

1 David A. Senior (# 108579)  
2 McBreen & Senior  
3 1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
4 Los Angeles, California 90067  
5 Telephone: (310) 552-5300  
6 Fax: (310) 552-1205  
7 dsenior@mcbreenseior.com

8 John R. Grele (# 167080)  
9 Law Offices of John R. Grele  
10 703 Market Street, Suite 550  
11 San Francisco, California 94103  
12 Telephone: (415) 348-9300  
13 Fax: (415) 348-0364  
14 jgrele@earthlink.net

15 Richard P. Steinken (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
16 Jenner & Block LLP  
17 One IBM Plaza  
18 Chicago, Illinois 60611-7603  
19 Telephone: (312) 923-2938  
20 Fax: (312) 840-7338  
21 rsteinke@jenner.com

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
23 MICHAEL ANGELO MORALES

24 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
25 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
26 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

27 MICHAEL ANGELO MORALES,  
28 Plaintiff,  
29 vs.

) CASE NO. C 06 0219 (JF) (RS)  
) C 06-926 (JF) (RS)

) JOINT PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE  
) STATEMENT

30 JEANNE WOODFORD, Secretary of the  
31 California Department of Corrections;  
32 EDDIE YLST, Warden, San Quentin State  
33 Prison, San Quentin, CA; and DOES 1-50,  
34 Defendants.

) **REDACTED VERSION**  
) **FOR PUBLIC RECORD**  
) HEARING DATE: Sept. 26, 2006  
) TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
) COURTROOM: 3

1 (2) Disputed Factual Issues (All Facts are Disputed by Defendant, Unless Marked  
2 “Disputed by Plaintiff”) Defendants’ objections are primarily to the form of the  
3 statements rather than the contents unless otherwise noted.  
4

5 1. The team always includes 2-3 medical personnel consisting of a  
6 combination of RNs and Medical Technical Assistants (MTA), who must be a Licensed  
7 Vocational Nurse (LVN) with a state credential authorizing insertion of IVs. **Disputed**  
8 **by Plaintiff.**  
9

10 2. Former execution team leader, Witness #10, was removed from the  
11 execution team for misconduct.  
12

13 3. The misconduct by Witness #10 leading to his several month suspension  
14 from work was unrelated to his participation in an execution.  
15

16 4.

REDACTED PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER

19 5. The execution teammates’ responsibilities are “awesome” and very stressful.  
20 The teammates become very apprehensive during an execution. It is a very intense  
21 process; it is the most stressful thing that a person in the Department of Corrections is  
22 asked to do. Team members, including the RNs and LVNs are as tense as they ever are.  
23 It is a surrealistic experience. It does not seem real when it’s happening. It seems  
24 dreamlike. It is stressful because there is no other place in the world that an LVN is asked  
25 to start an IV for that purpose. Warden Steven Ornoski was practically beside himself  
26  
27  
28

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

1 during the Stanley Williams execution. Wardens have refrained from viewing any part of  
2 the condemned inmate save his feet during the last three California executions.

3  
4 6. It is a rule that you cannot be working in the condemned area of the prison  
5 and be on the execution team. There are no exceptions to the rule.

6  
7 7. Warden Woodford had no inhibitions about assigning a member to the  
8 execution team who was known by the inmate who was being executed.

9 8. The LVNs claim to prepare the Pentothal by following the instructions.

10 9. The new Operational Procedure 770, March 6, 2006, each one gram of  
11 Pentothal is to be dissolved in 50 mL of a solution of sodium chloride of unknown  
12 concentration, rather than in 40 mL of sterile water.

13  
14 10. During an execution, "it's a bit more crowded" in the antechamber than  
15 16 or 17 people.

16  
17 11. During Stanley Williams's execution, Witness #4 was tasked with  
18 selecting the lethal drugs from the cart to be administered to Stanley Williams, and  
19 the large man "was standing in Witness #4's way."  
20

21 12. Twenty-six people or so were on the approved list to be present in the  
22 anteroom for the scheduled execution of Michael Morales.

23 13. To execute an inmate, officers bring the inmate from a holding cell  
24 across the hall from the execution chamber, through the anteroom of the execution  
25 chamber, and into the chamber. Witness #1 believes that five peace officers walk the  
26 inmate into the chamber, while Witness #4 thinks it's four.  
27  
28

1 14. Catheters are regularly set in the inmates' arms by RNs during  
2 executions.

3  
4 15. The setting of these catheters is performed in the execution chamber,  
5 not in a health care facility.

