

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
 4  
 5 MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,

6 Plaintiffs,

NO. C01-1351 TEH

7 v.

ORDER RE-APPOINTING  
ADVISORY BOARD

8 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,  
 9 et al.,

10 Defendants.

11  
 12 On June 6, 2008, this Court appointed nine individuals to the Advisory Board and  
 13 subsequently appointed three additional members. Ms. Madeleine LaMarre and Dr. Michael  
 14 Puisis were appointed to terms that expire on June 30, 2011. All other members of the  
 15 Board have terms that expire on June 15, 2010.

16 The Court has found the services of the Board to be extremely useful in its  
 17 consideration and evaluation of the Receivership and all other aspects of the remedial  
 18 process in this case. Each member of the Board has provided valuable contributions at  
 19 regular meetings and, in many cases, in between such meetings. Accordingly, with good  
 20 cause appearing, the following members shall be reappointed to the Board, with terms  
 21 expiring on June 30, 2012: Mr. Starr Babcock (as an *ex officio* member), Dr. Henry  
 22 Chambers, Ms. Rebecca Craig, Dr. Joe Goldenson, Ms. Kathleen Howard, Ms. Madeline  
 23 LaMarre, Dr. David Lawrence, Dr. Michael Puisis, Mr. Arnold Perkins, Dr. Jacqueline  
 24 Tulsy, and Professor Robert Weisberg.<sup>1</sup> All other provisions of the June 6, 2008 Order  
 25 Appointing Advisory Board shall remain in effect as to all Board members.


26  
 27 \_\_\_\_\_  
 28 <sup>1</sup>The Court extends the terms of Ms. LaMarre and Dr. Puisis to be concurrent with the  
 terms of all other Board members. Mr. Richard Bayquen, an original member of the Board,  
 voluntarily resigned in September 2009.

1           In addition, when the Court initially appointed the Advisory Board, it indicated the  
2 possibility that the Board might be asked “to consider specific questions concerning the  
3 remedial process and to perform other duties as assigned,” as well as reviewing the  
4 Receiver’s periodic reports and advising the Court on the Receiver’s progress. June 6, 2008  
5 Order at 2. The Court may, for example, request individual members to conduct reviews of  
6 one or more aspects of the Receiver’s operations, especially in cases where the Board may  
7 suggest to the Court that such reviews are necessary for the Board to fulfill its mission.  
8 While some Board members may be willing to undertake small projects pro bono, the Court  
9 understands that this may not be feasible in all instances and directs that reasonable  
10 compensation shall be provided when requested. The Court will resolve any compensation  
11 issues on an individual basis, and the Receiver shall enter into written contracts with the  
12 necessary Board members for administrative purposes only. Any such contracts shall not  
13 undermine the independence of the Board, which shall continue to report solely to the Court.  
14 Moreover, they shall not change the confidential and privileged status of the  
15 communications by members of the Board with the Court, with other members of the Board,  
16 or with the Receiver and his staff.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 05/12/10

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT