- And it seems to me they had an obligation to
- 25 do that.

- 1 The other point I want to make with respect
- 2 to Justice Kennedy's question is that there is not a
- 3 shred of evidence that 137.5 makes any sense whatsoever.
- 4 That is a pulled-out-of-the-air number. Theirs was
- 5 aspirational. None of that is based on what is the
- 6 constitutional violation that exists at the time you
- 7 adopt that particular percentage.
- 8 And it seems to me that's the entire problem
- 9 with this -- this exercise, which is to say we're going
- 10 to fix this across the board, rather than what would
- 11 make much more sense, which is to evaluate these matters
- 12 facility by facility, to evaluate these matters on the
- 13 basis of the various elements discrete elements of how
- 14 you can reduce the prison population, and to do it in --
- in conjunction with a receiver who is in place who can
- 16 help to implement this in a very systemic way and that
- 17 will get us to where we want to get to.
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why didn't you give
- 19 the court that as your plan? The court gave you
- 20 absolute discretion to implement the plan that you
- 21 wanted; it said we don't want to do facility by
- 22 facility, because we want you to figure out where you
- 23 need to implement.
- So, your plan didn't do that; why? Either
- in your 5-year plan or in your 2-year plan.

Official

Τ	MR. PHILLIPS: Because the district court's
2	order said you're going to have to reach 137.5 percent
3	in 2 years, period. That's the categorical rule. And
4	the first time we went in to suggest something above
5	137.5, Judge Henderson said: I'm not hearing that.
6	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
7	Mr. Phillips, Mr. Specter.
8	The case is submitted.
9	(Whereupon, at 12:31 p.m., the case in the
10	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
11	
12	
13	
14	· ·
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

A	administration's	amounts 38:3,14	argue 54:25	36:25 47:18 56:13
able 19:23 46:25	60:21	46:22	argued 40:8	60:24 63:11 64:7
47:1,2,5,19	admits 27:17	ample 61:21	argument 1:13 2:2,5	65:14
above-entitled 1:12	admitted 41:14	analysis 31:3 34:4	2:8 3:3,7 6:18 37:5	backwards 64:19
80:10	adopt 79:7	analyze 31:6 51:22	40:21 41:13 76:6	bad 21:23
absence 37:15	adult 41:4	analyzed 19:22	armed48:5	balancing 14:23
absolute 79:20	adversary's 37:22	45:16,17	ARNOLD 1:3	bang 73:18
absolutely 4:8 15:6	adverse 49:4,15,21	angry 14:14	asked 11:9 29:18	based 34:4 41:22
17:21 26:18 57:5	52:17	annoyed 36:1	56:14	45:18 46:11 48:8,8
abundance 61:22	affidavit 24:15	answer 11:7,7 14:1	asking 8:22 30:4	68:25 79:5
accept 19:1,3	affirm 12:8 25:14	20:19,21 21:2	31:1	basic 14:1 74:4
accepted 55:24	age 58:3,3	32:24 45:11 51:9	asks 29:1	basically 5:20 75:4
access 34:21	ago 6:13	60:24 62:5,9 73:4	aspirational 79:5	basis 50:3 61:21
accommodate 22:18	agree 16:19,20 41:6	73:16	assaults 48:5	79:13
accomplish 26:14	agreed 18:21	anymore 31:21	assessment 33:19	beginning 30:6,12
accomplished 75:12	ahead 3:24 5:23	anytime 78:10	58:10	59:22
accorded 5:1	23:13	anyway 19:3	assistant 77:2	behalf 1:16,18 2:4,7
account 14:24 60:13	aim 46:7	appealed 69:16	assume 36:18	2:10 3:8 37:6 76:7
60:16,19	aimed 19:6	APPEARANCES	assuming 74:19	belief 29:9
accurately 9:17 39:1	AL 1:4,7	1:15	assumption 29:9	believe 17:7 47:18
achieving 21:14	Alito 12:10,12 23:17	Appellants 1:17 2:4	attempt 40:24	57:5 64:1 65:8
acknowledges	23:22,23 24:1,10	2:10 3:8 76:7	attempting 64:20	72:16,19 73:15,24
16:10	24:13 25:16 42:1	Appellees 1:19 2:7	attend 42:13 43:15	75:8 77:12,20
act 19:9 21:5 33:4	42:11 43:2,7,10,12	37:6	attention 21:19	believed 60:23 75:4
36:1 49:3 51:13	44:7 45:4,23 46:3	Appellee's 45:12	attentiveness 18:2	believer 24:7
59:3,14 65:19,24	46:7,10 47:9,16,23	appendix 38:6 45:12	attitude 33:16	believes 9:25 46:11
action 71:15	58:12,22 59:2	57:9 76:12 78:6	August 8:6 12:15	bend 64:19
actions 12:17,17	66:20,24 67:16,23	appointed 4:20 7:22	16:4 19:21 31:14	beneficial 35:18
actual 43:1 77:10,12	68:6,15,22 70:20	16:24 30:19 33:12	39:9,18 40:11	benefit 61:23
add 5:16	Alito's 60:24	appointment 6:22	authority 18:8 34:19	Berkeley 1:18
added 55:24	allow5:3 22:20 53:9		available 42:13,15	best 9:12 14:25 15:2
additional 13:24	allowed 23:23,25	approach 9:8	43:14,20	15:16 31:4 52:1
29:18 34:24 55:25	63:11	approaching 8:15	average 15:24 16:1	62:20
57:23	allowing 32:5	appropriate 3:21	37:14	better 11:19 24:11
address 24:2 30:9	alternative 5:9	24:17 28:1 31:11	avoid 15:9,11	45:10 54:12 60:20
37:22 44:15 45:5	73:17 76:2	36:3	aware 39:22 61:7	73:18
45:25 46:5	alternatives 68:11	appropriateness	A.B 6:24 12:17,18	beyond 31:2,21
addressing 46:8	altogether 44:15	36:8	a.m 1:14 3:2	big 9:16,16,23 20:7
47:10 63:18	Amendment 26:17	approvals 28:14,15		26:13 27:10
adequacy 37:24	36:11	approve 10:16,17	B	biggest 26:16
adequate 15:3,14	amicus 24:2,7,14	10:18	back 6:5 8:16 9:2,4	billion 8:8 10:4
55:3 75:21	25:25 47:24	approved 10:10,15	11:25 13:19 14:3	11:10,12 20:20
adhering 31:12	amount 33:14 41:10	10:24 29:22	17:22 18:5 28:3	27:3 28:11 29:5,14
administered 8:15	59:16 75:2,13	arbitrarily 31:14	33:10 34:3 35:19	33:14 72:25 73:2
aummswituo.13	321-31-4,20	,		
			-	