6 16. During Stanley Williams's execution, an RN was responsible to set one  
7 catheter. The vein blew when she started the IV. She attempted again to start the IV  
8 and the vein blew again.

9  
10 17. The nurse was frustrated and became upset; she was visibly upset to  
11 other execution team members.

12  
13 18. Unbeknownst to the RN and Witness #3, the RN then failed to properly  
14 set the catheter a third time. The RN subsequently taped the catheter to Williams's  
15 arm, and began to exit the chamber.

16  
17 19. While Witness #3 and RN were exiting the chamber, it was said that "it  
18 wasn't flowing, the drip wasn't flowing." The RN couldn't believe that it wasn't  
19 running again. After the RN exited the chamber – while the chamber door still was  
20 open – it was said a second time that "the left wasn't running."  
21

22 20. Warden Ornoski was standing in the center of the anteroom, looking at  
23 the door. The team leader was present at the chamber door.

24  
25 21. Witness #4 was under the impression that the team leader was  
26 responsible to monitor the IV drip as a result of all the training he went through for  
27 Williams, as well as other executions.  
28

1           22.    The Warden then said, "Proceed," "after the comments were made that  
2 the left IV had failed. The execution proceeded without the IV line in the left arm  
3 properly set or operating.  
4

5           23.    After the RNs or LVNs leave the execution chamber, the lights are  
6 turned down in the anteroom before the execution begins. The lights are turned very  
7 low. Under the anteroom's subdued lighting, the syringes containing the lethal drugs  
8 are present, taped to a cart.  
9

10          24.    The syringes containing the lethal drugs to be used in the execution are  
11 taped to a cart in the order they are to be used and on a grid which identifies each  
12 drug by name. The syringes are numbered in the order they are to be used.  
13

14           **Disputed by plaintiff.**

15          25.    During an execution, the doctors filling out the execution record cannot  
16 see where their entries are supposed to be without the aid of a small flashlight.  
17

18          26.    The RN or MTA/LVN who attaches the syringe to the stopcock then  
19 stands in the window of the chamber to observe the inmate's right arm. **Disputed by**  
20 **plaintiff.**  
21

22          27.    Witness #1 believes that after a syringe has been emptied, the same  
23 MTA removes the syringe, places it back on the cart and retrieves the next syringe.  
24

25          28.    Witness #4 cannot conduct an inspection to see if the catheter is set  
26 properly without entering the execution chamber.

27          29.    The identity of the execution team leader is known to personnel at San  
28 Quentin from all aspects of the institution: maintenance, medical, and custody. For

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

1 Witnesses #1 and #5, their existence on the execution team and as execution team  
2 leader was not a secret at the institution. It becomes a known fact.

3 30. If the thiopental sodium drip stops during an execution, there is no  
4 procedure for what is to take place next.  
5

6 31. Operational Procedure 770 prohibits team members from asking  
7 anything that would require an oral response during an execution.  
8

9 (3) Agreed Statement

10 The action may not be presented upon an agreed statement.

11 (4) Stipulations Requested or Proposed.

12 Unless objected to below, all exhibits are stipulated by the parties to be  
13 admitted, except Exhibit Nos. 32-50, 79, 97, 98, 99 and 100 which at this time, are  
14 only being marked for identification by plaintiff.  
15  
16  
17

18 DISPUTED LEGAL ISSUES

19 Points of Law

20 1. California's lethal injection protocol, set forth in Operational Procedure  
21 770, as revised March 6, 2006 ("new Procedure 770"), is a regulation or regulations  
22 subject to California's Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), Cal. Gov. Code §§  
23 11340 et seq. The APA defines a "regulation" to mean "every rule, regulation, order  
24 or standard of general application or the amendment, supplement, or revision of any  
25 rule, regulation, order or standard adopted by any state agency to implement, interpret,  
26 or make specific the law enforced or administered by it, or to govern its procedure."  
27  
28 Cal. Gov. Code § 11342.600. To be a rule, regulation, order or standard of "general

1 application,” a rule need only apply to all the members of a class of persons; it need  
2 not apply to all citizens of the state. See Armistead v. State Personnel Bd., 583 P.2d  
3 744, 746 (Cal. 1978); Faunce v. Denton, 167 Cal. App. 3d 191, 213 Cal. Rptr. 122  
4 (1985).

5  
6 2. New Procedure 770 unilaterally was adopted by defendants in violation of  
7 the APA. A state agency may not issue, utilize, enforce or attempt to enforce any  
8 regulation unless the requirements of the APA have been satisfied. Cal. Gov. Code §  
9 11340.5. The agency must give the public notice of its proposed regulatory action  
10 (Cal. Gov. Code §§ 11346.4, 11346.5); issue a complete text of the proposed  
11 regulation with a statement of the reasons for it (Cal. Gov. Code § 11346.2(a), (b));  
12 give interested parties an opportunity to comment on the proposed regulation and to  
13 request a public hearing (Cal. Gov. Code § 11346.8(a)); respond in writing to public  
14 comments (Cal. Gov. Code § 11346.9); and forward a file of all materials on which  
15 the agency relied in the regulatory process to the Office of Administrative Law (Cal.  
16 Gov. Code § 11347.3(b)), which reviews the regulations for consistency with the law,  
17 clarity, and necessity (Cal. Gov. Code §§ 11349.1, 11349.3). Defendants have done  
18 none of these things in adopting New Procedure 770.

19  
20 3. New Procedure 770 is not a binding or properly approved execution  
21 protocol that can be utilized by the State of California in light of the state’s failure to  
22 comply with the APA. Cal. Gov. Code § 11340.5.

23  
24 4. The APA provides that “[a]ny interested person may obtain a judicial  
25 declaration as to the validity of any regulation or order or repeal by bringing an action  
26  
27  
28

1 for declaratory relief in the superior court in accordance with the Code of Civil  
2 Procedure.” Cal. Gov. Code § 11350(a). In such an action, the regulation or order  
3 may be declared to be invalid for a substantial failure to comply with the APA. Id.  
4 Plaintiff is entitled to such relief as a matter of law and is seeking such relief in the  
5 Superior Court of the State of California, County of Marin, Case No. CV 061436.  
6 The Superior Court has ordered that the matter be decided by summary judgment, and  
7 has calendared same for hearing on December 6, 2006.  
8

9  
10 5. California’s lethal injection protocol, set forth in Procedure 770, violates  
11 the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition on the “infliction of unnecessary pain in the  
12 execution of the death sentence.” Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber, 329 U.S.  
13 459, 463 (1947); see also Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 173 (1976) (the  
14 punishment may be not “excessive”).  
15

16 6. The lethal injection protocol impermissibly subjects the inmate “to an  
17 unnecessary risk of unconstitutional pain or suffering.” Cooper v. Rimmer, 379 F.3d  
18 1029, 1033 (9th Cir. 2004); see also Cooney v. Taft, 430 F. Supp. 2d 702, 708 (S.D.  
19 Ohio 2006) (in view of emerging evidence calling into question the conclusions of  
20 Dr. Mark Dershwitz, “Court is persuaded that there is an unacceptable and  
21 unnecessary risk . . . that [plaintiff] could suffer unnecessary and excruciating pain  
22 while being executed . . .”).  
23

24  
25 7. The unnecessary risk of substantial pain imposed by the lethal injection  
26 protocol renders the method of execution contained therein unconstitutional. Fierro  
27  
28



1 v. Gomez, 77 F.3d 301, 307 (9th Cir.), vacated as moot sub nom. Gomez v. Fierro,  
2 519 U.S. 918 (1996) (moot in light of Cal. Penal Code § 3604).

3 8. The protocol involves a “substantial risk” of an extended period of “intense  
4 physical pain.” Fierro, 77 F.3d at 308; see also Rupe v. Wood, 863 F. Supp. 1307,  
5 1313-15 (W.D. Wash. 1994), vacated in part as moot, 93 F.3d 1434 (9th Cir. 1996)  
6 (holding that a “significant” risk (less than 24% probability) of decapitation rendered  
7 judicial hanging unconstitutional as applied to an obese inmate).  
8

9  
10 9. The records from previous executions demonstrate the inherent, substantial  
11 risk the inmate will experience agonizing and prolonged pain, in violation of  
12 “evolving standards of decency,” and “contemporary values concerning the infliction  
13 of a challenged sanction.” Gregg, 428 U.S. at 173; Beardslee v. Woodford, 395 F.3d  
14 1064, 1075 (9th Cir. 2005) (California’s execution logs “contain indications that there  
15 were problems associated with the administration of the chemicals that may have  
16 resulted in prisoners being conscious during portions of the executions.”); Fierro, 77  
17 F.3d at 307 (“the key question to be answered in a challenge to a method of execution  
18 is how much pain the inmate suffers.”).  
19

20  
21 10. The protocol’s failure to provide for any meaningful monitoring of  
22 anesthetic depth by appropriate medical personnel exposes plaintiff to a substantial  
23 risk of extreme pain. See Order Denying Conditionally Plaintiff’s Motion for  
24 Preliminary Injunction, February 14, 2006, at 14 (in view of “substantial question” as  
25 to whether inmate might regain consciousness after administration of sodium  
26 thiopental, Court allows State to implement alternative procedure of continuous  
27  
28

1 presence of “qualified individual” to independently verify that inmate is unconscious  
2 before either pancuronium bromide or potassium chloride is injected).

