Thimesch Taw Offices 1 TIMOTHY S. THIMESCH, ESQ. (No. 148213) GENE FARBER, ESQ. (No. 44215) - Of Counsel 2 158 Hilltop Crescent Walnut Creek, CA 94597 3 Direct: (925) 588-0401 4 Facsimile: (888) 210-8868 tim@thimeschlaw.com 5 genefarber@gmail.com 6 Attorney for Plaintiff FRANCIE MOELLER 7 CAROLINE L. FOWLER, City Attorney (SBN 110313) JOHN J. FRITSCH, Assistant City Attorney (SBN 172182) 8 City of Santa Rosa 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 8 9 Santa Rosa, California 95404 Telephone: (707) 543-3040 10 Facsimile: (707) 543-3055 11 Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF SANTA ROSA 12 13 14 U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 15 16 FRANCIE MOELLER, Case No. CV 09-1100 LB 17 Plaintiff, Civil Rights 18 ν. FULL CONSENT DECREE ORDER AND JUDGMENT 19 CITY OF SANTA ROSA; and DOES 1 through 50, Inclusive, 20 Defendant. 21 22 23 24 25 FULL CONSENT DECREE ORDER AND JUDGMENT 26 Plaintiff FRANCIE 1. MOELLER is person with 27 disability condition that requires the use of a scooter or cane 28 for mobility. Defendant CITY OF SANTA ROSA owns, operates,

Thimesch Lew Offices 158 HILLTOP CRESCENT WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597-3452 (925) 588-0401

Consent Decree Judgment and Order: Case No. CV 09-1100 LB controls and/or maintains the following public parking lots and garages within city limits and described at City of Santa Rosa Downtown Parking Services map (Attachment 1):

Lot L-2 at 521 5th St. B.

Α.

6

4

5

Lot L-7 at 769 2nd St. C.

Lot L-D at 9 4th St.

7

Lot L-10 at 730 5th St. D.

8

Lot L-11 at 540 5th St. E.

9

Lot L-13 at 200 4th St. F.

10

Lot L-14 at 200 5th St. G.

11

Η. Garage G-1 at 521 7th St.

12

13

I. Garage G-3 at 735 5th St.

14

Garage G-5 at 635 3rd St. J.

15

Garage G-9 at 97 D St. K.

16

Garage G-12 at 555 1st St. L.

17

Hereafter, the foregoing Public Parking Areas shall be referred to as the "Subject Parking Lots".)

- 18
- Plaintiff FRANCIE MOELLER filed this action 2.
- 19
- herself and all other similarly situated members of the public, and against Defendant CITY OF SANTA ROSA ("Defendant"), to
- 20
- vindicate the public rights under Title II of the Americans 21
- 22
- with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et
- 23
- and through corresponding California including law, 24

seq.; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C.

- 25
- Government Code Sections 11135 and 4450-4456; Civil Code
- 26
- Sections 51, 54 and 54.1, et seq.; and Title 24 of the
- 27

28

3. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated these

California Code of Regulations.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

statutes and their corresponding regulations by failing to provide full and equal access to the Subject Public Parking Areas. Specific identification of the facilities and their deficiencies has been identified by Plaintiff through the joint inspection of the Parties and through Plaintiff's provision to Defendant of her expert's report.

4. Plaintiff alleges that the Subject Public Parking Areas have undergone construction triggering the requirement of full compliance with state and federal regulations in the altered areas, and that a further programmatic obligation is imposed on these facilities since the City is qualified government entity regulated by Title II of the ADA, and additionally pursuant to California Government Code Section 11135 and federal Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which imposes similar obligations on government entities that receive federal, state and/or local public funds.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

STIPULATIONS

- 5. Plaintiff's Qualified Disability. Plaintiff is a qualified individual with a physical disability. She requires the near fulltime use of a scooter, cane or other device for mobility.
- 6. Plaintiff's Residence and Status Aggrieved as Potentially Aggrieved. Plaintiff alleges she has standing. She lives in the same county and approximately 20 miles from the this downtown portion of the City, which is near businesses and government facilities that she frequents. While the City does not admit all of the specifics of the

12 13

11

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

allegations, it agrees that it is aware of sufficient undisputed facts to support Plaintiff's qualification "aggrieved and potentially aggrieved" under the relevant statutes, and to support her standing under Article III of the U.S. Constitution.

