

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
 Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)  
 steven.bauer@lw.com  
 Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)  
 sadik.huseny@lw.com  
 Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)  
 amit.makker@lw.com  
 Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar No. 294263)  
 shannon.lankenau@lw.com  
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 Telephone: 415.391.0600  
 Facsimile: 415.395.8095

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
 Richard P. Bress (*pro hac vice*)  
 rick.bress@lw.com  
 Melissa Arbus Sherry (*pro hac vice*)  
 melissa.sherry@lw.com  
 Anne W. Robinson (*pro hac vice*)  
 anne.robinson@lw.com  
 Tyce R. Walters (*pro hac vice*)  
 tyce.walters@lw.com  
 Genevieve P. Hoffman (*pro hac vice*)  
 genevieve.hoffman@lw.com  
 Gemma Donofrio (*pro hac vice*)  
 gemma.donofrio@lw.com  
 555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000  
 Washington, D.C. 20004  
 Telephone: 202.637.2200  
 Facsimile: 202.637.2201

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR  
 CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW  
 Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)  
 jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Ezra D. Rosenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Dorian L. Spence (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 dspence@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Ajay P. Saini (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 asaini@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Maryum Jordan (Bar No. 325447)  
 mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)  
 pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org  
 1500 K Street NW, Suite 900  
 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 Telephone: 202.662.8600  
 Facsimile: 202.783.0857

*Additional counsel and representation  
 information listed in signature block*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:20-cv-05799-LHK

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT  
 OF MOTION FOR STAY AND FOR  
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Date: TBD  
 Time: TBD  
 Place: Courtroom 8  
 Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

On September 20 and September 21, 2020 Defendants disclosed to Plaintiffs, via FTP transfer, a number of Administrative Record (“AR”) documents which had been initially redacted or entirely withheld on assertions of attorney client and/or deliberative process privilege. Although the number of unique documents is relatively small, given duplication (or near-duplication) in the documents produced, it is nevertheless telling. And it explains why Defendants have devoted so little time and space to defending their actions on the merits. The materials confirm what Plaintiffs have long argued: the Census Bureau was forced to scrap a decade of detailed planning and testing for a retrofitted and truncated “Replan” that they knew was impossible to do right. The decision to abandon the COVID-19 Plan did not come from the Bureau. The decision did not acknowledge, let alone explain, the radical departure from the factual findings underlying the COVID-19 Plan—it simply ignored those contrary facts and the serious reliance interests engendered thereby. The decision was not driven by a (mistaken) belief that adherence to the COVID-19 Plan would be unlawful because of the statutory deadline. And the decision cannot be said to have a “reasonable relationship” to an actual enumeration when the Bureau itself said it did not.

The recently released Office of Inspector General for the U.S. Department of Commerce publicly released a report titled *The Acceleration of the Census Schedule Increases the Risks to a Complete and Accurate 2020 Census* (“OIG Report”) further confirms what the existing AR shows. This is not surprising, given that the AR is largely a product of the OIG Documents. In that report, dated September 18, 2020 and first provided to the Department of Commerce on or about that date, the Inspector General made two primary findings: (1) “[t]he decision to accelerate the Census schedule was not made by the Census Bureau,” and (2) “[t]he accelerated schedule increases the risks to obtaining a complete and accurate 2020 Census.”

Plaintiffs have written at length about all of these matters, and look forward to discussing them in detail at the September 22 preliminary injunction hearing. For purposes of this submission, Plaintiffs will allow a small but illuminating subset of these new AR materials—set forth below, along with other evidence the Court has seen and the OIG Report—to speak with their own voice (with attribution left off of the selected images, due to Defendants not yet

providing Plaintiffs with PII-redacted materials). In addition, as requested, Plaintiffs attach as Exhibit A a short timeline of when and how the Replan was created and adopted and when and how the agency considered the statutory deadlines for the COVID-19 Plan and the Replan.

**A. The Decision To Truncate The Census Timeline Was Not Made By The Census Bureau And Was Made Shortly After The President’s July 21, 2020 Apportionment Exclusion Order**

As the OIG Report found, the decision to cut the census timeline nearly in half was not made by the Census Bureau and was made shortly after the President’s July 21, 2020 Apportionment Exclusion Order. Exhibit A goes into the timeline in detail. Below are key excerpts from the AR that speak to that finding.