3 11. The risk of inadequate anesthesia is compounded by the fact that  
4 Procedure 770 requires that *no* personnel be present in the execution chamber when  
5 *any* of the drugs are administered thus preventing personnel from visual and tactile  
6 verification that the drugs are actually being administered to the inmate, or that the  
7 sodium pentothal anesthetic has taken effect. Cooper v. Rimmer, 379 F.3d 1029,  
8 1033 (9th Cir. 2004) (state prohibited from subjecting inmate “to an unnecessary risk  
9 of unconstitutional pain or suffering.”).

10 12. The protocol’s failure to anticipate foreseeable events, and to provide  
11 contingency plans for such events subjects plaintiff to an unnecessary risk of  
12 unconstitutional pain. See id.

13 13. The execution protocol involves acts by prison personnel which are  
14 prohibited by law. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2051; 2052; 2860; 2860.5; Magit v.  
15 Bd. of Med. Exam’rs, 57 Cal. 2d 74, 366 P.2d 816, 17 Cal. Rptr. 488 (1961).

16 14. The protocol is performed by prison personnel with criminal records of  
17 misconduct, and who lack skill, competence, professionalism, patience, stability,  
18 training, qualifications, mental health, and the necessary character to perform  
19 executions and the tasks associated with executions. Ford v. Wainwright, 477 U.S.  
20 399, 410 (1986) (plurality opinion) (the Eighth Amendment “protect[s] the dignity of  
21 society itself from the barbarity of exacting mindless vengeance.”); Taylor v.  
22 Crawford, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42949, at \*20 (W.D. Mo. June 26, 2006) (court is  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 “gravely concerned” about condition of physician who mixes the lethal drugs); *id.* at  
2 \*21-22 (court concludes it would be “almost impossible” for the physician to monitor  
3 the inmate’s anesthetic depth in the manner physician described in his deposition).

4  
5 15. The protocol is implemented under unacceptable conditions that  
6 unnecessarily increase the risk of unconstitutional pain, including overcrowding;  
7 obstructed views; inadequate lighting; sound suppression; remote administration of  
8 the drugs; insufficient supervision; unqualified management; and the absence of  
9 meaningful participation by properly licensed medical personnel. Taylor v. Crawford,  
10 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42949, at \*21-22 (W.D. Mo. June 26, 2006) (darkness and  
11 obstructed view result in inadequate monitoring of anesthetic depth); (Anderson v.  
12 Evans, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39407, at \*14 (W.D. Okla. Dec. 20, 2005), aff’d, 2006  
13 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1632 (W.D. Okla., Jan. 11, 2006) (court refuses to dismiss Eighth  
14 Amendment challenge where inmate alleges, inter alia, that execution personnel are  
15 untrained in the use of IV catheters; improper placement and monitoring of catheters  
16 can lead to inadequate anesthesia; medical personnel do not oversee the placement of  
17 catheters).

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 16. The use of sodium pentothal, an ultrashort-acting barbiturate anesthetic  
23 which is extremely sensitive to errors in preparation, to be administered through a  
24 high risk failure scenario more than likely will result in “the inmate not [being]  
25 properly sedated by the first drug, . . . [and] experienc[ing] torturous pain.”  
26 Beardslee, 395 F.3d at 1071; Taylor v. Crawford, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42949, at  
27 \*21 (W.D. Mo. June 26, 2006) (“the process of mixing the three different drugs and  
28

1 knowing the correct amount of the drugs to dissolve in the correct amount of solution  
2 involves precise measurements”).

3 17. Pancuronium bromide “paralyzes all skeletal or voluntary muscles, but []  
4 has no effect whatsoever on awareness, cognition, or sensation.” Beardslee, 395 F.  
5 3d at 1071. The state has failed to provide any legitimate justification for the use of  
6 pancuronium bromide, and apparently uses it merely to prevent witnesses from  
7 observing movement “that could be interpreted as . . . pain or discomfort.” Beardslee,  
8 395 F.3d at 1076 n.13.