bit 23:18 65:6	3:15 14:25 15:3,6	31:3,8	18:3 19:3 29:25	commonly 50:13
blank 52:25	17:24 18:8 23:8	caused 37:10 38:8	34:6,10 36:21	communities 66:19
blocked35:13	27:7 28:20 47:11	caution 61:22	62:21 63:13 64:15	community 58:20
board 79:10	47:24 48:6 50:25	CDCR 34:14 77:2	66:4,5	68:12
box 78:15	63:16 66:15,18	cell 44:1	cited 58:13	Compare 74:21
Breyer 9:12,22 10:7	67:19 68:23 78:14	cells 37:11 43:4,13	citizen 47:11	complained 24:18
10:9,12,16,19,23	called 26:11 70:5,16	43:18 45:5 68:7	claim 8:23 21:13	complete 36:15
11:1,6,17 12:3,5	camps 70:12,12	cert 52:3	claimed 21:14	completely 26:19
20:6,23 26:22	candidly 22:21 25:3	certain 25:15 70:12	clarified 25:15	compliance 17:9
27:16,19 57:6,13	cap 19:4	73:15	clarify 69:2	30:23 33:18,20
57:16,19 58:6 69:9	capacity 8:25 42:9	certainly 9:25 11:19	class 4:20,22 19:7	77:5
69:17,21,24 70:2	42:21,22 43:5	25:24 26:4 59:13	19:10,12,12 44:9	comply 17:8 21:7
70:14,18,22	44:25 45:1 60:12	cetera 17:17	clear 12:8 33:4	46:1 52:13 72:24
Breyer's 73:16	captured 39:2	challenged 61:16	35:21 52:23 56:9	77:21
brief 9:14 12:7	care 8:9,14,19 9:24	change 4:10 7:24	70:25 76:23,23	comprehensive 28:5
20:10 24:2,14,20	10:1,3 11:22 15:4	9:4 13:7	clearly 24:11 36:1	30:23
24:22 25:8,9,25	15:13 18:2 33:14	changed 8:18 63:13	52:24 53:7 54:25	compressed 78:11
28:11 40:23 45:12	34:14,15,21 42:4	64:14	61:17	compromise 11:21
47:24	43:14,23 44:2,12	changes 8:13 35:18	click 74:12	concede 32:18
briefing 40:9,21	47:7,13 55:3 60:13	63:15	clients 62:2	conceded 32:13,14
briefs 5:8 24:7 26:24	60:17,19,25 61:2	characterization 6:9	clinics 7:10 18:17	concedes 74:22
31:18 56:24	63:4,6 65:5 74:4	charge 77:2	19:12	concern 68:16
bring 17:9 19:23	77:2	check 29:1	close 7:4 20:24 40:2	concerned 47:12
30:23 32:9 33:16	cars 21:23	Chief 3:3,9 32:23	65:7	78:20
64:14 65:12	CARTER 1:16 2:3	37:1,3,4,7 40:13	closed 40:7,16	concerns 71:7
broken 6:25	2:9 3:7 76:6	40:19 41:1 49:1,7	closest 30:12	concession 74:9
broom 19:14	case 3:4,16 4:1,7,16	49:11,13,17,24	closet 19:14	conclude 27:24 34:2
buck 73:18	4:16 7:7,17 8:18	50:7,18 51:3,6,8	club 24:24	concluded 71:4
budget 29:16 72:10	9:6,18 12:9,16	51:11,16 52:6,9,12	Coleman 4:22 33:25	concludes 28:1
77:24 78:2	16:4 18:19,20	52:20 55:6,8,12	34:3 45:12,13,14	conclusion 5:15
build 45:4 68:7	21:13,20 22:23	56:10 62:4,8 65:9	collateral 47:10	11:21 26:4,8 48:11
71:23,25	25:5,23 30:6 32:21	66:1 67:4,8 71:6	come 3:19 9:4 13:19	48:23,24 57:9,10
building 10:4 70:7	40:8,25 43:21	71:10,13,22 72:3,6	14:3 20:23 28:10	conclusions 40:23
buildings 10:5	46:20,21 65:10	72:9,13,19,22 76:4	28:10 39:4 47:18	concrete 6:1,18
built 29:22 43:22,23	66:8 69:11 71:14	76:8 80:6	49:8 63:11 64:13	conditions 20:16
53:17 61:1 73:12	72:2,4 73:10,24	Chino 50:24,24	comes 65:14	38:15,16,19 39:11
73:14	75:24 80:8,9	choice 73:11	coming 35:24	39:22 45:20 56:16
bump 61:24	cases 3:5 30:5,12	choices 73:23 74:1	comity 52:1 73:22	57:1,1 64:12
burden 32:18,20	33:22 54:21 66:6	choose 53:9 55:20	commission 26:7	conduct 26:19
33:6	categorical 80:3	73:17	commit 67:25 68:10	confer 18:7
	category 58:4	chooses 44:24 73:13	committed 17:21	conferred 5:4
C	cause 7:18,19 9:16	circumstance 31:13	57:23	conflicting 72:23
C 2:1 3:1	9:23 16:14 17:23	circumstances 4:24	committee 29:16	confusing 31:18
California 1:4,18	21:21 22:10 30:9	8:14,17 9:4 17:20	committing 37:13	Congress 9:7 20:3
		,		

	i	1	1	
22:1,16 59:2	context 9:9 24:23,25	38:6 39:6 40:5,5,7	culture 7:20,24	deliberate 26:18
conjunction 79:15	25:13,17 65:4	40:7,9 42:20 44:4	cure 5:17 11:2 18:22	deliver 15:3,13 63:6
connection 42:2	66:15 76:13	44:20 45:13,14,16	18:24 27:2,9,13	64:12
43:16	continue 38:9	45:16 46:10,19	current 11:21,22	density 11:23
connections 4:21	contrary 41:23	48:7 49:2,4,19	12:6 37:17 38:19	Department 18:9,10
consent 7:23 69:15	46:10	50:12,19 51:12,23	38:20,20,24 39:11	22:19 48:14 58:9
consequences 47:11	contributed 47:20	51:24,24 52:25	53:2,2 57:1,3	dependent 28:14
consider 39:7,7	controlling 34:13	53:5,11 54:13	currently 3:14 33:13	depends 4:15 21:16
considerable 59:9	convene 28:1	55:13,25 57:4,9	cut 16:4 31:14 40:15	27:14 66:22
considered 41:18,19	convened 4:23	59:9 60:12 61:16	cutoff 32:3 39:17	describe 38:7
considering 41:20	27:25	61:20 63:11 64:15		described9:18
consistent 22:9	convenes 30:21	64:16,22 65:11,19	D	25:16 67:12,14
25:24,25	cooperation 23:7	65:24 67:12,13,20	D 3:1	description 9:19
consistently 19:22	coordinates 23:6	69:1,14 70:25	damage 71:16	design 8:25,25 19:4
34:18	core 13:25	71:14,16,17,24	date 31:22 37:17	42:8,22 43:5
consists 24:14	correct 4:3 23:20	73:1,8,20,24 74:10	39:17	desires 64:17
Constitution 17:10	31:2 38:13 42:10	74:22 75:3,14 76:1	day 38:14 57:2	details 6:3
72:17,25 74:2	60:3 64:11	76:22 77:20 78:18	72:13	determinations
constitutional 5:17	corrections 18:9,11	78:20 79:19,19	days 15:12 35:8,8,8	41:22 49:25
7:18,19 10:1 11:3	22:19 48:15 50:17	courts 66:17 72:15	40:10	determine 31:6
11:22 15:4,5 16:9	58:9	72:17,24	dazed 15:12	36:22 50:1 52:1
17:23,25 22:11,25	cost 48:3	court's 13:13 37:20	deal 8:10 19:14 29:5	determined 49:3
26:15 27:2,16,19	counsel 6:12 32:22	52:22 54:5 80:1	65:21`	Deukmejian 60:9
32:14,15,19 33:2	34:22 35:16 37:1	credibility 41:22	dealing 7:12 19:15	develop 17:3
33:17,19 36:17,19	41:24 47:8 53:4,12	credit 63:16	30:15 33:2 54:21	developments 31:15
36:23 38:4 39:5	54:10 55:7 62:9	credits 13:7 41:11	dealt 46:15	31:16
42:3 52:2 54:20	71:6 72:20 76:4	48:17 53:24 54:2,7	death 15:20 54:22	devised 33:13
61:8 64:12 73:1,7	78:4 80:6	63:17 70:2 75:10	deaths 15:10	Dezember 77:1,4
76:21 79:6	couple 55:25	crime 47:21 48:13	December 40:3,8	diagnosis 35:7
constitutionally	course 5:1 6:22 16:6	48:25 58:19 64:6	40:16	die 74:5 78:13
25:21 36:10 52:14	21:20 22:1,20 23:4	66:19 68:1 70:23	decent 8:15,19	difference 17:18
55:3	26:20 53:16 54:12	71:5 78:13	deciding 21:7	26:13 32:5 66:13
constraints 17:17	court 1:1,13 3:10,11	crimes 57:23 68:10	decision 9:1 16:18	75:9
construct 44:24 75:7	3:13,23 4:7,7 5:9	68:23 69:4	40:10 66:3	differences 78:1,2
75:8,23	8:16,22 9:1,8	criminologists 57:21	decisions 34:19	different 28:3 34:5
constructed 75:25	11:15 12:8 13:21	crisis 5:12 37:9	declaration 77:4,10	44:15 55:13 58:24
construction 5:10	14:6 16:8,16 17:3	critical 46:16	77:10,13	58:25,25 71:11
5:12 6:25 7:25 8:3	17:19 21:6,8 23:11	crowded 18:1 43:4	declaring 13:10	72:23 77:16
8:8 10:11 11:20	23:14,20 25:11,14	43:13,19 60:11	decline 41:8	differential 74:13
19:25 28:21 29:10	26:5 27:23,25 28:4	crowding 44:22	declined 41:4,7	difficult 22:13
29:23 34:21 41:15	30:13,21,21 31:1,6	46:15,16,18 47:15	decrease 34:25	direction 23:10
44:12,23 75:15,21	31:11,12,13 33:2	48:12,18 50:14	deferring 31:12	33:16
76:1	34:2 35:6,14,15,20	crowding-reduction	deficiencies 38:8	directly 44:14 45:25
contempt 11:9 14:9	35:21 36:7 37:8	68:4	degree 66:6 73:25	disabled 71:17

