

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

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

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,  
et al.,

Defendants.

MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

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

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,  
et al.,

Defendants.

CARLOS PEREZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

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

v.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

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

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 **Space Coordination Agreement**

2  
3 Space planning is defined as the leasing and management of physical office space including, but not  
4 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.

5 The Office of the Receiver (responsible for medical care remedial infrastructure) needs to work in  
6 coordination with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the  
7 Division of Correctional Health Care Services (DCHCS) (responsible for the mental health, dental,  
8 and the Americans with Disabilities Act remedial infrastructure) to achieve the respective missions,  
9 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.

10 Currently, office space planning is managed separately by the Receiver and DCHCS. It would be  
11 more practical and efficient for this process to be managed and handled by a single unit. The Court  
12 representatives in *Plata*, *Coleman*, *Perez*, and *Armstrong* propose that the Receiver's *Plata* Support  
13 Division Business Operations Unit assume responsibility, in coordination with DCHCS and subject to  
14 the oversight of the Court representatives in *Plata*, *Coleman*, *Perez*, and *Armstrong*, for all non-  
15 institutional office space statewide for the medical, mental health, and dental programs. Placing  
16 this responsibility under a single unit will ensure that the planning, acquisition, and management  
17 of necessary space would support both the Receiver's objectives and the requirements of the mental  
18 health and dental programs in a cost efficient manner.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26