- **July 23, 2020**, “2020 updated for Soft Launch at DOC” email chain between Bureau employees (KD40<sup>1</sup>; DOC-7737-39):

We need to sound the alarm to realities on the ground - people are afraid to work for us and it is reflected in the numbers of enumerators working in the 1a ACOs. And this means it is ludicrous to think we can complete 100% of the nation's data collection earlier than 10/31 and any thinking person who would believe we can deliver apportionment by 12/31 has either a mental deficiency or a political motivation.

Agree that elevating the reality is critical, especially in light of the push to complete NRFU asap for all the reasons we know about.

- **July 29, 2020**. According to Mr. Fontenot (Sep. 4, 2020, Fontenot Dec. ¶ 81), on July 29, several days before the Replan announcement on August 3, 2020, the Secretary of Commerce “directed” the Bureau to “present a plan” to “accelerate the remaining operations” to meet the December 31 deadline.
- **August 1, 2020**, “”Draft Replan Deck for Review” email chain between Bureau employees (KD88, DOC\_10183):

**Subject:** Re: Draft Replan Deck for Review  
**Date:** Saturday, August 01, 2020 9:13:20 PM

I REALLY think we need to say something on page 2 that this is what we’ve been directed to do or that we are presenting these in response to their direction/request. This is not our idea and we shouldn’t have to own it.

<sup>1</sup> “KD1” is a cross reference to Plaintiffs’ final Key Document submission to this Court. Plaintiffs use that protocol throughout this filing for ease of reference.

- **August 1, 2020.** “Draft Replan Deck for Review” follow-up email chain between Bureau employees, (KD95, DOC\_10940):

Question - “your” or “Department of Commerce request”

**Subject:** Re: Draft Replan Deck for Review  
**Date:** Saturday, August 01, 2020 10:55:00 PM

I would say your is more accurate, but your call.

- **August 2, 2020** email between top Census Bureau employees, (DOC\_13150), in a meeting set up to discuss what the Census Bureau had been directed to do:

**Subject:** Fw: brute force method - meeting info in this message  
**Date:** Sunday, August 02, 2020 10:46:23 AM  
**Attachments:** Operational and Processing Options to meet September 30 Final.pdf

- **September 18, 2020.** And here’s what the OIG found, after an investigation into this very issue:

## Findings and Conclusion

### I. The Decision to Accelerate the Census Schedule Was Not Made by the Census Bureau

On August 3, 2020, the Bureau issued a press release announcing the decision “to accelerate” the 2020 Census.<sup>22</sup> The schedule change was not the Bureau’s decision, nor was it the first time the 2020 Census schedule had been changed. Senior officials at the Bureau, including the Director, did not know who ultimately made the decision to accelerate the Census schedule. As a consequence, this management alert does not identify the decision maker. Some Bureau officials speculated the decision came from the Department, while others thought the decision likely came from the White House. However, Bureau officials confirmed that the decision was not the Bureau’s.

### B. The Replan’s Truncated-Census Directive Was Made Without Consultation With Bureau Officials, With No Analysis Of The Statutory Deadline or Effects on Accuracy, and Without Considering All Relevant Issues

As set forth above, and previously discussed in Plaintiffs’ filings, the undisputed record establishes that Bureau officials were given no more than a few days to determine how best to

1 implement a directive previously made, *without any apparent deliberation at all*. This decision-  
 2 making process was backwards: the Secretary directed the Bureau to revise the timeline to meet  
 3 the deadline without considering important factors that would bear on that, and then directed  
 4 Bureau experts to, effectively, make it happen, regardless of what the open issues or problems  
 5 were, what had been studied or analyzed (or not), and so on. By way of just a few examples:

- 6 • **July 31, 2020**, “5:00 Process Planning Meeting” email chain between Census employees

7 Should we mention any global risks, such as the following:

8 -- Many of these changes delay activities required for developing the  
 9 remaining data products following apportionment, some of them (but not all  
 10 until after 12/31/20, increasing the risk that they will not be completed on  
 11 time, whatever that schedule becomes.