1:
disagree 50:5 60:8
disagreement 39:1
disconnect 36:16
42:16
discounted 65:6
discovered 9:24
discovery 31:21,24
35:5 39:15
discrete 45:13,21
79:13
discretion 59:9
64:20 79:20
discuss 55:13
discussed 65:4
discussion 48:1
dispute 41:2
disregard 7:20
distinguished 41:21
district 3:13,22 4:6
4:7 8:16,22 9:1
17:19 18:19 21:8
31:12,13 35:14,15
36:6 40:5 49:2,18
50:19 51:12 55:13
56:4 57:9 59:8
60:12 63:10 65:11
65:19 66:17 71:14
71:24 72:15,23
78:20 80:1
diversion 68:11
75:11
divert 63:21 68:8
doctors 45:10 47:2
doing 18:23
dollars 8:7
DONALD 1:18 2:6
37:5
doors 44:21
double 49:18
double-cell 43:22,24
· ·
doubt 34:1 61:23
doubts 22:23
downward 15:22
dramatically 9:7

dropped 12:15 13:6 due 41:9 duty 22:2 52:13 D.C 1:9,16 E E 2:1 3:1.1

earlier 29:5 64:7 early 4:19 earmarked 28:19 economic 78:1 education 71:17 **effect** 26:2 48:1 59:18 63:22,25 64:3,4,10 68:18,20 70:3 effective 42:25 46:12 58:20,21 62:13 71:1 efficacious 22:4 64:23 **effort** 38:24 53:8 **efforts** 12:25 58:23 77:6 **Eighth** 26:17 36:10 either 21:13,13 25:24 28:3 44:10 73:11 79:24 **elderly** 69:21 elected 41:12 **element** 26:17 elements 78:22 79:13.13 eliminated 26:19 emergency 13:10 emphasize 63:10 68:3 emphatically 49:14 employees 21:24 **enable** 42:23 enacted 6:24 59:3 enactments 50:16 enforce 72:17

enormous 29:24

31:15,16 33:14 **ensure** 52:13 enter 64:18 77:1 entered 33:3 entering 65:11 entertaining 35:22 **entire** 18:8,10 79:8 entirety 8:23 entitled 17:7 environmental 71:15 envisions 22:16 equity 9:9 28:4 33:2 equivalent 11:20 equivocal 63:7 erroneous 52:24 53:7 54:25 61:17 **error** 31:1 57:4 70:25 escape 74:5 **ESQ** 1:16,18 2:3,6,9 essential 7:12 essentially 30:14 et 1:4.7 17:17 etched 29:8 **evaluate** 79:11,12 evaluated 11:15 78:21 eventually 19:20 everybody 18:21 26:25 30:23 everything's 39:4,5 **evidence** 11:1,7,8 20:8 26:21 32:10 34:7,23,24 35:22 36:7 38:3,11,14 39:8 40:2,7,15,18 41:14,17,19,20,21 41:23 46:23 48:20 54:5,6,23 56:16,19 56:24 57:20 59:21 61:17,25 69:17 70:9,19,24 76:20

evidence-based 58:14 exact 36:22 exactly 36:16 39:23 45:7 46:19 68:16 **examine** 21:9 49:19 examined 50:12 example 20:11 48:16 57:21 69:6 70:14 **excluded** 56:19,22 56:25 57:3 excuse 5:7 54:12 exercise 79:9 exist 5:14 38:9 existed 4:19 38:4 39:22 exists 79:6 **expect** 34:18 expectation 28:20 29:9,19 expenditures 12:19 expensive 71:3 experience 68:25 **expert** 22:6 48:8 59:20 61:14 62:6 62:14,17,19,20 expertise 63:4 **experts** 16:15 26:1 26:3,25 39:8,10,21 44:6 46:13 48:9,10 48:10 58:18 60:4 60:18,22 61:4,6,15 62:11 65:15 68:18 expire 37:2 **explain** 24:4 31:17 42:1.17 explains 24:3 explicit 20:3 explicitly 65:3 extended 47:25 **extent** 42:14 77:5 extra 61:24

extraordinarily 3:18

extraordinary 3:12 4:25 5:4 7:2 18:7 extreme 33:7 extremely 64:18

 \mathbf{F} facilities 5:16 7:1,14 19:17 20:14,15 29:25 31:20 37:12 41:4 42:15,25 43:14,19 44:12,12 44:25 60:25 70:4 75:7 **facility** 18:9 29:22 79:12,12,21,22 **fact** 6:10 7:5 22:21 23:2 31:5 32:11 39:7 41:22 45:17 55:23 56:25 61:7 65:5,21 **facts** 30:4,15 46:11 58:7 factual 14:1 fact-finding 30:17 **failure** 23:1 67:12 fair 6:8 9:19 56:3 **fairly** 21:25 familiar 48:2 farther 11:19 **fast** 74:11 **favor** 48:16 **February** 40:9,22 feces 15:12 **Federal** 19:8 21:6 72:15,16 73:7,8 74:10 **federalism** 14:1,19 fewer 7:9,13 19:5 **fighting** 14:12,13,14 **figure** 42:2,6 44:4 59:10 60:8,12

62:24 65:4,7,16

69:3 79:22

66:14 68:14,15,16

76:23 79:3

69:7 frile 25:8,9 friled 24:20,22 frinal 40:1 55:23 fruinalized 30:22 frind 20:7 frinding 45:17 53:1,3 54:5 56:6 64:21 frindings 21:2 42:20 fruindings 21:2 42:20 fruindings 21:2 52:22 54:24 55:1 fruindings 21:2 55:1	rankly 4:17 ree 64:13 riend 38:23,25 41:7 ull 9:11 unction 19:13 undamental 7:17 7:24 9:6 11:14 17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14 utile 36:1	18:5 21:7 23:14,14 26:23 28:3 30:9 31:21 33:7,10 34:3 44:14 57:25 62:23 69:19 72:10 goal 74:9 goes 11:13 13:1 14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	guarantee 78:12 guess 58:1,3 guest 21:24 guidance 23:5 gun 23:11 H halfway 59:11 70:4 70:11	39:15,23 41:18 42:10,19 43:11 44:3 46:9 48:7 49:6,10,12 50:20 53:23 54:18 55:21 56:2,8,17,24 58:5 58:16 59:4,7,12,17 60:8 62:13 63:1,19
file 25:8,9 filed 24:20,22 final 40:1 55:23 finalized 30:22 find 20:7 finding 45:17 53:1,3 54:5 56:6 64:21 findings 21:2 42:20 52:22 54:24 55:1 fired finalized finali	riend 38:23,25 41:7 ull 9:11 unction 19:13 undamental 7:17 7:24 9:6 11:14 17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	31:21 33:7,10 34:3 44:14 57:25 62:23 69:19 72:10 goal 74:9 goes 11:13 13:1 14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	guest 21:24 guidance 23:5 gun 23:11 H halfway 59:11 70:4	44:3 46:9 48:7 49:6,10,12 50:20 53:23 54:18 55:21 56:2,8,17,24 58:5 58:16 59:4,7,12,17 60:8 62:13 63:1,19
filed 24:20,22 final 40:1 55:23 finalized 30:22 find 20:7 finding 45:17 53:1,3 54:5 56:6 64:21 findings 21:2 42:20 52:22 54:24 55:1	ull 9:11 unction 19:13 undamental 7:17 7:24 9:6 11:14 17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	44:14 57:25 62:23 69:19 72:10 goal 74:9 goes 11:13 13:1 14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	guidance 23:5 gun 23:11 H halfway 59:11 70:4	49:6,10,12 50:20 53:23 54:18 55:21 56:2,8,17,24 58:5 58:16 59:4,7,12,17 60:8 62:13 63:1,19
final 40:1 55:23 full full full full full full full ful	unction 19:13 undamental 7:17 7:24 9:6 11:14 17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	69:19 72:10 goal 74:9 goes 11:13 13:1 14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	gun 23:11 H halfway 59:11 70:4	53:23 54:18 55:21 56:2,8,17,24 58:5 58:16 59:4,7,12,17 60:8 62:13 63:1,19
finalized 30:22 find 20:7 finding 45:17 53:1,3 54:5 56:6 64:21 findings 21:2 42:20 52:22 54:24 55:1	undamental 7:17 7:24 9:6 11:14 17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	goal 74:9 goes 11:13 13:1 14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	H halfway 59:11 70:4	56:2,8,17,24 58:5 58:16 59:4,7,12,17 60:8 62:13 63:1,19
find 20:7 finding 45:17 53:1,3 54:5 56:6 64:21 findings 21:2 42:20 52:22 54:24 55:1 fu	7:24 9:6 11:14 17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	goes 11:13 13:1 14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	halfway 59:11 70:4	58:16 59:4,7,12,17 60:8 62:13 63:1,19
finding 45:17 53:1,3 54:5 56:6 64:21 findings 21:2 42:20 52:22 54:24 55:1 f u	17:17 18:2 19:19 30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	14:19 32:6 45:7 59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	-	60:8 62:13 63:1,19
54:5 56:6 64:21 findings 21:2 42:20 52:22 54:24 55:1 fu	30:17,18 31:1 38:7 unded 29:14	59:6 68:16,20 going 3:24 13:12,18	70:11	· ·
findings 21:2 42:20 fu 52:22 54:24 55:1 fu	unded 29:14	going 3:24 13:12,18		65:2 69:3,20,23
52:22 54:24 55:1 f u			hammer 17:18	70:13,17,21 71:9
		13:21,22 15:8,9,11	hand 14:9	71:12 72:1 73:5
66:17		15:12,13,14 18:16	happen 10:8 12:1	hope 11:16 43:21
fine 25:18 39:4	G	18:22,22 23:12,12	26:23 27:9,11,12	hopefully 22:17
finish 12:13	G 1:16 2:3,9 3:1,7	23:13 28:21 29:10	27:22 48:6 53:22	horrendous 9:17,20
finished 29:11	76:6	29:16 30:8 33:7	67:21	20:9 45:20
111500.217.11,15	ambit 11:12	36:16,18,18 39:3	happened35:1	hotel 21:21,23
7.10 11.13 11.3	amut 70:8	44:9 45:5 46:4,18	67:21	houses 70:4,11
15.17 10.15,25	ates 44:21	47:17 48:6 49:14	happens 71:13	housing 43:25
21.0 22.7 20.10	general 42:4 45:19	49:20 53:22 56:13	harm 45:22 66:7	huge 32:4
JU.17,4+ J1.0	58:22 66:24	59:15 61:24 65:21	health 7:14 8:9,19	human 27:10
32:24 44:18 64:18 g	enerally 30:13	67:25 68:17,17	11:22 18:11 20:14	hundreds 8:7
67:5,6 68:3 69:12	32:21 58:25	72:7 73:14 75:20	23:1,7 27:21 33:14	hurt 51:18
07.12,13 /0.7 00.1	etting 11:9	78:11,12,13 79:9	34:21 39:12 43:23	hypothetical 65:10
110001	Ginsburg 4:1,4,5,9	80:2	44:2 60:13,17,19	66:4
11/1 / / 1 / 0	4:10,13 7:5,16 8:2	good 13:7 41:11	60:25 61:2 63:4,6	
flaws 22:22	8:12,20 12:22	48:17 53:24 54:1,7	65:5 77:2	I
flexibility 52:1 53:9	18:13,25 19:10,18	57:25 63:16,17	hear 3:3 25:11	idea 19:4
73.23	24:19 28:8,24 29:2	70:2 75:10	heard 46:13 54:23	identify 58:10
inpparit 15.0	29:4,15 30:1 31:17	gotten 5:12	hearing 80:5	ill 17:25 19:15 43:1
focus 16:17	32:17,25 33:21	governor 1:3 27:20	help 34:19 58:19	43:1
follow 49:17 73:7	54:19 63:14,20	29:20,20 50:13,14	79:16	illness 42:5,14
100011010 20.12,13	64:2 69:10	50:23 60:9 67:11	Henderson 80:5	44:13,14
10100 20.0	Ginsburg's 32:24	74:25 75:4	high 13:5 60:12	illnesses 37:11
formal 32:5	ive 6:1,18 9:10	governor's 13:9	higher 70:23	immediate 13:21
former 60:9	11:16 27:4 29:17	26:7,7	highway 21:22	impact 49:4,15,21
101 (11 33.0	38:17 49:4 50:2	governor-elect	highways 21:22	52:17 77:18 78:18
Tor theorning 20.10	51:19,25 53:8	29:21	high-risk 66:23	78:22
101 Wal a 20.21 32.7	61:22,23 64:20	grave 69:6	hip 34:12	impediment 22:11
33.2130.1	65:15,24 79:18	great 8:10,13 44:8	hire 45:9	implement 5:3 13:16
10d11d 10.11,17 10.0	iven 4:24 5:19 7:11	greater 32:9	hiring 5:14 7:3 44:13	17:4 78:7,9 79:16
30.10 00.13 01.10	7:12 12:16 16:8	ground 6:25	hit 13:12,17,20	79:20,23
66:9,10 67:20 69:1	17:3,16 45:22 59:9	group 60:10	homicides 15:25	implementation
70.25 75.5 70.1	iving 54:7	group's 20:10	Honor 15:17 24:16	22:12
frame 17:6	(o 8:16 9:2 17:22	growing 5:22	37:20 38:2,12	implemented 5:20

