

1 MARY KELLY PERSYN (CABN 264782)
2 **PERSYN LAW & POLICY**
3 **912 Cole Street PMB 124**
4 **San Francisco, CA 94117**
5 **(628) 400-1254**
6 **marykelly@persynlaw.com**

7 GREGORY L. DISKANT*
8 ARON FISCHER*
9 BENJAMIN F. JACKSON*
10 JACOB NEWMAN*
11 **PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP**
12 **1133 Avenue of the Americas**
13 **New York, NY 10036-6710**
14 **(212) 336-2000**
15 **(212) 336-2222**

16 *Not admitted in this jurisdiction

17 *Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
20 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*

22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 WILBUR ROSS, JR., *et al.*

25 Defendants.

26 -----
27 CITY OF SAN JOSE, *et al.*

28 Plaintiffs,

29 vs.

30 WILBUR ROSS, JR., *et al.*

31 Defendants.

Case Nos. 3:18-cv-01865-RS,
3:18-cv-02279-RS

**BRIEF OF COMMON CAUSE,
TREVOR POTTER, REP. JODY
L. MCNALLY, AND JUSTICE
ROBERT ORR (RET.) AS AMICI
CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS**

Date: February 1, 2019

Time: N/A

Judge: Honorable Richard Seeborg

Dept.: 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF PERSONS IS THE CORE CONSTITUTIONAL VALUE OF ARTICLE I, SECTION 2 AS AMENDED BY THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.	3
A. The Founders agreed that all persons—not just citizens—must be included in the representation base for members of Congress.	3
B. The Constitution resolves the tension between the broad right to equal representation and the then-narrow right to vote by distinguishing between those who can vote and those who are counted for census purposes.....	5
C. The Fourteenth Amendment reaffirmed the representation of all persons as a foundational principle of our democracy.	6
II. CENSUS RESULTS DRIVE BOTH POLITICAL REPRESENTATION AND FUNDING FOR LARGE GROUPS OF PEOPLE IN BROAD AREAS.....	7
III. SECRETARY ROSS’S FAILURE TO CONSIDER THE RISK THAT INCLUDING A CITIZENSHIP QUESTION ON THE 2020 CENSUS WOULD UNDERMINE EQUALITY OF REPRESENTATION CONFIRMS THAT HIS DECISION TO ADD THE QUESTION VIOLATES THE ENUMERATION CLAUSE AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.....	9
A. Being counted, and being included in the apportionment process, is integral to the fundamental right to political representation.	9
B. Secretary Ross’s decision to add the citizenship question—and thereby undermine a core constitutional commitment—violates both the substantive and procedural protections of the APA.....	11
CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page(s)

Cases

California v. Ross,
18-cv-01865-RS (N.D. Cal August 17, 2018) 3

Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe,
401 U.S. 402 (1971)..... 12

Common Cause et al. v. Rucho et al.,
1:16-CV-1026 (M.D.N.C.)..... 1

Evenwel v. Abbott,
136 S. Ct. 1120 (2016)..... *passim*

Fed’n for Am. Immigration Reform (FAIR) v. Klutznick,
486 F. Supp. 564 (D.D.C. 1980)..... 3

Harper v. Va. Bd. of Elections,
383 U.S. 10

Kadrmas v. Dickinson Pub. Sch.,
487 U.S. 450 (1988)..... 10

Lindsey v. Normet,
405 U.S. 56 (1972)..... 10

Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. (State Farm),
463 U.S. 29 (1983)..... 11

New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Commerce (New York),
Nos. 18-CV-2921 & 18-CV-5025, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6954 (S.D.N.Y. Jan.
15, 2019) *passim*

Rucho, et al. v. Common Cause, et al.,
No. 18-422, *consideration of appellate jurisdiction postponed to hearing on
merits*, 586 U.S. --- (Jan. 4, 2019) 1

Shaw v. Reno,
509 U.S. 630 (1993)..... 6

Utah v. Evans,
536 U.S. 12

Wesberry v. Sanders,
376 U.S. 1 (1964)..... 4

1 *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*,
118 U.S. 356 (1886).....7