- 7. Ownership, Control, Operation and/or Maintenance of the Subject Public Parking Areas. Defendant CITY OF SANTA ROSA owns, operates, controls and/or maintains the Subject Public Parking Areas.
- Receipt of Federal, State and Local Funding. For 8. purposes of this decree, Defendant CITY OF SANTA ROSA admits that it receives federal, state and local funding, additionally that such funding has been used to build, alter and maintain the relevant portions of the Subject Public Parking Areas, including the adjoining vehicular roadways passing under the undercrossing.
- Construction History. The parties stipulate that all facilities in issue have undergone sufficient and recent alteration and/or new construction to require at least some level of compliance with the requirements of the 1998 Edition of Title 24, Part 2, of the California Code of Regulations and the Americans With Disabilities Act Access Guidelines published in 1992. The scope of facilities to be corrected under this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment are identified in paragraph 10.
- Scope of Facilities in Issue. The following are the facilities affected by this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment: The Subject Public Parking Areas.

Settlement Agreement between the United States 11. 1 America and The City of Santa Rosa, California under the 2 Americans with Disabilities Act: The parties stipulate that the 3 Department of Justice of the United States of America and the 4 City entered into a settlement agreement (DOJ Settlement) on 5 December 19, 2009 relating to compliance of City facilities and 6 7 programs with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12134. (Attachment 2) In relevant 8 9 10 11 12

part, the facilities subject to the instant Consent Decree are subject to the DOJ settlement with City, and mandated plans of survey, remediation and compliance. In relevant part, City's proposed plan of remediation is subject to DOJ review and approval. 12. The parties have investigated the allegations in the Complaint via plaintiff's consultant Karl Danz and City's

consultant certified access specialist Kim Blackseth.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

13

14

15

16

JURISDICTION

- The facts requisite to federal jurisdiction and venue are admitted. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 for the alleged violations of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. Article III jurisdiction is proper due to §§ 12101, et seq. the Plaintiff's continued exposure and proximity for use of the Subject Public Parking Areas. Pendant jurisdiction of the state law claims arises from a common nucleus of fact and is proper. Venue and intra-district jurisdiction is proper as the property in issue is located in Sonoma County.
 - 14. This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment is

3

terms.

15.

specified herein.

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FULL RESOLUTION OF ISSUES:

which provides as follows:

This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment shall be a full, complete, and final disposition and settlement of the below claims that have been or could have been alleged in the Complaint, including for injunctive relief, declaratory relief, statutory and compensatory damages, including personal and bodily injury, and Plaintiff's claims for reasonable statutory attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs. This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment was reached through negotiations between the parties. The Court shall retain jurisdiction of this action to enforce and interpret this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment. The parties agree that if they or any of them seek Court enforcement of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment, any such enforcement will be by

contingent upon Court approval and acceptance of its terms, and

the normal retention of jurisdiction to interpret and enforce

Decree Order and Judgment in order to resolve the below listed

allegations raised in the Complaint filed with this Court on

March 12, 2009. Accordingly, they agree to the entry of this

Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment without trial or further

adjudication of any issues of fact or law concerning the issues

Court's entry of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment,

WHEREFORE, the parties hereby agree and stipulate to the

The parties agree to entry of this Full Consent

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

noticed motion,

this Order, the parties acknowledge

Code section 1542 which reads:

IN

HIS

SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

EXIST

17. As a part of a compromise of global liability, the CITY OF SANTA ROSA ["City"] agrees that it has or will perform all work identified in the report of Karl Danz at Attachment 3 with following exceptions and clarifications:

application, or contempt citation.

respect to the injunctive relief and damage claims resolved by

provisions of and any benefits that may be conferred by Civil

WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO

EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR

HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER

HER FAVOR AT

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND

OR

- A. City will provide an accessible pay station and related path of travel in each garage. (Danz report items 12.22; 12.23; 12.26; 12.28; 13.29; 13.30; 13.31; 14.18; 15.4; 15.5)
- B. Garage G-3, G-5 and G-9 height issues shall be resolved consistent with the Department of Justice review and determination of City's presently pending proposal to furnish accessible on-street parking with no height restrictions with a design. Part of that proposal includes the provision of an accessible on street parking location on D Street in the vicinity of Garage G-9. (Danz report items 13.2; 14.4; 15.2)

With

that they waive the

TO CLAIMS

TIME

THE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Lots L-4; L-6 and the lot on the west side of C. City Hall are employee-only lots and not subject to this Consent Decree. (Danz report items 3.0, et seq. and 4.0, et seq.)
- Lots and the garage at Santa Rosa Plaza are not D. operated, controlled, or maintained by City of Santa Rosa, and are not subject to this Consent Decree.
- E. City will furnish proper number of the accessible and van parking spaces. (Danz report items 1.1; 7.1; 9.1)

In addition to the forgoing, City of Santa Rosa further agrees that it will survey and furnish accessible facilities at the following locations:

- Pay kiosks at parking lots
- Gutter-swale at head of spaces at Lot L-7 ii.
- iii. Landings at elevator doors at Garage G-12
- iv. Path of travel at southwest corner Garage G-9
- Compromise of Statutory Obligations. The parties the forgoing remedial work specified stipulate that paragraph 17 is strictly a compromise of the programmatic services obligations under Section 202 and 204 of the ADA [42 USC §§ 12132 and 12134], shall be deemed work to "Existing Facilities" 28 CFR §35.150, and thus its performance shall not be treated as triggering any additional duties under §35.151 ("alterations") or Government Code Section 4456 ("alterations and structural repairs").
 - Performance Standards. All ofthe foregoing 19.