	1	·	<u> </u>	
16:24 19:5 58:21	infection 20:16	issues 24:3	45:4,23 46:3,7,10	46:22 59:5,8,13,18
75:11	infirm 69:22		46:22 47:8,9,16,23	59:25 60:3,15 61:4
implementing 28:6	information 12:23	<u>J</u>	49:1,7,11,13,17	61:6,11,25 64:8,21
implements 52:14	29:19 63:22	January 63:23	49:24 50:7,18 51:3	64:25 74:8,18,21
implications 66:3	inherent 4:18	job 52:5	51:6,8,11,16 52:6	Kennedy's 36:25
important 14:5 16:2	inhibit 47:7	joined 34:11	52:9,12,20 53:4,12	79:2
25:12 44:18 56:13	initial 14:5	joint 29:15 76:12	53:13,16,21 54:1,9	killing 20:14
impose 73:9	initially 12:4	judge 3:13 18:19	54:10,11,16,19	kind 25:17 31:5
imposed 22:2 25:23	injury 54:22	34:23 76:21 80:5	55:6,7,8,8,10,12	34:19 46:4 73:21
38:1,5 39:25 50:4	inmate 7:20	judges 21:1 30:5,11	55:12,15,18,22	kinds 45:11 57:20
73:20	inmates 3:14 33:8	36:2	56:3,10,12,14,18	70:4
imposing 55:19	41:5 78:8,11	July 63:25	56:21 57:6,8,13,16	know 8:6 11:4 13:6
impossible 8:18	inquiry 31:10	jumped23:11	57:19 58:6,12,22	14:22,22 15:20
improve 68:9	insisted 25:21	jurisdictional 25:4	59:2,5,8,13,18,25	16:21 17:16 19:25
improvement 14:10	insisting 33:7	38:6 49:22 78:6	60:3,15,24 61:4,6	24:6 25:7,10 26:23
improvements 16:1	inspection 31:25	jurisdictions 69:1	61:11,25 62:4,6,8	28:7,22 30:4,14
32:11	instance 11:15 21:8	Justice 3:3,9 4:1,3,5	62:14,17,23 63:2,5	32:15 33:10 34:25
inappropriate 36:13	26:16 30:24 31:7	4:9,10,13 5:7,25	63:14,20 64:2,8,21	36:20 49:23 53:17
incarcerate 73:11	74:15	6:3,12,17 7:5,16	64:25 65:9 66:1,20	53:21 54:4,13 59:4
73:12,13	instituted33:23	8:2,12,20 9:2,6,12	66:24 67:4,8,16,23	64:2,23,25 65:10
incarcerated 3:14	institutional 71:7	9:22 10:7,9,12,16	68:6,15,22 69:9,10	68:19 72:3 77:9
incarcerates 15:4	instrument 58:10	10:19,23 11:1,6,17	69:17,21,24 70:2	
incarcerating 74:3	67:19	12:3,5,10,12,22	70:14,18,20,22	<u>L</u>
incarceration 74:1	interest 14:25 15:2	13:11,15 14:12,20	71:6,10,13,22 72:3	lack 18:2
include 69:4	interests 22:18,19	15:2,8,15 16:3,6	72:6,9,13,19,22	language 22:10
includes 68:14 69:3	22:20	16:13,19 17:1,5,11	73:16 74:8,18,21	languish 37:11
69:4	interim 32:10	17:16 18:6,13,25	75:14,18,20 76:4,8	larger 19:24
increase 41:11	intermediate 70:16	19:10,18 20:6,23	76:16 77:7,9,13,14	Laughter 15:18 50:8
44:25 45:1,2 47:20	interpret 19:2	21:12,18 22:23	77:15,22,24 78:1	50:10 72:5,21
48:12,24 64:6	intervening 76:20	23:17,21,23 24:1	78:16 79:2,18 80:6	law24:3 31:5 63:17
66:19 71:5	intervenors 32:8	24:10,13,19 25:16		73:7,7
increased 7:25 70:3	41:3 48:10 58:17	26:1,6,10,22 27:16	<u>K</u>	laws 72:18 73:8
increases 66:18	76:13	27:19 28:8,24 29:2	Kagan 17:1,6 30:2	lawsuits 44:10 46:7
increasing 48:17	intervenor's 35:16	29:4,15,25 30:2	54:11,16 77:15,22	lead 58:1
incredible 18:12	intrusion 61:19	31:17 32:12,17,22	77:24 78:1,16	leap 23:13
incredibly 64:16	intrusive 64:9	32:23,24,25 33:21	Karlton 76:21	leapfrogged 3:23
incur 73:14	invited 9:3 13:19	34:22 35:4,12 36:6	keep 25:13 35:13	led 64:6
independent 31:7	36:7	36:14,24,25 37:1,3		left 76:5
indicate 59:21	involved 30:5	37:4,7,16,21,24	keeps 5:22	legal 31:1
indication 74:11	issue 7:17 19:22	38:10,17,19,22	Kennedy 16:6,13,19	legislation 50:21
indifference 26:18	34:22 40:12 44:15	39:1,13,16,20,24	17:11,16 18:6	63:22 78:9
indirect 47:9	50:2 60:17 61:21	40:4,13,19 41:1,13	21:12,18 22:23	legislative 29:16
individual 18:8	issued 3:12 40:11	41:24 42:1,11 43:2	26:1,6,10 32:12	50:16
ineffective 45:15	40:23	43:7,10,12 44:7	39:16,20 41:13	legislature 5:11
!				

				I
10:5,10 12:17 27:3	lot 12:18 27:7 57:11	77:19 78:3,14	months 30:20 39:17	number 13:8 21:22
50:21,22 63:16	66:16 71:11 74:14	means 6:4 22:3	56:18	21:24 42:7,12,21
72:14 75:1	lots 69:4	59:14	motion 11:10 14:8	47:25 48:4,4,5,5
legislatures 12:18	lower 13:13	meant 56:9	30:20 64:14	57:7 60:20,20,22
length 4:14	low-risk 58:11 67:2	measure 37:25 68:4	motivated 25:7	61:11 66:18 67:6
lesser 73:13	67:14,17,24,24	measured 37:25	movement 23:9	67:13 68:11,12
let's 15:19 62:23		medical 8:14 18:2	moving 8:17 29:23	73:13 79:4
65:11	M	18:11,11,17 19:16	33:15	numbers 7:25 19:25
level 13:24 45:22	magnitude 52:23	20:15 34:14 42:4	multibillion-dollar	
levels 10:1 11:23	main 58:13	42:13 43:14 44:12	10:11	<u> </u>
12:7,15 53:2,3	major 75:8	74:4	murders 48:4	O 2:1 3:1
life 54:21	majority 44:9 61:15	medication 42:25		object 17:13 25:10
life-threatening	making 5:6 24:23	45:10	N	objected 32:7
37:11	36:2 56:22,22	meet 43:25 44:1	N 2:1,1 3:1	objecting 14:17
likelihood 69:9	73:22	52:16 74:9	narrow76:1	objection 7:23
limit 13:22	management 42:25	member35:20	narrowly 28:2 42:17	obligation 15:5 55:2
limited 19:12	45:10	mental 9:18 20:13	75:16	72:17 73:6,9 78:24
line 78:7,7,9	manner 55:4,4	23:1,7 39:12 42:4	national 37:14	obligations 71:19
listening 30:3	MARCIANO 1:7	42:14 44:13,13	necessary 19:6 60:6	73:15
lists 45:12	marginal 41:11 64:4	mentally 17:25	need 5:17 10:19,23	obvious 20:13
literal 43:25	mark 13:12,18	19:15	21:22 26:14 27:1	obviously 4:14
literally 8:6	massive 22:5 38:3	mentioned 42:24	31:24 74:4 78:9	11:10 17:7 24:9,17
litigation 19:8 21:5	38:13 46:22	met 14:8	79:23`	25:18 28:3 33:25
25:5 33:4 49:3	master 4:22 6:5 7:8	methods 48:11	needed 16:21 17:2	69:14
59:14 65:19,23	18:19 20:20 23:6	50:12 52:8 53:10	needless 15:9	October 41:3,3
71:8	24:22 25:8 34:11	75:10	needs 42:13 43:24	offer 68:10
little 23:18 44:17	34:14 45:18	million 28:9,10,17	43:25 44:2 60:14	offered 41:17
65:6	matter 1:12 9:9 10:1	millions 8:7	60:17,19 64:17	officer 18:14
local 58:18	12:25 65:13 80:10	mind 25:11,13 36:15	negative 49:18	officers 47:4
lockdowns 47:6	matters 79:11,12	minimize 61:19	neither 19:6	officials 54:6
logical 5:1	maximize 5:15	minimum 3:18 59:16	never 5:23 21:14	oh 6:12 51:17
long 25:10	61:19	minutes 76:5	nevertheless 10:10	Okay 10:5,19 58:7
longer4:11,12 8:18	maximum 42:21	missed 69:5	14:4 20:2	70:7
32:20 36:10 75:5,6	51:25 53:8 73:25	mistake 34:10	new 27:8 41:15	old 58:2,2
long-time 24:7	ma'am 37:23	mixed 31:4	44:24 53:17 70:7	older 70:3
look 6:21 10:3 15:20	mean 8:23 9:10	modify 63:12,12	75:23	ones 66:23
19:21 20:6,13,17	10:14 12:23 13:8	moment 21:19 22:23	newer33:23	one-judge 40:5
23:12 39:2 49:8	13:25 15:19 16:25	26:23	newspaper 27:6	ongoing 54:20 75:24
51:11 53:7 65:15	17:2,6,22,24 18:18	money 8:4 10:21	note 29:6	on-line 20:8
76:11 78:3,5	21:17,24 22:8,22	27:1,7 28:13,21	notion 35:24	open 22:13 24:8
looked 20:8,18,18	24:9 25:9 26:3,23	29:10,17,21 33:14	notwithstanding	44:21
55:22	26:24 27:6,10 28:7	70:6 71:23,24 72:7	14:10 77:24	opening 11:12 35:17
looking 21:21 28:11	28:17 29:4 53:13	75:21,23	November 1:10	operate 7:15 18:18
31:3 48:20 49:21	57:7 73:5 76:14	month 40:21	39:19	21:11 46:25 60:11

opinion 20:25 37:20	out-of-time 25:8,9	partly 50:24	Phillips 1:16 2:3,9	Plata 1:7 3:4 4:20	
40:12 41:19 48:8	overall 67:1	pass 63:17	3:6,7,9 4:1,3,8,13	30:6 34:7	
59:20	overcrowding 6:7	pass 03.17 passed 63:23,24	5:24 6:2,8,15,20	play 23:13 34:8	
opportunity 5:3 9:11	7:6 9:16,23 16:13	passed 03.23,24 patient 55:9	7:16 8:5,20 9:5,21	played 23:16	
17:8	16:14 17:24 21:20	penal 3:15 4:18	10:6,9,14,18,21	please 3:10 37:8	
opposed 14:15	22:3 31:8 37:9	pending 4:2	10:25 11:4,8 12:2	62:9 76:24	
31:11 35:19	38:9 44:5 46:24,25	Pennsylvania 46:13	12:5,10,11,13 13:4	plenty 43:15	
opposite 36:22	61:8	people 7:9,13 15:4	13:14,25 14:18,22	PLRA 49:25 69:12	
option 5:13,13	overturning 50:3	15:11 19:16 20:14	15:6,16,19 16:7,11	point 3:19 6:11	
options 68:12	over un imig 30.3	44:11,22 54:2	16:19 17:5,15	11:16 13:2 14:2,19	
oral 1:12 2:2,5 3:7	P	57:11 58:1 67:24	18:25 19:18 20:22	15:13 16:2,7,16	
· ·	P 3:1			, ,	
37:5	page 2:2 9:14,18	68:22 69:5 70:3	21:4,16 22:8 23:21	17:11 18:6,17	
order 3:12,16,19,22	20:10 28:12 38:6	78:13	23:25 24:6,11,16	19:19 23:2 35:23	
5:19 8:23 12:9	49:21 57:8,16	percent 7:4 8:24	25:2 26:3,9,12	37:22 38:5,11	
13:21 17:19 20:4	76:16	13:22 15:24,25	27:14,18,23 28:17	39:21 44:18,24	
21:13 23:15 25:22	pages 21:1 48:8	19:4 28:2 42:2,6	28:25 29:3,7,18	45:3 52:25 56:21	
26:14 33:3,16 34:6	57:19	42:20 43:5,23 44:4	30:2,16 31:19 32:4	59:22 63:8,12 64:7	
40:2,12 41:21 44:7	panel 4:23 9:3 13:16	59:20 60:11,19	32:25 33:25 35:3	64:8 68:4 69:3	
44:10,19,20 46:3,3	27:24 39:2 41:18	61:1,2,24 62:22	35:11,14 36:14	70:19 72:9 76:19	
46:4 47:14 48:1		64:13 65:7 67:2,3	37:3 41:7 64:11	79:1	
59:15,19 61:21	45:1 56:4 66:10	67:7,17,18 68:14	76:5,6,8,18 77:8	points 76:9	
62:12 63:12 64:9	71:4	68:15,16 69:3	77:12,15,19,23,25	policies 14:23	
64:18 65:11 68:20	panel's 27:12	74:13 80:2	78:3,19 80:1,7	policy 73:23,25	
71:24 74:10 78:9	paragraphs 9:14,15	percentage 13:20	physically 70:5	politicians 51:1	
80:2	9:19	63:12 79:7	pictures 20:9,9	population 5:22 6:10	
ordered 22:3 45:24	pardon 62:1,16	perfect 18:23	pie 53:22	10:2 11:23 12:7,14	
50:19 53:11 74:22	parole 57:22 66:16	perfectly 16:18	piece 28:8	12:20,25 13:1	
ordering 44:11,21	67:12 68:9,9 69:5	period 3:15 6:22 8:6	place 6:23 7:1,9,21	18:15,16,22 41:4,7	
45:9,10 50:1 51:14	69:18 74:16,17	13:12,24 14:8 22:5	10:17 13:23 19:25	45:2 48:21 50:15	
71:14	75:10	32:10 33:9 45:14	21:9 28:4,5 33:12	52:23 53:2 54:24	
orders 4:6 17:9 21:9	parolees 63:18	48:3,21 50:19	39:3 47:5 64:19	55:16 60:23 61:20	
21:10 45:13,21	66:18,21,23 67:7	64:10,11 66:12	79:15	64:5 66:11 71:5	
72:23	part 22:6 23:13 25:5	75:5,6 78:12 80:3	plainer 33:5 35:15	75:1 79:14	
ordinary 33:1	25:12 45:8 70:19	permissible 22:4	plaintiff 33:6	population-crowdi	
organized 60:10	71:3	25:22	plaintiffs 22:18	44:20	
originally 20:1	particular 3:16,25	perplexing 23:19	31:20 32:1 76:19	position 20:25 52:19	
ought 31:6 34:3	4:16 8:10 12:9,16	persists 16:9	76:20 78:3	52:22	
59:22	25:19,23 28:19	personnel 18:18	plan 9:25,25 10:4	possibility 66:5	
outcome 27:25	29:25 72:2,4 73:10	19:13,24 42:12	14:13 17:4,4 28:5	possible 13:11 55:4	
outer 63:8	78:15 79:7	perspective 11:14	30:23 33:13 49:8	55:5 64:9	
outside 5:18 6:6	particularly 3:17	Petitioners 1:5	51:7,13,19,22,23	post-trial 35:1 40:9	
19:14	6:23 31:10	phase 4:16	55:23 78:23 79:19	40:20	
outweigh 66:7	particulars 53:8	Philadelphia 48:2	79:20,24,25,25	potentially 33:8	
out-of-State 41:9	parties 40:17,24	67:21	plants 71:25	powers 4:25 5:4	
1	i e	i	• ·· ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 	