12 -- Many of these changes, separately or in combination, have not been

13 <value><item>DOC\_0009073</item></value>

14  
 15 previously studied or analyzed for their effects on data quality. We risk  
 16 decreasing the accuracy of apportionment counts and other statistics  
 17 released later.

18 -- With these changes to the original operational plan and schedule, we  
 19 increase the chance of subsequent data concerns. For example, it may be  
 20 necessary to release tabulations later that are not all completely consistent.

- 21 • **July 31, 2020**, email between Bureau employees responding to the “new revised  
 22 schedule” shown to them (KD67; DOC\_9242):

23 Thanks Christine! Jason will you take the lead with Christine to polish what we will send to  
 24 Tori? We want to emphasize what will not get done for each file review and apportionment -  
 25 considering the Clark revised schedule. We also want to emphasize the risk involved. I would  
 26 also focus on the total pop review as well as the characteristics review. It is not clear if the  
 27 demo characteristics will be on this initial version of the CUF - and we don't want anyone  
 28 trying to cut our days because they think we have less review to do.

- **July 31, 2020**, “2020 Census Response Processing Review,” (KD68, DOC\_9245), details various potential issues from the shortened schedule, including “inaccurate counts of the total population and characteristics” and differentials between states:

With the current proposed schedule, we plan to conduct the activities listed below; however, there will be limitations in how in-depth we can complete the reasonableness review listed in activity six. We will also focus our review on the first four to ten states produced by DITD; later states will undergo a more cursory review. Finally, with this reduced schedule, the time available to review any reruns will be limited.

- **July 31, 2020**, “Backend Processing Options,” (KD69, DOC\_9458): Discussing significant risks with the “highly compressed schedule,” including threats to the overall fitness of use of the Census

#### Backend Processing Options

This plan presents a revised and highly compressed schedule for 2020 Census post-processing that increases the likelihood of delivering apportionment counts by 12/31/20. It is based on two critical assumptions:

1. Post processing must start by **10/1/2020**, which means all Self Response and FLD collection activities close out, and data are reconciled and loaded in the Census Data Lake (CDL) by that date.
2. Post-processing work activities in this plan are limited to those required to produce apportionment counts, with an understanding that redistricting data products will be taken up later.

All of the changes below, taken together, reduce the time required for post-processing such that, when combined with the operational changes above in this document, make it possible to deliver the apportionment package in time to meet the statutory deadline. All of these activities represent an abbreviated process that is likely to reduce the accuracy of the 2020 Census and threaten the fitness for use. Additionally, the downstream effect of separating apportionment and redistricting processing activities is not known, but presents further risk to redistricting product creation and accuracy.

- **July 31, 2020**, “Operational and Processing Options to Meet September 30,” (KD80, DOC\_9951), which lays out the “significant risk to the accuracy of the census data” from “[a]ccelerating the schedule by 30 days,” *requires* that at least 99% of Housing Units in every state must be resolved, and lays out how each additional day of NRFU results in significant capacity expansion:

#### Operational and Processing Options to meet September 30 July 31, 2020

Due to COVID-19 impacts, the conclusion of field operations for the 2020 Census was previously scheduled to end on October 31. In order to meet the statutory date of December 31, 2020 for apportionment, field operations must now conclude no later than September 30, 2020. Accelerating the schedule by 30 days introduces significant risk to the accuracy of the census data. In order to achieve an acceptable level of accuracy, at least 99% of Housing Units in every state must be resolved.

##### Nonresponse Followup Operational Options

Option	Potential Benefits	Potential efficiency gain / applicable costs to implement
1. Early Start of NRFU operations early everywhere nationwide on 8/9 instead of 8/11	Begins data collection in advance of scheduled start date, allowing more production days.	There are currently 50 days in the production schedule for NRFU. Each additional day of production expands the capacity by 2%.
Cycle 2 Early Starts (7/30 Scheduled):		

- **September 18, 2020**, the recently-released OIG Report, highlights this issue as well at pages 9-10:

The accelerated schedule raises risk besides the potential for natural disasters. As one official explained, the Bureau “no longer [has] the runway” of time to correct discovered errors through re-enumeration, as was necessary in the field portion of the 2010 and 2000 Censuses.