9  
10  
11 18. Administered on their own, pancuronium bromide and potassium chloride  
12 would violate the Eighth Amendment. Morales v. Hickman, 438 F.3d 926, 928 (9th  
13 Cir. 2006) (“[t]here is no dispute that in the absence of a properly administered  
14 anesthetic, Morales would experience the sensation of suffocation as a result of the  
15 pancuronium bromide and excruciating pain from the potassium chloride activating  
16 nerve endings in Morales’ veins.”).

17  
18  
19 19. The enactment of laws by at least nineteen states that mandate the  
20 exclusive use of a sedative or expressly prohibit the use of a neuromuscular blocking  
21 agent in the euthanasia of animals provides objective evidence that society’s  
22 “contemporary values” (Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. at 173) render California’s lethal  
23 injection procedure unacceptable. Beardslee, 395 F.3d at 1073.

24  
25  
26 20. Thiopental sodium is a Schedule III controlled substance under the  
27 Controlled Substance Act. Federal law requires the state to keep accurate logs as to  
28 the amount of this drug that it has used, dispensed, or disposed of. 21 U.S.C. § 827;

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

1 21 C.F.R. §§ 1304.03, 1304.04, 1304.11, 1304.21. The violations of specified  
2 procedures and federal laws for obtaining, storing, preparing, using, dispensing,  
3 disposing, and appropriately labeling the drugs, all affect their efficacy and subject  
4 the inmate “to an unnecessary risk of unconstitutional pain or suffering.” Cooper v.  
5 Rimmer, 379 F.3d 1029, 1033 (9th Cir. 2004).  
6

7 20. Procedure 770 does not require medically trained personnel to supervise  
8 or assist in the medical tasks necessary to prepare for the execution. These tasks  
9 include mixing the sodium pentothal solution, setting up the IV line and associated  
10 equipment, including the “Y” injection site, in order to ensure that fluids do not leak  
11 and are not misdirected, finding a usable vein, properly inserting the IV line in the  
12 proper direction, and verifying that the drugs are flowing into the inmate’s vein rather  
13 than into surrounding tissue. These tasks require a high degree of specialized  
14 training. The absence of these tasks subject the inmate “to an unnecessary risk of  
15 unconstitutional pain or suffering.” Cooper v. Rimmer, 379 F.3d 1029, 1033 (9th  
16 Cir. 2004).  
17  
18  
19

20 21. Procedure 770 creates the unnecessary and unacceptable risk that the  
21 drugs will be administered in the wrong order as a result of the improper management  
22 of the team and the labeling of the syringes. If an error in loading or labeling the  
23 syringes occurs, the personnel administering the drugs will have no means of  
24 detecting it. In addition, because the drugs are administered from another room, IV  
25 line extensions must be used, which increases the risk that a flaw or kink in the IV  
26 line will disrupt the flow of drugs. Thus, the State cannot establish that “the risk has  
27  
28

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

1 been minimized as much as possible . . . .” Campbell v. Wood, 18 F.3d 662, 687 n.17  
2 (9th Cir. 1994).

3 Defendants agree that the above are disputed legal issues without agreeing that  
4 all are relevant to or necessarily need to be decided by the Court in this action.  
5

6  
7 Plaintiff’s Conclusions of Law

8  
9 1. The implementation of Operational Procedure 770 contains a substantial  
10 risk of unnecessary pain in the execution of the sentence of death, thereby depriving  
11 plaintiff of his rights under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to be free from  
12 cruel and unusual punishment, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.  
13

14 Defendants’ Conclusions of Law

15 1. Conducting a lethal injection execution pursuant to OP 770 does not result  
16 in cruel and unusual punishment or deprive Plaintiff of any right under the Eighth or  
17 Fourteenth Amendments. Defendants refer the Court to the pleadings filed in  
18 opposition to Plaintiff’s motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Injunction.  
19  
20

21  
22 WITNESSES TO BE CALLED AND TIME ESTIMATE

23 The following witnesses will be called at the hearing by plaintiff, other than  
24 solely for impeachment or rebuttal.