nyactical 65.12
practical 65:13
preceding 15:24
57:16
precisely 19:1
prefer71:21
prejudice 57:5
premature 3:18
present 24:8
presentation 25:19
presentations 24:21
presume 35:5
pretrial 35:2
pretty 12:15 20:9
24:7 70:15
preventable 37:15
prevents 74:2
primarily 38:8
primary 22:10,11
31:3,8 46:23
principal 16:14,14
prior 24:4,4
prioritization 72:10
prison 42:22,22 43:4
43:12,19 46:15,25
47:13 48:21 50:15
50:25 56:16 57:22
57:25 58:2 59:14
63:4 65:18,23
69:11 70:4,12 71:2
71:5 74:5 75:1
79:14
prisoner 20:4 23:15
34:5 48:1 49:3
prisoners 19:8 21:5
22:7 33:4 37:10,13
41:8 42:8,21 43:1
43:22,25 44:8 47:4
47:13,17 48:17
54:7 58:11 61:3
65:14,17,22 66:15
66:16 67:2,15,17
68:5,13 69:22
73:11,14 74:2 75:3
prisons 18:1 23:14

27:22 35:4 39:9
41:9 43:22 45:9,20
53:17 70:7 71:23
75:24
private 18:7
probably 3:20
probationers 63:18
problem 5:23 9:16
9:20 16:6 19:15
21:19,23 27:10,11
27:13,16,21 30:10
30:17 34:1 43:20
44:14 45:5,21,25
46:5 47:10 51:2
54:17 73:1 79:8
problems 4:17 19:16 30:18 34:4 66:6
proceed 22:14
process 3:19 7:3
23:15
proclamation 13:9
professional 60:22
proffer 34:23 35:6
35:25 36:7,9,12
76:12,14
proffered 35:2
76:11,11
proffering 56:15
program 10:11
16:24
programs 27:8
58:13,15,25 71:1
progress 5:6,21 7:8
project 29:12,15
projects 29:11,11
promote 34:15
prong 26:18
proper 24:5
properly 7:22
proposal 14:6
proposals 5:10
13:17 50:17
proposed 20:1 50:13

74:25 78:23

```
proposition 22:6
prove 36:19
proved 32:10
proven45:15
provide 7:24,25 8:1
 8:3 9:24 10:1
  19:16 34:19 42:23
 43:23 46:4 47:1.2
 55:2.3 61:1 65:5
 68:11
providing 23:2
 58:14 74:4
provision 8:9 18:11
  34:13 42:3 44:11
provisions 73:22
psychologist 62:25
  63:4
psychosis 37:10
public 49:5,15,21
 50:2 51:18 52:13
 52:17 54:8,16 56:6
  66:2.6 68:18 73:19
 77:18 78:17
publicly 27:20
pulled-out-of-the-...
  79:4
punishments 70:6
  70:16 73:17,18
purpose 13:9 28:19
purposes 42:15
  59:19
pursue 41:12
put 6:23 7:10,21
  13:23 24:25 25:17
  36:4 66:14 72:7
 75:23 76:20
puzzled 57:7
p.m 80:9
         0
```

R
R 3:1
raised 70:20
range 70:15
rapes 48:4
rapidly 29:23
rate 37:13 48:25
66:19,21,25
rates 70:23
reach 13:23 30:14
43:1 65:16 69:13
80:2
reached 26:4,7
reaches 63:8
reacting 50:23
read 9:15 27:6 57:8
77:3,3
ready 11:16
real 7:18,19 22:22
reality 12:14 23:4
30:25 35:9 78:10
really 5:12 13:20
27:2 33:18 47:18
75:23
reason 7:21 18:5
46:23 71:3
reasonable 14:7,8
16:18 17:8 21:10
44:4

question 9:7 11:14

22:13 23:24 31:4

32:24 33:17 45:8

51:4 56:13 59:5

60:25 65:10 73:5

quickly 74:15 75:11

quite 25:6 33:4 61:7

quote 31:8 50:25

quoted 25:1

quoting 52:10

73:16 79:2

quickest 55:4

questions 55:11

reasonably 11:11 reasons 52:1 11:25 12:3 16:3,22 rebuffed 77:8 **REBUTTAL** 2:8 76.6 receive 76:22 received 77:4 receiver 4:20,21,25 5:3,20 6:5,9,10,21 6:23 7:2,7,21 8:11 9:11,11,12,22 10:25 11:9,11,18 12:6 16:23 17:2.3 18:6,20 19:2 22:20 23:6,18,19 25:9,11 25:14,15,20 28:4,5 28:12,25 29:7 30:7 30:19,22 33:11,12 33:12,13 34:11,13 34:18 79:15 receiver's 12:21 15:20 17:8 19:21 45:19 recidivism 66:20,21 66:25 71:2 recognition 4:17 **recognize** 22:1 59:8 recognized 26:5 recognizes 15:7 recognizing 26:16 recollection 62:10 recommendations 55:24 recommended 44:6 record 9:20 12:24 15:10 16:4 20:7 25:24 31:14 34:24 37:20 38:18 51:12 58:22 60:8 62:1 66:12 76:10.23 77:11,13 records 59:1 **reduce** 18:16 44:22 46:16,17,24 48:12

qualified 19:24

quality 34:20

quantity 34:20

quarrel 25:18

	1			
48:18 50:14,15	65:16 68:13	resort 3:22 5:2 9:10	riot 50:23,25	satisfied 11:12
53:1 57:10 58:19	relied 70:11,11	20:5	risk 58:10 66:22	save 70:6
66:10 67:13 75:1	relief 8:21	resources 34:20	67:1,3	saying 6:6 13:18
79:14	religious 20:10	respect 34:7 38:13	risk-assessment	20:12 26:25 29:7
reduced 35:9 48:21	reluctant 64:18	51:4,13 71:15	67:19	35:13 36:9,16
55:1	rely 70:10	76:10 79:1	robberies 48:5	45:24 48:20 52:16
reducing 6:7 18:15	relying 6:13,16	respectful 50:9	ROBERTS 3:3	54:19 56:5,7 61:18
18:21 55:15 64:5	remains 77:22	respectfully 50:5	32:23 37:1,4 40:13	61:21 65:12,15
71:2	remarkable 3:17	60:7	40:19 41:1 49:1,7	71:16,18,24 72:22
reduction 12:23	remedial 4:15	responding 55:12	49:11,13,17,24	73:1,21 74:18
14:7 44:20 52:15	remedies 43:9 55:25	response 16:2 36:3	50:7,18 51:3,6,8	says 8:24 9:22,23
52:23 69:11 71:4	62:12 75:9	41:2	51:11,16 52:6,9,12	10:4 11:17,18 12:6
reductions 12:19	remedy 3:22 5:2	responses 44:16	52:20 55:6,8 56:10	12:6 15:22 20:25
75:12	16:15,17,22,23	responsible 71:11	62:4,8 65:9 66:1	28:13 35:6 76:21
reference 36:2	18:7 19:5,7,11	rest 28:18	67:4,8 71:6,10,13	77:5 78:6,21
41:15	20:4,5 21:14 22:4	restricted 6:4	71:22 72:3,6,9,13	Scalia 15:15 38:10
referred 25:3	22:12 23:3 26:15	restrictive 6:19 70:6	72:19,22 76:4 80:6	38:19,22 39:13,24
referring 64:1	33:7 36:8,12,20,20	73:17	room 7:14,14 18:17	40:4 53:13,16,21
refers 20:8	37:25 38:1,5,15	result 11:21 25:22	18:17 37:12 47:2	54:1,9 56:14
reform 19:9 21:5	39:24 40:1 43:11	30:14 41:10 65:13	root 17:23 30:9	scheduled 29:12
33:4 49:3 59:3,14	46:4,12 50:3 52:2	70:23	roughly 75:2	scheme 34:17
65:19,24 67:12	55:2 59:6,19 60:23	reversed 5:22	route 3:25	Schwarzenegger 1:3
71:8 74:16 75:10	64:8,23 73:9 74:12	review3:11 15:21	rug 51:2`	3:4
regard 14:4	75:16 76:1	31:7	rule 33:1 73:21 80:3	scope 3:20
rehabilitation 58:14	remember 12:6	re-find 30:4	ruling 42:11 57:4	scrupulous 41:20
58:23 68:10	30:19	re-finding 30:14	run 18:8 35:4	season 24:8
rejected 10:5 38:23	remind 74:25	re-incarcerate	running 21:21	second 6:23 7:2 14:2
rejecting 27:3	remove 8:23	74:16		45:8 56:12
rejection 14:9	render 8:19	re-violate 67:3	<u>S</u>	secretary 48:14,15
relate 38:15	report 60:9	rhetoric 6:1	S 2:1 3:1	50:16 67:11 77:2
related 3:5 61:8	reported 15:10	rhetorical 14:4	Sacramento 51:1	secured 28:15
relating 42:3	reports 19:21 26:25	15:15	safe 48:13 50:17	see 5:5,13 37:1 43:2
relation 42:8	39:10 45:19 64:5	rigamarole 32:6	52:4 55:13 75:4	51:12 61:25 64:21
release 3:13 13:21	representation	right 9:5 10:25 23:9	safeguard 58:14	68:20,22,23 69:18
20:4 23:15 34:5	77:17	26:12 27:18 33:15	safely 53:3,17,20,24	seek 8:22
44:7,10,19,22	representations	33:16 35:3,11	53:25 55:2 57:14	sense 11:11 22:17
47:12,14 48:1	24:21	36:14 40:19 42:9	63:6 66:11 75:2,12	34:11,12 79:3,11
59:15 65:13 68:5	required 19:8 51:13	43:6,18 49:16,23	safest 55:4	sensitive 64:16
78:11	52:14	51:3,3,15,21 52:18	safety 27:21 49:5,15	sent 57:22
released 33:9 47:17	requirements 21:6	52:20 54:15 57:18	49:21 50:2 51:18	sentence 74:5
57:24 58:3 67:25	requires 49:3,25	66:1 70:1,18 72:12	52:13,17 54:8,16	Sentencing 59:3
68:3,7 69:25	65:24	75:22 77:14	56:7 66:2,6 68:18	separate 44:17
releases 66:15	requiring 3:13	rights 17:25 19:8	73:19 77:18 78:17	September 15:21
releasing 59:16	resolved 69:15	22:25 27:10	78:21	sequence 22:15
				_

				rage 71
series 3:23 21:5	slice 34:15	15:21 26:22 27:9	7:14 34:20 43:15	52:21 55:23 56:25
serious 34:1 54:22	slow 5:25	32:7 51:4 77:3	44:13	74:8,11 78:22,23
seriously 43:1	small 5:21 34:15	78:6	staffing 42:24	statistical 48:19
service 21:23	smaller 3:20 10:10	Specter 1:18 2:6	stage 19:20	70:19
services 47:1 61:1,2	solution 6:6	37:4,5,7,19,23	stand 77:16	statistically 70:9
64:13 65:6	solve 45:21	38:2,12,20,25	standard 31:5	status 35:18
set 13:22 35:6 64:10	somebody 74:3	39:14,18,23 40:1,6	staph 20:16	statute 33:5
settle 40:24	someplace 19:13	40:16,20 41:6,16	start 35:17	stay 22:20
Seventeen 67:18	somewhat 43:4	41:25 42:10,19	started 33:24 39:19	step7:11,11,13
Seven-zero 67:8,9	soon 43:24	43:6,9,11,17 44:16	43:24	11:19 18:15,24
shifted 9:7	sorry 29:3 32:23	45:7 46:2,6,9	state 4:15 8:3 14:23	steps 3:23 5:9,18
shifts 33:5	38:12 40:13 41:25	47:15,22 48:7 49:6	14:25 15:3,12	6:18
short 68:13	53:15 67:4 76:14	49:10,12,16,23	16:10 17:12,20,21	stone 29:8
show34:25 36:12	76:16 77:7,15	50:5,9,11,20 51:5	21:12,13 23:8	stood 35:16
38:24 46:23	sort 13:25 14:1	51:10,15,21 52:8	26:20 27:17,20	stop 20:14,16
showing 32:20 65:15	71:19	52:11,18,21 53:6	28:20 31:19,23	stopped 56:15
shown 52:24 53:6	Sotomayor 5:7,25	53:15,19,23 54:4	32:2,7,7 37:25	streets 65:22 78:13
shows 20:11 59:10	6:3,12,17 9:2,6	54:15,18 55:14,17	39:8,9 40:24 41:12	strike 26:6,10 60:20
shred 79:3	13:11,15 14:12,20	55:21 56:2,8,17,20	42:23 44:21,23,24	60:21
side 23:1,7 32:8	15:2,8 16:3 32:22	56:23 57:12,15,18	45:19 46:14 47:23	strikes 3:17 22:15
36:2 39:12 56:22	34:22 35:4,12 36:6	58:5,8,16,24 59:4	49:8,11,13 51:17	struck 5:11
69:8	36:15,24 37:16,21	59:7,12,17,24 60:2	51:19,25 52:4,13	studies 48:23
significant 6:25	37:24 38:17 39:1	60:7,16 61:5,10,13	52:16 53:1,8,9,10	styled 24:2
11:19 13:8 15:22	41:24 47:8 53:4,12	62:3,10,16,19,25	54:6,12,13,25	subject 77:16
16:1,22,23 20:2	54:10 55:7,9,10,15	63:3,7,14,19,24	55:19 58:17 61:23	submission 77:20
22:24 23:3,8,9	55:18,22 56:3,12	64:4,24 65:2,23	62:1 63:11 64:13	submit 24:14 32:2
32:11 63:15	56:18,21 57:8 62:6	66:2,22 67:1,6,9	64:17,20 65:14	submitted 24:1
significantly 12:15	62:14,17,23 63:2,5	67:18 68:2,8,21,25	66:10 71:10,15,19	40:17 47:25 50:21
19:24 33:6	75:14,18,20 76:16	69:13,20,23 70:1	72:7,10,14,15 73:3	80:8,10
simple 21:25 73:4	77:7,9,13,14 79:18	70:13,17,21,24	73:10,16,21,23,24	substantial 4:17 7:1
simply 18:9 25:15	sounds 9:15	71:9,12,21 72:1,8	74:3,15,21,24 75:7	12:19,23 20:1 49:4
25:23 31:11 51:16	space 19:16 44:1	72:12,16 73:4	75:17,22 76:10,15	50:2 59:19 65:24
single-judge 4:7	73:14	74:14,20,24 75:17	77:5,16	75:12
8:16,21 45:13	speak 28:6,22 42:12	75:19,22 80:7	stated 16:12	substantially 3:20
singular 46:24	42:14	spectrum 33:20	statement 6:13 9:13	succeeded 21:14
singularly 45:15	special 4:22 6:5 7:8	speech 24:23	16:21 25:4 35:17	success 7:3 58:23
sit 32:12	18:19 20:20 22:2	spend 10:4 27:1	38:6 41:2 49:22	successfully 19:23
sitting 15:11	23:6 24:22 25:8	71:16,18,22,24	56:3,15 78:6	suffered 46:14
situation 38:1,24	34:10,14 45:18	73:2	statements 24:4,5	suffering 37:10
67:10,11 73:3	specific 5:18 16:3	spending 33:13	25:1,4,15 45:18	sufficient 11:2 19:6
six 57:19	17:6 19:7,7 21:6	57:25 72:25	States 1:1,13 47:25	59:21 60:23 61:12
size 12:20	22:12 26:4 76:12	spent 8:9 10:22	48:20 70:10 72:18	suggest 12:7 80:4
sky 53:22	76:14 78:20	28:18	State's 7:23 22:19	suggested 56:1
slavishly 31:12	specifically 4:20 8:8	staff 5:14,15,16	48:9 49:20 52:19	61:12,14,15