*The Bureau “no longer [has] the runway” of time to correct discovered errors through re-enumeration.*

*As described by one senior Bureau official*

Given this accelerated schedule, the Bureau views “resolving” or “completing” at least 99 percent of housing units in every state, at the end of data collection, to be an acceptable level of accuracy and completeness.<sup>33</sup> “Resolving” or “completing” a housing unit means determining: (1) whether it is in-fact a housing unit; (2) whether it is occupied or vacant; and (3) how many people live there and their basic census characteristics. The 99 percent resolution rate is based on the resolution rates achieved in the fieldwork of the 2010 and 2000 Censuses. Bureau officials expressed confidence that the Bureau could reach the 99 percent figure by the end of data collection.

Senior Bureau officials do not know what will occur if the 99 percent target is not met by September 30, 2020. If the goal is not reached by that date, a decision must be made to either continue data collection to meet 99 percent completeness in every state (and achieve an acceptable level of accuracy and completeness) or cease data collection. There are risks either way. If data collection ends before 99 percent completeness is met in every state, the Bureau will not achieve what it views as an acceptable level of accuracy and completeness. But, if data collection extends beyond September 30, 2020, that will either further condense an already compressed schedule for data processing—which carries its own risks—or the Bureau will miss the December 31, 2020, statutory deadline.

*Senior Bureau officials do not know what will occur if the 99 percent target is not met by September 30, 2020. If the goal is not reached by that date, a decision must be made to either continue data collection to meet 99 percent completeness in every state (and achieve an acceptable level of accuracy and completeness) or cease data collection. There are risks either way.*

According to several senior Bureau officials, the Bureau will miss the December 31, 2020, deadline if data collection goes beyond September 30, 2020.

///

**C. It Was Universally Understood and Undisputed That Truncating The Timeline Would Produce A Flawed and Inaccurate Census, and That It Was “Impossible” To Meet a December 31 Deadline**

- **July 21, 2020**, “Census Bureau Restarts as States Re-Opens,” (KD31, DOC\_7086):

**Restart Cannot Compress Timeline**

The earliest field operations in the continental United States had begun by March 18, 2020. This includes efforts to count rural, remote and special populations, as well as all of the work needed to hire, process and prepare hundreds of thousands of workers needed for later operations.

The original operational timetable for the census required beginning field operations on March 12, 2020, would have enabled the Census Bureau to field its peak workforce by May 15, 2020, and would have made it possible to finish collection of data by July 31, 2020. This entire sequence of dates shifted forward as the Census Bureau suspended operations per Task Force guidance. The work not done during the past eight weeks cannot be appreciably compressed.

The suspension lasted across the entire country until May 4, 2020, per Task Force guidance, and is only now restarting on a phased geographic and operational basis. But even if the White House Task Force guidance permitted the Census Bureau to restart operations in every state and locality tomorrow, the Census Bureau assesses it currently cannot complete 2020 Census field operations in time to deliver apportionment counts by December 31, 2020, and redistricting data by April 1, 2021.

The sequence of completing the 2020 Census is critical to its accuracy: from the creation of the address list, to the invitation to respond, managing the self-response process, the followup and data collection from the approximately 50 million households that do not self-respond, and finally the tabulation of data for state and local population counts which fuel reapportionment and redistricting. The 2020 Census operations are designed to cover specific populations for a complete count of the population. If specific operations are cut or reduced, the effect would be

to miss specific parts of the population lead to an undercount of specific groups. That is why operations like update leave targeting rural populations or group quarters enumeration are critical to full coverage and need to be done in specific orders.

- **April 17, 2020**, “High Level Talking Points” (KR2, DOC\_265):

**Why does post processing take so long?**

As is evident from the description above, post processing activities must, by their nature, occur in a consecutive sequence, and quality assurance needs to be performed at each step of the process. Subject matter expert review is critical to ensuring the quality of the data during this iterative process. It is important to note post processing cannot begin in earnest until all in-field work is completed. We have examined our schedule and compressed it as much as we can without risking significant impacts on data quality. Given the important uses of census data collection processing, it is vital that we not short cut these efforts or quality assurance steps.