25 1. Witness #1 - execution team leader for scheduled execution of plaintiff. This  
26 witness will testify regarding team members’ qualifications and training, and the  
27 execution protocol and practices;  
28

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

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

|                                     |                             |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 4 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

2. Witness #3 - Licensed Vocational Nurse, execution team member. This witness will testify regarding team members' qualifications and training, and the execution protocol and practices;

|                                     |                             |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 4 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

3. Witness #4 - Licensed Vocational Nurse, execution team member. This witness will testify regarding team members' qualifications and training, and the execution protocol and practices;

|                                       |                             |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 1.5 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

4. Witness #5 - execution team leader for last 8 California executions. This witness will testify regarding team members' qualifications and training, and the execution protocol and practices;

|                                     |                             |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 4 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

5. Warden Ornoski - warden for last two lethal injection executions and scheduled execution of plaintiff. This witness will testify regarding defendant's management and oversight of execution team members' qualifications, and the execution protocol and practices;

|                                     |                             |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 2 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

**MCBREEN & SENIOR**  
 1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 552-5300

6. Warden Woodford - warden for four lethal injection executions. This witness will testify regarding defendant's management and oversight of execution team members' qualifications, and the execution protocol and practices;

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

7. Warden Calderon - warden for four lethal injection executions. This witness will testify regarding defendant's management and oversight of execution team members' qualifications, and the execution protocol and practices;

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

8. Anesthesiologist #2 - this witness will testify regarding execution training and compliance with this Court's February 14, 2006 order;

|                                    |                             |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 1 hour | Defendant's time estimate - |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

9. Robert Singler, M.D. - this witness will testify regarding execution training and compliance with this Court's February 14, 2006 order;

|                                    |                             |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 1 hour | Defendant's time estimate - |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

10. Donald Calvo, M.D. - CDCR doctor who has attended executions;

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

11. Jack St. Clair, M.D. - CDCR doctor who has attended executions;

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300



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

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

12. Thomas Rosko, M.D. - CDCR doctor who modified execution protocol;

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

13. Darc Keller - CDCR Secretary in charge of plaintiff's scheduled execution;

|                                       |                             |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 1.5 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

14. Lt. Eric Messick - Administrative Assistant of the Warden and spokesperson for San Quentin State Prison;

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

15. San Quentin Pharmacist - practices and procedures regarding refrigerated storage of drugs;

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 20 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - |
|--|-----------------------------|

16. Denise Dull - Legal Affairs Coordinator for San Quentin State Prison and person with knowledge of record retention and preparation;

|                                       |                             |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 1.5 hours | Defendant's time estimate - |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

17. Cindy Adcock - execution witness of North Carolina execution that used 1.5 grams of Thiopental;

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - 15 minutes |
|--|--|

18. Heather Jarvis - execution witness of North Carolina execution that used 1.5 grams of Thiopental;

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - 15 minutes |
|--|--|

19. Kim Stevens - execution witness of North Carolina execution that used 1.5 grams of Thiopental;

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - 15 minutes |
|--|--|

20. Chuck Patterson - California execution witness;

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - 15 minutes |
|--|--|

21. Margo Ricconi - California execution witness;

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 30 minutes | Defendant's time estimate - 15 minutes |
|--|--|

21. William Ebling, Ph.D. - pharmacologist who will present evidence that the administration of thiopental as described in Operational Procedure 770 and the prior executions creates a substantial and unreasonable risk that an inmate will be inadequately sedated during an execution;

|                                       |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Plaintiff's time estimate - 2.5 hours | Defendant's time estimate - 1.5 hours |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

22. Dr. Kevin Concannon - doctor of veterinary medicine and a diplomat of the American College of Veterinary Anesthesiologists who will present evidence that

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

1 California's lethal injection protocol is not an acceptable method of euthanasia for  
2 animals.

|                                      |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 3 Plaintiff's time estimate - 1 hour | 4 Defendant's time estimate - 1 hour |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|

5  
6 23. Mark Heath, M.D. - anesthesiologist who will present evidence that California's  
7 lethal injection protocol is more likely than not to cause extreme and excruciating  
8 pain to the inmate.

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 9 Plaintiff's time estimate - 4 hours | 10 Defendant's time estimate - 3 hours |
|---------------------------------------|--|

11  
12 The following witnesses will be called at the hearing **by defendant**, other than solely  
13 for impeachment or rebuttal.

14  
15 1. Robert Singler, M.D. - anesthesiologist who will testify on the properties and use  
16 of the drugs used in a lethal injection execution in light of the procedure set forth in  
17 O.P. 770.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 18 Plaintiff's time estimate - 4 hours | 19 Defendant's time estimate - 3.5 hours |
|--|--|

20  
21 2. Dr. Brent Ekins - will present evidence on the pharmacological properties of the  
22 drugs used in lethal injection execution.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 23 Plaintiff's time estimate - 1.5 hours | 24 Defendant's time estimate - 2 hours |
|--|--|

25  
26 The witness list and/or time estimates from plaintiff will be substantially  
27 reduced based upon the stipulated facts set forth above. The final best estimates will  
28 be modified upon further review of the stipulated facts, disputed facts, and the

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

witnesses deposition testimony, and will be submitted to the Court. Defendants will be better able to make time estimates when the parties have agreed upon a final witness list.