	1	1	1	1
suggesting 6:16	47:5 50:22 54:17	things 24:17 28:7	38:1,4,21 39:14	twice 37:13 76:22
14:6	60:13,16,18 64:10	34:17 42:24 43:15	41:11 48:3,15,17	two 9:14,15,18
suggestion 66:11	67:7 71:15 74:8	45:9,11,16,17,25	53:24 54:1,7 57:24	30:18 39:9 42:17
suggestions 69:18	taken 3:24	56:5 58:7 71:11	57:25 63:11,16,17	44:16 63:15 75:9
suggests 11:2	takes 75:6	74:15 78:4,10	70:2 75:6,10,13	two-thirds 37:14
suicide 37:13	talk 23:17	think 4:14 6:8 8:21	76:3,24 78:12 79:6	type 71:7
suicides 15:23,23	talked 5:9,14 62:22	9:17,24 13:14,20	80:4	
35:1 37:15	talking 29:24 33:3	14:4,18 17:1,12	today 3:11 32:12,16	U
summarize 9:13	33:22 35:17 37:16	19:1,18 22:2,12,21	35:19 36:17	ultimate 34:18
57:20	38:23 74:10,12	23:18 25:12,20	told 14:15 78:18	ultimately 17:9
summary 14:9 40:23	talks 78:4	26:10 29:4 36:3	total 42:7	22:17 23:1 28:15
supplement 24:4	tallied48:3	38:2 39:1 46:10	tough 70:15	29:21 34:3
supply 8:3	team 26:10 60:20,22	50:11 51:21 55:6,8	tour 31:20	umpteen 53:17
support 22:6 26:21	technical 57:22	59:2,13 61:13,14	tours 31:25 32:5	unanimous 48:11
supported41:21	63:20 69:5,18	62:3 63:24,25 65:3	track 40:14	unconstitutional
65:15	74:17	65:3,4,18 78:17,19	transfer 41:9	38:8 43:7
suppose 27:14	technically 35:25	third 44:5	transferred72:14	understand 13:5
supposed 3:21 5:2	tell 5:8,18 6:18	Thirty-five 57:12,13	transfers 13:8 44:23	24:23 25:10 29:8
9:8,9 10:8 12:1	36:16 37:17 50:6	thought 7:6 14:7	treat 44:13,13	33:1 34:4 43:3,21
73:3	50:11	18:13 24:19 30:6	treatment 35:7	44:19 60:1 67:22
Supreme 1:1,13	telling 29:6 51:18	31:19,23 37:21	37:12 42:4 47:6	69:15
sure 6:2 16:11 18:4	72:24	38:11 50:7 55:23	71:25	understanding 42:6
22:9 25:2 29:19	tentative 40:10	56:10 60:21 63:8	tremendous 27:21	understood 5:8
37:19 49:20 51:17	term 47:13	thousand 57:12,13	trend 15:22	67:23
51:17 52:4,7 55:11	terminology 47:16	threat 54:7	trial 12:16 37:19	unfortunate 18:3
61:24 67:20 68:3	terms 24:8	three 3:12 21:1	38:14,21 39:15,17	United 1:1,13 72:18
surrounding 74:1,1	testified 16:15 26:2	three-judge 4:23 9:1	39:18 40:16 45:16	unprecedented3:12
sustainable 11:22	39:10,11,22 48:16	13:16 14:6 21:7	48:7,15 54:5 56:19	upped 63:17
swept 51:1	50:17 54:6 56:25	23:14,20 27:24	tried 5:21 25:16	urge 12:8
system 3:15 4:18	60:5,18	30:13,21,21 35:20	45:14	urging 31:24
8:10 21:22 24:11	testify 23:19 24:13	35:21 39:2,6 40:6	tries 24:3	use 73:17
33:15 42:8,13	68:19	40:7 41:18 45:1	trouble 30:2	
60:11 63:21 68:9	testifying 61:7	49:2 56:4 64:22	true 4:8 23:21 24:10	V
73:12 74:16	testimony 22:6	66:10 71:4	41:9 46:19 58:12	v 1:6 3:4
systemic 79:16	46:12 48:9 57:2	throw6:5 44:21	63:9 77:22	variety 34:12 45:24
systems 46:15	58:9 62:11	thrown 69:7	trust 52:10,12	various 79:13
	Texas 46:13	till 56:18	truth 33:18 36:4	vehemence 32:9
T	Thank 3:9 15:16	time 4:14 5:19 6:22	try 17:4 45:9	viable 76:2
T 2:1,1	37:3,7 62:10 74:7	8:6 10:8 13:2,7,24	trying 34:15 51:23	view 18:18 30:11,13
table 12:19	76:4,8 80:6	14:8,11 16:8,15	tubercular 20:16	viewed 36:9
tailored 28:2 42:18	Theirs 79:4	17:1,2,6 21:10	Tuesday 1:10	views 11:25 24:3
75:16	theory 61:9	22:5 25:6 27:5	turnaround 9:25	violate 65:18 71:23
take 9:8 11:6 14:24	thing 19:11 28:22	28:25 32:10 33:9	10:3	violated 17:24
34:7 36:11 38:10	46:17 57:7 71:7	33:11 35:7 37:2	turns 5:5	violating 36:10,10
	•	•	•	•

73:22	34:12 55:13 67:13	Y	42:2,6,20 43:4	37:9 40:10 46:20
violation 5:17 7:18	weakest 6:17	year 40:22 63:25,25	44:4 49:9 51:20	54:21
7:19 11:3 16:9	weeks 29:13 35:9	66:16	52:16 53:3 59:10	200 21:1 43:23
17:23 22:11 26:15	40:22	years 4:2,11 6:13	59:23 65:12 79:3	2000s 4:19
26:17 27:2 31:9	weight 49:4 50:2	8:25 14:15,15,16	80:2,5	2001 33:23
32:14,15,16,19	61:17 65:24	14:21 15:23,25	14,832 41:5	2005 16:24
33:2 36:17,19,23	went 20:8 36:7 44:5	17:12 19:5 22:25	140 13:20	2006 16:24 41:3
79:6	61:18 63:25 65:6	23:5 26:20 30:6,15	140,000 73:11	75:24
violations 22:24	80:4	37:9 45:14 46:20	145 59:11,20,20,22	2008 8:6 16:4 19:21
38:4 42:3 52:2	weren't 18:1 43:23	46:21 47:19 48:22	60:5,8,11 61:12,14	31:22 32:3 39:9,13
54:20 61:8 76:21	we'll 3:3 36:11,24	49:9 51:19 52:17	62:2,15,18,21,24	40:3,8,15,17
violators 57:22	65:20	54:14,17,21,22	63:6 64:13,22 65:3	2009 15:20 40:9,11
63:21 68:9 69:5,19	we're 7:12 23:12,12	58:1,2,2 65:12,16	65:4	2010 1:10 15:21
74:17	29:16,23,24 32:13	65:20,20 67:10	147,000 13:5	41:4
void 27:4	32:13 33:3 36:9,17	74:9,10,11,13 75:3	148,000 73:13	2085 76:12,18
volume 76:18 77:1	36:18 39:3 46:4	75:15 77:18 78:16	15 45:14 48:22	22 14:15
voting 27:7	49:20 51:17 52:4,7	80:3	16,000 78:8	2338 76:25
***	52:25,25 54:21		165 13:5	25 14:16 15:23
<u>W</u>	55:18 61:24 72:8	\$	17 67:3,17 68:15,16	253 57:8,17
wait 4:11,14 5:13	74:10 79:9	\$2.35 29:14	17,000 57:21	
35:7	we've 9:24 16:11	\$4 8:8 33:14	170,000 13:6	3
want 14:3 19:13	24:17 30:7 35:8	\$8 10:4 20:20	18 12:17	3 2:4 15:25 23:5
24:8 27:2 31:20,21	77:6	0	183-page 40:12	26:20 28:13 30:20
31:24 35:17 50:18	whatsoever 79:3		41:19	67:10 74:10,13
51:25 55:19 63:10	withdrew 11:10	08 31:14	1990 33:24	76:5
65:20 68:3,19 69:2	witness 24:13,14	09 15:24	1990s 4:19 17:25	3,000 67:25
69:2 72:6 74:24	witnesses 56:25	09-1233 1:5 3:4	2	30 1:10
79:1,17,21,22	58:17,18	1	-	30a 38:6
wanted 24:25 32:8,9	word 46:24	138:6	2 8:25 14:15 19:5	30,000 57:11 78:11
34:25 50:14 53:9	work 18:16 36:21	10 20:10	27:3 35:9 39:17	35,000 66:14 68:5
53:10 61:18 79:21	46:18 47:3 60:5	10,000 41:8	47:18 49:9 51:19	36,000 3:14 33:8
wants 19:12 75:8	62:2	100 61:1,2	52:17 56:18 65:12	37 2:7
Washington 1:9,16	worked46:21,23	11 28:12	65:20 66:12 74:10	37,000 50:15 75:3
46:14 wasn't 40:5 41:17	worse 5:12	11:10 1:14 3:2	75:3,15 80:3	4
	wouldn't 23:16	12:31 80:9	2-year 3:15 13:12	4 15:23 23:5 26:20
41:17 56:7	50:22,22 51:17	120 35:8	33:9 50:19 51:6	65:16,20
waste 76:24 water 71:25	54:11 62:2 69:1	120,000 66:15	64:10,11 79:25 2.3 10:17	4a 49:22 52:10
	71:5 75:15 76:2	130 59:11 60:5,19	2.31 10:12	4-year 66:12
way 8:15 28:3,22 29:12,24 35:19	wrong 14:13 27:12	61:15,18,21 62:12	2.35 10:17,24 11:2	40 58:2
36:22 47:9 48:17	60:4	62:22	11:12,18 27:4 28:9	40,000 44:8 47:12
52:4 57:3 78:14,18	wrote 39:10	137 61:5 65:1	28:11 29:2,5	47:17 65:14,22
79:16	X	137-1/2 19:4 28:2	2.5 13:22	66:14
ways 4:15 27:15	$\frac{1}{x}$ 1:2,8	137.5 8:24 17:13	20 4:2,11 30:6,15	400 28:17
mays 7.13 21.13	A 1.2,0		20 7.2,11 30.0,13	
	l	l	l	l

-			Page 94
45,000 3:14 33:8			
5 14:21 54:14,17			
74:9,13 77:18			
78:16			
5-year 75:5,5,6			
79:25			
50 48:8 58:1			
55 58:3			
6			
6 29:13 76:18 77:1			
60 15:25 35:8 58:2			
60(b) 8:17			
66 15:24			
7			
7 17:12 65:7			
7.5 61:24			
70 4:6 45:12 67:2,7			
68:14 69:3			
70a 78:5		,	
75 58:3			
76 2:10			
8			
8 10:20,23 11:10			
27:3 28:10 46:21			
72:25 73:2			
8th 8:6			
80 73:14			
80,000 73:12			
9			
9 9:14 15:25			
90 7:4 35:8			
900 6:24 12:18			