- **May 8, 2020**, “Operational Timeline V5 Clean,” (KR17, DOC\_2287)—showing that the Bureau could not meet the statutory deadline as far back as May, given the COVID-19 delays—and that it was fully funded for the extension it sought:

- **If Census Bureau could fully restart today, under ideal conditions:** As a rough calculation: If today, May 8, the Census Bureau could restart Update Leave and NRFU Enumerator Onboarding in every state and locality, which it cannot, NRFU Enumerator on boarding could finish on June 3. However, Update Leave would finish on June 8, so the earliest you could field NRFU enumerators to begin that operation would be the following week, June 15. This means the earliest you could finish NRFU, even with the ability to restart immediately every state, is approximately September 1, 2020. By finishing NRFU on September 1, 2020, apportionment counts could not be delivered until January 31, 2021, already after the statutory deadline. Redistricting information would be provided to states by April 30, 2021, already after the statutory deadline.
- **Based on the initial suspension of field activities in line with OMB guidance, the Census Bureau can no longer meet its statutory deadlines for delivering apportionment and redistricting data, even conducting operations under unrealistically ideal conditions.**
- **Reality of Phased Restarting:** While the Census Bureau is looking to complete field operations as quickly as possible, the reality of the phased, rolling reopening of states is that it will be difficult to expect to start Update Leave and NRFU Enumerator Onboarding in the states that are furthest behind until the middle of June. This puts the Census Bureau closer to the second week of August before NRFU can fully begin.
- If NRFU begins in its last location by August 14, 2020, it can finish by October 31, 2020. If NRFU is completed by October 31, 2020, apportionment counts can be delivered by April 1, 2021. Redistricting information could be delivered by July 1, 2021. This would require a 90-day extension of the existing statutory deadlines for producing this data.
- **Due to the unpredictable nature of the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as increased risks of hurricanes affecting the Southeast during NRFU, the Census Bureau in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce proposed a 120-day extension of the statutory deadline, to mitigate this risk and in order to make one single request of Congress and not need to come back for an additional extension.**
- The Secretary of Commerce and Census Bureau leadership have been conducting considerable outreach to state and local elected officials to promote 2020 Census participation. Multiple Governors have communicated with the Census Bureau or made public statements supporting an extension, including Governor Kay Ivey of Alabama. The Secretary has been calling local elected officials for low responding districts, and has found unanimous support for an extension.
- Finally, all of this extension is fully covered by the Census Bureau’s already appropriated contingency budget.

- **July 23, 2020**, “Elevator Speech” (KR43, DOC\_8021-24; *see also* July 21 version, KR36, DOC\_7323-26) (Shared with GAO, *see* DOC\_0008025-28).

Draft 7-23-2020 v4

### Elevator Speech

**High Level Message:** Curtailing census operations will result in a census that is of unacceptable quality. The Census Bureau needs the full 120 days that the Administration originally requested from Congress to have the best chance to produce high quality, usable census results in this difficult time. Shortening the time period to meet the original statutory deadlines for apportionment and redistricting data will result in a census that has fatal data quality flaws that are unacceptable for a Constitutionally-mandated national activity.

I. **Shortening field data collection operations will diminish data quality and introduce risk.**

- COVID-19 presents an unprecedented challenge to field data collection. While starting NRFU early in select ACOs is a good idea and has provided the Census Bureau a short window to work out any kinks with our systems, the Census Bureau will likely need to conduct staggered operations all over the country from July until the end of October in order to conduct the most complete NRFU possible. Areas that are now low risk for COVID will become high risk and vice versa, and the Census Bureau will need to adapt NRFU on an almost daily basis to conduct data collection using the Administration’s gating criteria.
- The Census Bureau is adapting NRFU for the COVID environment, including development of systems for an outbound telephone operation, increased use of administrative records (is this last one true?), and significantly increasing selections for field positions to compensate for a much higher dropout rate from enumerator training to field deployment. These adaptations are designed to adapt NRFU operations to the COVID environment, not to shorten the operation.
- NRFU is not the only challenge; the Census Bureau is also adapting its operations for counting the group quarters population, college students and the homeless.
- All of these adapted operations are intended to produce the most accurate census possible, and cannot be rushed without diminishing data quality or introducing unacceptable risk to either operations or field staff.