5

8

7

11

10

13

12

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

facilities specified in paragraph 17 shall be brought into full and strict compliance with the performance standards for new construction of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24-2 (2008), and Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines, effective January 26, 1992.

- 20. Conflict in Performance Standards. The parties acknowledge that each of the architectural features specified in paragraph 177 is regulated in near parallel fashion as "barriers to disabled access" under both Title 24 and the with Disabilities Americans Act Guidelines, and the corresponding statutory remedies. However, in the event of a conflict between the two sets of regulations identified in the proceeding paragraph, the provisions that supply maximum protection and accessibility to the disabled shall apply.
- 21. Option to Close Facilities. In lieu of making modification to any particular facility or amenity called for by this decree, the Defendant may choose to permanently close such facility or amenity from public use. Such facilities shall not be reopened for public use without provision of full disabled access pursuant to the terms of paragraph 17.
- 22. Time for Compliance. No later than December 19, 2011 and consistent with its obligations under Paragraph 48 of the DOJ settlement, City shall survey and report to Department of Justice the list of access issues identified in Paragraph 17 together with corrective actions and completion dates proposed to resolve any issues remaining outstanding at that date. City's intent is that the Department of Justice shall supervise and determine remediation and compliance. City's obligations

under this Consent Decree shall expire concurrently with expiration of City's obligations under the DOJ Settlement more fully described in Paragraph 11.

Enforcement. Should Plaintiff in the future become aware of any facts or conditions relating to the Subject Public Parking Areas that may give rise to a claim that Defendant has failed to comply with any of the injunctive relief provisions set forth herein, Plaintiff shall, prior to seeking enforcement from this Court, provide notice to the City Attorney's Office. The Defendant shall have sixty (60) days, following receipt of such notification to undertake to correct the alleged violation and/or respond to Plaintiff's allegations. Any response made by Defendant shall be in writing, addressed to Plaintiff's counsel, Tim Thimesch of the Thimesch Law Offices, at his then current address registered with the State Bar. Plaintiff's counsel agrees to contribute pro bono up to three hours in any given calendar year toward these informal negotiation efforts. If Plaintiff determines, in her own good faith discretion, as constrained by the good faith requirements imposed by Rule 11, that the matter(s) are not resolved by Defendant' response, Plaintiff shall be permitted to file a noticed motion under the current case number of this action seeking enforcement of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment. The prevailing party in such motion proceedings, whether in full or in part, may be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs for such motion, i.e., pursuant to normal prevailing party standards that applied under the subject civil rights statutes before entry of this decree.

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

DECLARATORY RELIEF

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

By this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment, and consideration of the global compromise on liability, defendants stipulate that the barriers identified herein for correction, at paragraph 17, supra, constitute past and present violations of Plaintiff's rights under Title Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. §794: and thru corresponding California law, including Government Code Sections 11135 and 4450-4456; Civil Code Sections 51, 54 and 54.1, et seq., and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

25. Plaintiff has filed this action as a public interest lawsuit, specifically alleging on page 1 lines 21 - 22 of her Complaint that she brings the action "on behalf of herself and other similarly situated disabled persons". The parties intend that, this Consent Decree and Order shall additionally be binding upon all persons with disabilities similarly situated to Plaintiff, found to be in privity with her, and thus, to permitted by law, shall have the binding effect of res judicata and/or collateral estoppel. See <u>Headwaters</u>. Inc. v. U.S. Forest Service, 399 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2005).

2324

25

26

27

28

RESOLUTION OF CLAIM FOR REASONABLE STATUTORY DAMAGES:

26. Defendant agrees to pay the amount of \$25, 000 (twenty five thousand dollars) in full_ satisfaction of Plaintiff's claims for bodily and personal injury and for statutory damages under Title II of the ADA, and Civil Code

Consent Decree Judgment and Order: Case No. CV 09-1100 LB

Sections 52 (Unruh Act) and 54.3 (Disabled Persons Act). A check for this amount shall be made payable to "FRANCIE MOELLER," and deposited into the U.S. mail and addressed to plaintiff's counsel within 10 days of approval of the terms and conditions set out in this form of Consent Decree by the City Council of the City of Santa Rosa.