2 **Other Authorities**

3 86 Cong. Rec. 4372 (1940).....3

4 *5 Facts About Illegal Immigration in the U.S.*, PEW RES. CTR. (Apr. 27, 2017),
5 [http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/27/5-facts-about-illegal-](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/27/5-facts-about-illegal-immigration-in-the-u-s/)
6 [immigration-in-the-u-s/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/27/5-facts-about-illegal-immigration-in-the-u-s/).....5

7 Richard Briffault, *Legal History: The Contested Right to Vote*, 100 MICH. L. REV.
1506, 1510 (2002).....5

8 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUND., *Who Voted in Early America?*, BILL OF RIGHTS IN
9 ACTION (Fall/Winter 1991).....5

10 THE FEDERALIST No. 54.....6

11 FOUNDING FAMILIES: DIGITAL EDITIONS OF THE PAPERS OF THE WINTHROPS AND THE
12 ADAMSES (C. James Taylor ed., 2015)4

13 MICHAEL J. KLARMAN, *THE FRAMERS’ COUP* (2016)4

14 Justin Levitt, *Citizenship and the Census*, 119 COLUM. L. REV. (forthcoming 2019).....7

15 *National Demographic Characteristics*, U.S. DEP’T OF LABOR,
16 <https://www.doleta.gov/naws/pages/>8

17 U.S. CENSUS, FOREIGN-BORN: 2014 CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY DETAILED
18 TABLES tbl.1.1 (2014), *available at*
<https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2014/demo/foreign-born/cps-2014.html>8

19 U.S. CENSUS, USES OF CENSUS BUREAU DATA IN FEDERAL FUNDS DISTRIBUTION 3-8
20 (2017), *available at* [https://www2.census.gov/programs-](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-papers/Uses-of-Census-Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf)
21 [surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-papers/Uses-of-Census-](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-papers/Uses-of-Census-Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf)
22 [Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-papers/Uses-of-Census-Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf)8

23 UNIV. OF CAL. AGRIC. ISSUES CTR., *AGRICULTURAL WORKFORCE* (2009), *available at*
24 [https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/agvision/docs/Agricultural_](https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/agvision/docs/Agricultural_Workforce.pdf)
25 [Workforce.pdf](https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/agvision/docs/Agricultural_Workforce.pdf)9

26 GORDON S. WOOD, *THE CREATION OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC, 1776-1787*, at 170
27 (2d ed. 1998)4

28

1 **INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE**

2 *Amicus curiae* Common Cause was founded by John Gardner in 1970 as a nonpartisan
3 “citizens lobby” whose primary mission is to protect and defend the democratic process and make
4 government accountable and responsive to the interests of ordinary people, and not merely to those
5 of special interests. Common Cause is one of the nation’s leading democracy organizations and
6 currently has over 1.2 million members and supporters nationwide and local chapters in 25 states,
7 including states that will be disproportionately impacted by the inclusion of a citizenship question on
8 the 2020 Census, including California, Colorado, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island,
9 and Texas. Common Cause has been a leading advocate for policies that ensure a responsive and
10 representative government.

11 Common Cause filed an *amicus* brief in *Evenwel v. Abbott*, 136 S. Ct. 1120 (2016). Common
12 Cause also recently filed an *amicus* brief in litigation in the U.S. District Court for the Southern
13 District of New York concerning Secretary Ross’s decision to include a citizenship question on the
14 2020 Census. *New York v. U.S. Department of Commerce (New York)*, Nos. 18-CV-2921 &
15 18-CV-5025, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6954 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 15, 2019). Additionally, Common Cause
16 is a leading organization challenging the practice of partisan gerrymandering. Common Cause is the
17 lead plaintiff in the challenge to the congressional gerrymander in North Carolina that will be argued
18 before the Supreme Court this March. *Rucho, et al. v. Common Cause, et al.*, No. 18-422,
19 *consideration of appellate jurisdiction postponed to hearing on merits*, 586 U.S. --- (Jan. 4, 2019)
20 (appealing the three-judge district court’s decision in *Common Cause et al. v. Rucho et al.*,
21 1:16-CV-1026 (M.D.N.C.)).

22 *Amicus curiae* Trevor Potter is a former Republican Chairman of the Federal Election
23 Commission. He is one of the country's most prominent and experienced campaign and election
24 lawyers, and served as general counsel to John McCain’s 2000 and 2008 presidential campaigns.
25 Mr. Potter is currently the President of the Campaign Legal Center, a nonprofit nonpartisan
26 organization that fights the current threats to our democracy in the areas of campaign finance, voting
27 rights, redistricting, and ethics. Mr. Potter has long been engaged with good government issues and
28 has served as *amicus curiae* in a number of cases.