- **July 27, 2020**, Presentation titled “House Committee on Oversight and Reform – Decennial Hearing Prep Materials” (KD 45; DOC\_0008148-58 at 58). As late as a July 27, 2020 hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, the Bureau’s line was still that the statutory deadlines could not be reached:

### Post Processing

The current methodology that has been researched, developed and tested over the decade based on proven processes used in prior Census’ and upgraded with improved current technology and processes will not enable us to meet the statutory deadlines based on projected current field completion dates.

**D. The Replan’s “Truncated-Census” Directive Was Based on a Contrived Justification Incongruous with the Record, Because Officials Never Considered The Legality Of The COVID-19 Plan To Mandate A Flawed, Erroneous Census**

- **April 19, 2020**, “Talking Points Re: 2020 Census Extension & Shift in Field Operations” (KR11, DOC\_1687), shows that, in fact, the Census Bureau recognized that the statutory deadline must yield to accuracy and reality:

**Are there constitutional concerns with delaying the delivery of the apportionment counts?**

- We are dealing an unprecedented situation.
- The reality is that we can’t make the deadline as of right now.
- We carefully reviewed the proposal and it went through inter-agency review, including review by the Department of Justice.
- Their view is that there is not a constitutional issue with the proposal.
- We can get back to you with more on those considerations [To my knowledge, we do not have a copy of DOJ comments].
- [NOTE – written prospectively assuming the proposed language is cleared and that any concerns raised were addressed]

- **April 23, 2020**, edited version of talking points, (KR12, DOC\_1973):

**Are there constitutional concerns with delaying the delivery of the apportionment counts?**

- The proposal complies with the Constitution and will assist the Census Bureau in fulfilling its constitutional requirement to conduct an enumeration. [This sentence is suggested by OGC.]

- **April 28, 2020**, call notes/agenda for “Call with Representative Jamie Raskin,” (KD15, DOC\_2222-2230):

**Is delaying the apportionment data constitutional?**

- The proposal underwent a constitutional review, and we believe it is constitutional and that the adjusted schedule will help us fulfill the constitutional requirement of a complete and accurate census.
- The 12/31 deadline is in statute.
- In history, especially for the many of the earlier censuses, data collection and reporting the counts shifted beyond the zero year.

- **August 2, 2020**, “Slides” email between Bureau personnel, showing that implementation of the July 21, 2020 PM was a priority while the Bureau struggled to truncate overall Census operations. (KD104, **DOC-0013288-920**):

A team has been established and is tasked with deriving the best feasible methodology (in both terms of statistical methods and operational feasibility) to achieve the goals of directives from Secretary Ross regarding implementation of the PM.

- **No documents**: Plaintiffs also must briefly note the absence of any documents in one key respect: no documentary evidence showing any belief, or even discussion, that the Bureau was compelled to produce an inaccurate or erroneous Census, solely in order to meet any statutory deadline. There was similarly no evidence that the preexisting COVID-19 Plan would somehow become unlawful and must be halted if the statutory deadline were not extended.

Dated: September 22, 2020

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By: /s/ Sadik Huseny

Sadik Huseny

Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)

steven.bauer@lw.com

Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)

sadik.huseny@lw.com

Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)

amit.makker@lw.com

Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar. No. 294263)

shannon.lankenau@lw.com

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: 415.391.0600

Facsimile: 415.395.8095

Richard P. Bress (admitted *pro hac vice*)

rick.bress@lw.com

Melissa Arbus Sherry (admitted *pro hac vice*)

melissa.sherry@lw.com

Anne W. Robinson (admitted *pro hac vice*)

anne.robinson@lw.com

Tyce R. Walters (admitted *pro hac vice*)

tyce.walters@lw.com

Genevieve P. Hoffman (admitted *pro hac vice*)

genevieve.hoffman@lw.com

Gemma Donofrio (admitted *pro hac vice*)

gemma.donofrio@lw.com

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.637.2200

Facsimile: 202.637.2201

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League; League of Women Voters; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Harris County, Texas; King County, Washington; City of San Jose, California; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; and the NAACP*

Dated: September 22, 2020

By: /s/ Jon M. Greenbaum  
 Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)  
 jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Ezra D. Rosenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Dorian L. Spence (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 dspence@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Maryum Jordan (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Ajay Saini (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 asaini@lawyerscommittee.org  
 Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)  
 pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org  
**LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL  
 RIGHTS UNDER LAW**  
 1500 K Street NW, Suite 900  
 Washington, DC 20005  
 Telephone: 202.662.8600  
 Facsimile: 202.783.0857