- 27. The parties stipulate that the foregoing amount is intended to be paid in full to Plaintiff, and understand that no part of it shall be received by Plaintiff's Counsel in compensation toward Plaintiff's separate claim for reasonable statutory attorney fees, litigation expenses, and costs.
- 28. FRANCIE MOELLER agrees to pay any and all present or future liens, claims or demands arising as a result of the circumstances giving rise to this Action, and FRANCIE MOELLER will defend, indemnify and save harmless City of Santa Rosa herein from any loss, claim, expense, demand or cause of action of any kind or character through the assertion by any assignee or transferee of a claim, or claims connected with the subject matter of this Consent Decree.

RESOLUTION OF CLAIM FOR REASONABLE STATUTORY ATTORNEYS FEES, LITIGATION EXPENSES AND COSTS:

29. Defendant agrees to pay the amount of \$99,000 (ninety nine thousand dollars) in full satisfaction of Plaintiff's claims for interim and final claims for reasonable statutory attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs, including claims, under Section 505 of the ADA [42 USC 12205]; Civil Code Sections 52, 54.3, and 55; Health & Safety Code Section 19953;

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FULL CONSENT DECREE ORDER AND JUDGMENT:

character as a result of such division.

the City of Santa Rosa.

31. This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment constitutes the entire agreement between the parties on the matters of Plaintiff's claims for injunctive relief, statutory and personal injury damages, and reasonable statutory attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs, and no other statement, promise, or agreement, either written or oral, made by any of the parties or agents of any of the parties, that is not contained in this written Full Consent Decree Order Judgment, shall be enforceable regarding the matters described herein.

and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5. A check for this

amount shall be made payable to "TIM THIMESCH, IN TRUST," and

counsel within 10 days of approval of the terms and conditions

set out in this form of Consent Decree by the City Council of

A division, if any, of the aforementioned sum between

deposited into the U.S. mail and addressed to plaintiff's

TIM THIMESCH and anyone else shall, in no way, affect the

validity of this Consent Decree. TIM THIMESCH will defend,

indemnify and save harmless City of Santa Rosa herein from any

loss, claim, expense, demand, or cause of action of any kind or

25

26

28

24

FULL CONSENT DECREE ORDER AND JUDGMENT BINDING ON PARTIES AND

27 SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST:

32. The parties agree and represent that they have

Thimesch Lew Offices 158 HILLTOP CRESCENT WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597-3452 entered into this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment voluntarily, under no duress, and wholly upon their own judgment, belief, and knowledge as to all matters related to this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment, after having received full advice from counsel.

33. This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment shall be binding on Plaintiff FRANCIE MOELLER, and Defendant CITY OF SANTA ROSA; and any successors in interest. During the period of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment, the parties have a duty to so notify all such successors in interest of the existence and terms of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment during the period of the Court's jurisdiction of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment.

1.0

1.3

JOINT PREPARATION AND SEVERABILITY:

34. This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment is deemed jointly prepared by all parties and shall not be strictly construed against any party as its drafter. If any term of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment is determined by any court to be unenforceable, the other terms of this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment shall nonetheless remain in full force and effect.

SIGNATORIES BIND PARTIES:

35. Signatories on the behalf of the parties represent that they are authorized to bind the parties to this Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment.

////

2 3

> 4 5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

1111

20 21

22

23

24

25

27

28

SIGNATORIES BIND PARTIES:

This Full Consent Decree Order and Judgment may be executed in counterpart signatures, and such signatures may be attached in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and which together shall constitute one and the same signed as faxed Such counterparts may be instrument. signatures, which shall have the same force and effect as original signatures.

Dated:

Print Name: Kathleen

26

Consent Decree Judgment and Order: Case No. CV 09-1100 LB

-15-

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM and AS TO PARAGRAPHS 29 and 30:	
2		
3 4 5	Dated: April, 2011	THIMESCH LAW OFFICES TIMOTHY S. THIMESCH, ESQ. GENE A. FARBER, ESQ. of Counsel
6		1) in timesa
7		Attorneys for Plaintiff FRANCIE MOELLER
8	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
9		CAROLINE L. FOWLER
10		CITY ATTORNEY
11		JOHN J. FRITSCH ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
12		() () () ()
13	!	Attorneys for Defendant
14		CITY OF SANTA ROSA
15		
16		
17		
18		ORDER
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	·	RATES DISTRICT CO
26	1 20 2011	ODERED E
27 28	Date: April 29, 2011	HON. LAUREL FORLER Magistrate Judgeler U.S. Bistweet Court
Shimesch Law Offices 158 HILLTOP CRESCENT WALNUT CREEK, CA 94597-3452 (925) 588-0401	Consent Decree Judgment and Order: Case No. CV 09-1100 LB	-16-