Should Plaintiff continue to include any current or former members of the execution team on their witness list Defendants request that such testimony be taken at San Quentin State Prison under the same terms and conditions as applied to the March 30, 2006 hearing with Witness # 1.

Defendants intend to move to exclude the testimony of some witnesses as irrelevant.

JOINT EXHIBIT LIST

The following documents and items will be offered as exhibits at the evidentiary hearing, other than solely for impeachment or rebuttal. The parties have conferred with respect to the objections.

| Exh. No. | Description   | Sponsoring witness | Objections |
|----------|---|--------------------|------------|
| 1        | Photo of syringe attachment site                                  |                    |            |
| 2        | Pentothal mixing instructions                                     |                    |            |
| 3        | Photo of door in antechamber                                      |                    |            |
| 4        | Photo of saline bags and light                                    |                    |            |
| 5        | Photo of chamber door, window to mixing room, and drug cart       |                    |            |
| 5A       | Xerox Photo of chamber door, window to mixing room, and drug cart |                    |            |

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
 1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 552-5300

**MCBREEN & SENIOR**  
 1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 552-5300

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

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 6   | Photo depicting location for delivery of drugs               |  |  |
| 7   | Handwritten log from Thompson execution                      |  |  |
| 8   | Printed and handwritten log from Siripongs execution         |  |  |
| 8A  | Printed log from Siripongs execution                         |  |  |
| 9   | Printed and handwritten log from Babbitt execution           |  |  |
| 9A  | Printed log from Babbitt execution                           |  |  |
| 10  | Printed and handwritten log from Rich execution              |  |  |
| 10A | Printed log from Rich execution                              |  |  |
| 11  | Printed and handwritten log from Massie execution            |  |  |
| 11A | Printed log from Massie execution                            |  |  |
| 12A | Printed and handwritten log from Anderson execution by Calvo |  |  |
| 12B | Printed log from Anderson execution by second doctor         |  |  |
| 13  | Printed and handwritten log from Beardslee execution         |  |  |
| 13A | Printed log from Beardslee execution                         |  |  |
| 14  | Printed and handwritten log from S. Williams execution       |  |  |
| 14A | Printed log from S. Williams execution                       |  |  |
| 15  | Printed and handwritten log from Allen execution             |  |  |
| 15A | Printed log from Allen execution                             |  |  |
| 16  | Redacted LVN license for Witness #3                          |  |  |
| 17  | OP 770 dated March 6, 2006                                   |  |  |
| 18  | Photo of chamber EKG machine                                 |  |  |

**MCBREEN & SENIOR**  
 1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 552-5300

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

|    |   |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
| 19 | Memo re S. Williams veins   |  |  |
| 20 | Memo re Allen veins   |  |  |
| 21 | Photo of execution chamber from witness side                                  |  |  |
| 22 | Photo of door to execution chamber from antechamber                           |  |  |
| 23 | Photo of execution chamber depicting right side of window, IV bags, and light |  |  |
| 24 | Photo of gurney depicting left arm rest                                       |  |  |
| 25 | Printed log from K. Williams execution  |  |  |
| 26 | Photo of closeup on IV bags and light in chamber                              |  |  |
| 27 | Photo of syringes on cart   |  |  |
| 28 | Photo of panel for attachment of syringes                                     |  |  |
| 29 | Printed log from Bonin execution  |  |  |
| 30 | Redacted LVN license for Witness #4   |  |  |
| 31 | Pages 43-44 from OP 770   |  |  |
| 32 | Subpoena for Witness #5   |  |  |
| 33 | Dr. Ekins' Report   |  |  |
| 34 | List of Dr. Ekins' source material  |  |  |
| 35 | Table re pentothal from Dr. Ekin's materials                                  |  |  |
| 36 | Dr. Singler's report  |  |  |
| 37 | Dr. Singer's CV   |  |  |
| 38 | Dr. Dershwitz's declaration from Cooper v. Rimmer                             |  |  |
| 39 | Dr. Dershwitz's declaration from Perkins v. Beck                              |  |  |
| 40 | Dr. Concannon's CV  |  |  |
| 41 | Dr. Concannon's report  |  |  |