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;  
 City of San Jose, California; Harris County,  
 Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,  
 Washington; Black Alliance for Just  
 Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the  
 NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

Wendy R. Weiser (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 weiserw@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
 Thomas P. Wolf (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 wolf@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
 Kelly M. Percival (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 percivalk@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
**BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE**  
 120 Broadway, Suite 1750  
 New York, NY 10271  
 Telephone: 646.292.8310  
 Facsimile: 212.463.7308

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;  
 City of San Jose, California; Harris County,  
 Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,  
 Washington; Black Alliance for Just  
 Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the  
 NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

Mark Rosenbaum (Bar No. 59940)  
 mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org

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

**PUBLIC COUNSEL**

610 South Ardmere Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90005  
Telephone: 213.385.2977  
Facsimile: 213.385.9089

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of San Jose*

Doreen McPaul, Attorney General  
dmcpaul@nndoj.org  
Jason Searle (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
jasearle@nndoj.org

**NAVAJO NATION DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

P.O. Box 2010  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Telephone: (928) 871-6345

*Attorneys for Navajo Nation*

Dated: September 22, 2020

By: /s/ Danielle Goldstein  
Michael N. Feuer (Bar No. 111529)  
mike.feuer@lacity.org  
Kathleen Kenealy (Bar No. 212289)  
kathleen.kenealy@lacity.org  
Danielle Goldstein (Bar No. 257486)  
danielle.goldstein@lacity.org  
Michael Dundas (Bar No. 226930)  
mike.dundas@lacity.org

**CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

200 N. Main Street, 8th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone: 213.473.3231  
Facsimile: 213.978.8312

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Los Angeles*

Dated: September 22, 2020

By: /s/ Michael Mutalipassi  
Christopher A. Callihan (Bar No. 203010)  
legalwebmail@ci.salinas.ca.us  
Michael Mutalipassi (Bar No. 274858)  
michaelmu@ci.salinas.ca.us

**CITY OF SALINAS**

200 Lincoln Avenue  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Telephone: 831.758.7256  
Facsimile: 831.758.7257

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Salinas*

1 Dated: September 22, 2020

By: /s/ Rafey S. Balabanian  
Rafey S. Balabanian (Bar No. 315962)  
rbalabanian@edelson.com  
Lily E. Hough (Bar No. 315277)  
lthough@edelson.com  
**EDELSON P.C.**  
123 Townsend Street, Suite 100  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Telephone: 415.212.9300  
Facsimile: 415.373.9435

7 Rebecca Hirsch (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
rebecca.hirsch2@cityofchicago.org  
8 **CORPORATION COUNSEL FOR THE**  
9 **CITY OF CHICAGO**  
Mark A. Flessner  
Stephen J. Kane  
10 121 N. LaSalle Street, Room 600  
Chicago, IL 60602  
11 Telephone: (312) 744-8143  
12 Facsimile: (312) 744-5185

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago*

14 Dated: September 22, 2020

By: /s/ Donald R. Pongrace  
Donald R. Pongrace (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
dpongance@akingump.com  
15 **AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD**  
16 **LLP**  
2001 K St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
17 Telephone: (202) 887-4000  
18 Facsimile: 202-887-4288

19 Dario J. Frommer (Bar No. 161248)  
dfrommer@akingump.com  
20 **AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD**  
21 **LLP**  
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 600  
22 Los Angeles, CA 90067-6022  
23 Phone: 213.254.1270  
Fax: 310.229.1001

24 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Gila River Indian*  
25 *Community*

1 Dated: September 22, 2020

By: /s/ David I. Holtzman  
David I. Holtzman (Bar No. 299287)  
David.Holtzman@hklaw.com  
**HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP**  
Daniel P. Kappes  
Jacqueline N. Harvey  
50 California Street, 28th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 743-6970  
Fax: (415) 743-6910

*Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Los Angeles*

**ATTESTATION**

I, Sadik Huseny, am the ECF user whose user ID and password authorized the filing of this document. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that all signatories to this document have concurred in this filing.

Dated: September 22, 2020

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

By: /s/ Sadik Huseny  
Sadik Huseny