## Case3:98-cv-04935-CRB Document67 Filed11/05/14 Page1 of 5

1	LAURENCE W. PARADIS (CA BAR NO. 122336 KARA JANSSEN (CA BAR NO. 274762)	5)
2	Disability Rights Advocates	
3	2001 Center Street, Fourth Floor Berkeley, California 94704-1204	
4	Telephone: (510) 665-8644 Facsimile: (510) 665-8511	
5	TTY: (510) 665-8716 Email: lparadis@dralegal.org	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
7	KAMALA D. HARRIS	
8	Attorney General of California ELIZABETH S. ANGRES	
9	Supervising Deputy Attorney General GARY OSTRICK	
10	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 211031	
11	300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013	
12	Telephone: (213) 897-8055 Fax: (213) 897-2810	
13	E-mail: Gary.Ostrick@doj.ca.gov	
14	Attorneys for Defendant State of California, acting by and through the Department of Parks & Recreation	
15	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	FOR THE NORTHERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
17		
18		ase No. C-98-04935 CRB
19		RDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION
20	themselves and all others similarly situated, N	EQUESTING COURT APPROVAL OF IODIFICATION OF THE CONSENT
21	Plaintiffs,	PECREE
22	v.	
23	CT ATE OF CALLEONALA DEDARENT	
24	STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, RUTH	
25	COLEMAN, and the STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	
26	Defendants.	
27		
28	1	
	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION REQ	JESTING COURT APPROVAL OF MODIFICATION

On November 7, 2014, at 10:00 a.m., in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the Honorable Charles R. Breyer, United States District Judge, presiding, heard and considered the joint motion of Class Plaintiff's Bonnie Tucker, Peter Mendoza, California Council of the Blind, and Californians for Disability Rights (collectively, Class Plaintiffs), and Defendant the State of California, acting by and through the Department of Parks and Recreation (the State), requesting court approval of modifications to the Consent Decree approved by this Court on November 18, 2005. This Court retains jurisdiction over the Consent Decree according to the terms of that Order approving the Consent Decree. Laurence W. Paradis and Kara Janssen, Disability Rights Advocates, appeared on behalf of the Class Plaintiff's. Deputy Attorney General Gary Ostrick, California Department of Justice, appeared on behalf of the State.

The Court has read and considered the joint motion of the Class Plaintiffs and the State, the memoranda, declarations, and exhibits submitted by the parties, and heard oral argument. Based on its review, the Court finds that the Class Plaintiffs and the State have met their burden under *Rufo v. Inmates of Suffolk County Jail*, 502 U.S. 367 (1992), and their proposed modifications to the Consent Decree are suitably tailored to the changed circumstances of fact and law that has occurred since the Consent Decree was approved on November 18, 2005. In addition, this Court finds that the proposed modifications advance and support the Consent Decree's purpose of providing increased access for persons with disabilities to the park facilities and trails of the State of California's parks. Accordingly, the Court hereby rules as follows:

- 1. The Court GRANTS the Joint Motion Requesting Court Approval of Modification of the Consent Decree.
  - 2. The Consent Decree shall be amended and modified as follows:
    - A. Section II.M. of the Consent Decree shall state:

"Outdoor Developed Areas Standards" shall mean and refer to the U.S. Access Board's Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Guidelines; Outdoor Developed

1 2	Areas, codified at 36 C.F.R. pt. 1191, which is available at http://www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/recreation-facilities/outdoor-developed-areas	
3	B. Section III of the Consent Decree shall state:	
4	This Consent Decree shall become effective on the date of Final Approval.	
5	The terms of this Consent Decree shall expire on June 30, 2028, except that Plaintiffs or Defendants may petition the Court for an extension to the	
6	extent any of the improvements required under Sections IV.A, IV.K., IV.L,	
7	or IV.M.1 will not be completed within the Settlement Period. In deciding a disputed request for an extension, the Court may exercise its discretion,	
8	taking into account all relevant information (including whether a new concessionaire is hired or a new park unit is acquired so close to the end of	
9	the Settlement Period that extending the Consent Decree is inappropriate).	
10	C. The Transition Plan Completion Schedule in Section IV.A. of Consent	
11	Decree shall state:	
12	The Department shall schedule and complete the access modifications	
13	described in its Transition Plan (attached as Exhibit A hereto), including its Work Plan (attached as Exhibit B hereto) and Trails Plan (attached as Exhibit C hereto), and as detailed in other sections of this Consent Decree, according to the following schedule:	
14		
15	1. <u>Level 1 Park Units</u> – The access work at Level 1 park units shall be	
16	completed no later than June 30, 2016.	
17	2. <u>Level 2 Park Units</u> – The access work at Level 2 park units shall	
18	commence no later than July 1, 2013 and be completed no later than June 30, 2018.	
19	3. <u>Level 3 Park Units</u> – The access work at Level 2 park units shall	
20	commence no later than July 1, 2016 and be completed no later than June 30, 2022.	
21		
22	4. <u>Level 4 Park Units</u> – The access work at Level 2 park units shall commence no later than July 1, 2016 and be completed no later than June 30,	
23	2024.	
24	5. <u>Level 1 Trails</u> – The trail access work at Level 1 park units shall be	
25	completed no later than June 30, 2015.	
26	6. <u>Level 2 Trails</u> – The trail access work at Level 2 park units shall commence no later than July 1, 2013 and be completed no later than June 30,	
	2018.	
27		
28	3	
	ii	

## Case3:98-cv-04935-CRB Document67 Filed11/05/14 Page5 of 5

1 1. Each fiscal year, the Department shall provide to Class Counsel and the Monitor a detailed Yearly Work List of the access work that it proposes to 2 engage in that fiscal year pursuant to the timeline set forth in the Transition Plan. The Yearly Work List will also include: (a) any new proposed exceptions, 3 pursuant to Section IV.D.2.; (b) any planned new parks and/or new construction (costing over \$500,000), pursuant to Section IV.M.; (c) an assessment of the 4 Department's progress in completing the Transition Plan items for each park level; 5 and (d) any significant developments that may cause delays or problems in timely completion and what efforts the Department has made or plans to make to mitigate 6 the delays. 7 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 IT IS SO ORDERED 10 DATED: November 5, 2014 11 Judge Charles R. Breyer 12 13 14 15 16 CHARLES R. BREYER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28