

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS
6 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7 AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,

10 Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-90-0520 LKK JFM P (E.D. Cal.)

11 v.

12 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
13 et al.,

14 Defendants.
_____ /

15 MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,

16 Plaintiffs,

No. C 01-1351 TEH (N.D. Cal.)

17 v.

18 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
19 et al.,

20 Defendants.
_____ /

21 CARLOS PEREZ, et al.,

22 Plaintiffs,

No. C 05-5241 JSW (N.D. Cal.)

23 v.

24 MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

25 Defendants.
26 _____ /

1 JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al.,

2 Plaintiffs,

No. C 94-2307 CW (N.D. Cal.)

3 v.

4 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
5 et al.,

ORDER APPROVING SPACE
COORDINATION AGREEMENT

6 Defendants.
7 _____/

8 The Receiver in Plata, the Special Master in Coleman, and the Court Representatives in
9 Perez and Armstrong have presented to the judges in the above-captioned cases an agreement
10 that they have reached during the coordination meetings that they have held to date. The
11 agreement, which is attached to this order, was presented to the undersigned for review and
12 approval. By order filed September 5, 2008, the parties in the above-captioned cases were
13 granted until September 26, 2008, to show cause why the attached agreement should not be
14 adopted as an order of the court.

15 On September 26, 2008, defendants filed a response to the order to show cause. Therein,
16 defendants state that they support the proposed agreement, except insofar as the creation of a
17 single unit to manage office space planning “is a step toward creating a new and distinct health
18 agency” with jurisdiction over California prisoners that, according to defendants, the Receiver
19 has stated his intention to create. Defendants’ Response to Order to Show Cause, filed
20 September 26, 2008, at 2. Defendants’ objection to the creation of a new state agency is noted.
21 Nothing in the agreement before the court requires further consideration of that objection at this
22 time.

23 /////

24 /////


25 /////

26 /////


1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the attached space coordination
2 agreement is adopted as an order of these courts.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**


5
6 DATED: 10/07/08


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


7
8
9
10 DATED: 10/07/08


THELTON E. HENDERSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11
12
13
14 DATED: 10/07/08


JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15
16
17
18 DATED: 10/07/08


CLAUDIA WILKEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Space Coordination Agreement

Space planning is defined as the leasing and management of physical office space including, but not limited to, space design, tenant improvements, and procurement of furniture (both conventional and modular), required office equipment, and the voice and data structure to operate an office.

The Office of the Receiver (responsible for medical care remedial infrastructure) needs to work in coordination with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the Division of Correctional Health Care Services (DCHCS) (responsible for the mental health, dental, and the Americans with Disabilities Act remedial infrastructure) to achieve the respective missions, visions, and goals of the *Plata*, *Coleman*, *Perez*, and *Armstrong* class actions. Based on previously approved coordination agreements, the Receiver is responsible for Information Technology, Telemedicine, Construction including New Healthcare Facility Construction and Upgrade Construction, Chief Executive Officer Pilot Program, CIM-GACH, Contracts, Credentialing, Hiring, and Pharmacy. A coordinated office space agreement would ensure that the space related infrastructure required will be available to support these agreements.

Currently, office space planning is managed separately by the Receiver and DCHCS. It would be more practical and efficient for this process to be managed and handled by a single unit. The Court representatives in *Plata*, *Coleman*, *Perez*, and *Armstrong* propose that the Receiver's *Plata* Support Division Business Operations Unit assume responsibility, in coordination with DCHCS and subject to the oversight of the Court representatives in *Plata*, *Coleman*, *Perez*, and *Armstrong*, for all non-institutional office space statewide for the medical, mental health, and dental programs. Placing this responsibility under a single unit will ensure that the planning, acquisition, and management of necessary space would support both the Receiver's objectives and the requirements of the mental health and dental programs in a cost efficient manner.