|    |       |   |  |  |
|----|-------|---|--|--|
| 1  | 42    | AVMA Euthanasia Guidelines                                      |  |  |
| 2  | 43    | AVMA brochure re: animal euthanasia                             |  |  |
| 3  | 44    | Dr. Concannon's declaration in <i>Brown v. Beck</i>             |  |  |
| 4  |       |   |  |  |
| 5  | 45    | AC brief of Dr. Concannon et al. from <i>Hill v. McDonough</i>  |  |  |
| 6  |       |   |  |  |
| 7  | 46    | Dr. Concannon's declaration in <i>Page v. Beck</i>              |  |  |
| 8  |       |   |  |  |
| 9  | 47    | Limits on use of AVMA Guidelines                                |  |  |
| 10 |       |   |  |  |
| 11 | 48    | Article from DVM Magazine                                       |  |  |
| 12 |       |   |  |  |
| 13 | 49    | Dr. Ebling's report   |  |  |
| 14 |       |   |  |  |
| 15 | 50    | Dr. Ebling's CV   |  |  |
| 16 |       |   |  |  |
| 17 | 51-74 | OPEN FOR NEW EXHIBITS   |  |  |
| 18 |       |   |  |  |
| 19 | 75    | Controlled substance inventory log 2004                         |  |  |
| 20 |       |   |  |  |
| 21 | 76    | Controlled substance inventory log dated 1/4/05                 |  |  |
| 22 |       |   |  |  |
| 23 | 77    | Controlled substance inventory log dated 4/10/06                |  |  |
| 24 |       |   |  |  |
| 25 | 78    | OP 770, issued 10/1/92, revised 6/13/03                         |  |  |
| 26 |       |   |  |  |
| 27 | 79    | Robert Singler, M.D. copies of legal opinions and document      |  |  |
| 28 |       |   |  |  |
|    | 80    | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of IV bags                             |  |  |
|    |       |   |  |  |
|    | 81    | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of panel for syringes                  |  |  |
|    |       |   |  |  |
|    | 82    | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of panel for syringes - from left side |  |  |
|    |       |   |  |  |
|    | 83    | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of EKG monitor                         |  |  |
|    |       |   |  |  |
|    | 84    | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of door to death cell                  |  |  |

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
 1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 552-5300

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

|     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 85  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of antechamber ceiling vent                                      |  |  |
| 86  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of radiator  |  |  |
| 87  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of radiator  |  |  |
| 88  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of execution chamber from witness side - antechamber door open   |  |  |
| 89  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of execution chamber from witness side - antechamber door closed |  |  |
| 90  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of window into execution chamber; stopcocks                      |  |  |
| 91  | 3-30-06 Crittendon partial photo of syringes on cart                                      |  |  |
| 92  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of gurney - from foot  |  |  |
| 93  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of gurney - from right side                                      |  |  |
| 94  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of gurney depicting right arm rest                               |  |  |
| 95  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of gurney depicting left arm rest                                |  |  |
| 96  | 3-30-06 Crittendon photo of gurney depicting both arm rests                               |  |  |
| 97  | March 20, 1978 Court of Appeal Opinion in Civil Case No. 40716                            |  |  |
| 98  | Handwritten execution Log Michael Morales   |  |  |
| 99  | Letter of Jeanne Woodford, March 13, 2006, to Senator Thomas McClintock                   |  |  |
| 100 | Governor's Office Privilege Log   |  |  |
| 101 | Execution Team Training Logs (78 pages)   |  |  |



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

USE OF DISCOVERY

The parties have not yet agreed on the use of discovery responses and depositions to be used at the hearing, other than solely for impeachment or rebuttal.

MISCELLANEOUS

During the course of discovery, including through the depositions of Anesthesiologist #2, Warden Ornoski, and Witness #1, plaintiff learned of additional claims against defendants. The facts underlying these claims continue to be investigated. Prior to the September 13, 2006 pre-hearing conference, plaintiff will file a motion for leave to file an amended pleading pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), setting forth additional claims against defendants. The amended pleading will allege that defendants' actions taken vis a vis plaintiff, his counsel, and the Court between February 14 and February 21, 2006, deprived plaintiff of the Eighth Amendment's protection against deliberate government indifference to the risk of pointless suffering, in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 1983. See, e.g., Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976).

The briefing for the basis of this motion has been presented to defendant. Defendant intends to oppose the motion.

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300

1 DATED: September 1, 2006

MCBREEN & SENIOR

2  
3 By: /s/ David A. Senior

4  
5 DAVID A. SENIOR  
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
7 MICHAEL ANGELO MORALES

8 DATED: September 1, 2006

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

9  
10 By: /s/ Dane R. Gillette

11 DANE R. GILLETTE  
12 Attorneys for Defendants  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MCBREEN & SENIOR  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1450  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 552-5300