1 *Amicus curiae* Representative Jody L. McNally is a Republican representative in the
2 Strafford 10 district in the New Hampshire House of Representatives. As an elected representative,
3 she has a vested interest in ensuring a full and accurate count in the 2020 Census.

4 *Amicus curiae* Justice Robert Orr is a retired Associate Justice of the North Carolina Supreme
5 Court. Justice Orr was elected as a Republican to the Supreme Court and is a former Republican
6 candidate for governor of North Carolina. After retiring from the Supreme Court, Justice Orr headed
7 the North Carolina Institute for Constitutional Law. Justice Orr has also served on the United States
8 National Park System Advisory Board, as an adjunct faculty member at North Carolina Central
9 University (“NCCU”), and as a member of the Board of Visitors for NCCU’s Law School. A former
10 justice and a constitutional scholar, Justice Orr is dedicated to the rule of law and the preservation of
11 our system of representative government.

12 **ARGUMENT**

13 In our constitutional democracy, *all* persons who reside within the United States—including
14 non-citizens—are granted the equal right to be represented by a member of Congress. This core
15 constitutional principle is as old as our democracy itself. The Founders introduced it in Article I,
16 Section 2 of the Constitution, and the country reaffirmed and perfected it in the Fourteenth
17 Amendment. Although the right to vote in federal elections has expanded over time, it has always
18 been the case that the right to representation in Congress belongs to persons, not to voters or citizens.

19 The primary constitutional purpose of the census is to ensure that our constitutional
20 commitment to equal representation of all persons is fully realized. Nevertheless, Secretary Ross has
21 decided to include a citizenship question on the 2020 Census, despite—or, perhaps, precisely
22 because of—the fact that doing so will cause undercounts in areas with large non-citizen
23 populations. This, in turn, will mean that states—California, particularly—stand to lose
24 representation in Congress based on the undercounting of certain demographic groups, *see New*
25 *York*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6954, at *241 (“[T]he Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence
26 that California residents face a certainly impending loss of representation in the House of
27 Representatives.”), and that areas with large non-citizen populations—again, like California—will
28 not receive their fair share of federal attention and resources, *see id.* at *246 (“[T]he Court finds

1 that . . . California . . . will lose some amount of federal funding as a result of the addition of the
2 citizenship question.”).

3 In denying motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ claims, this
4 Court reasoned that while “demographic questions have long been a part of the enumeration process
5 since its inception,” the claims survived because “there may be a rare question that is so uniquely
6 impactful on the process of counting itself, that it becomes akin to a mechanics-of-counting-type
7 challenge.” Order Denying Motions to Dismiss at 27-28, *California v. Ross*, 18-cv-01865-RS, slip
8 op. at 26-28 (N.D. Cal August 17, 2018) (ECF No. 75). In reaching a final disposition on the merits
9 of this case, the Court should consider not only the uniquely harmful impact of the citizenship
10 question, but also the constitutional purpose of Article I, Section 2. Secretary Ross’s failure to
11 account for the risk that including a citizenship question on the 2020 Census would undermine the
12 fundamental constitutional principle of equality of representation is an important reason that his
13 decision to add the question violates both the Enumeration Clause and the Administrative Procedure
14 Act (“APA”). Because Secretary Ross’s decision would undermine a core constitutional
15 commitment without any reasoned explanation for doing so, it violates both the Enumeration Clause
16 and the substantive and procedural protections of the APA. The core constitutional value embodied
17 in Article I, Section 2, the right to equal representation—“the right to be counted and
18 represented”¹—should inform the district court’s analysis of the claims in this litigation.

19 **I. EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF PERSONS IS THE CORE CONSTITUTIONAL VALUE OF ARTICLE I,
20 SECTION 2 AS AMENDED BY THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.**

21 **A. The Founders agreed that all persons—not just citizens—must be included in
22 the representation base for members of Congress.**

23 Equal representation of all persons in the United States is, and has always been, a
24 foundational principle of our republican system of government. The Founders firmly believed that
25 all persons living in the United States must be included in the representation base for Congress.
26 They enshrined this belief in Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, which apportions congressional
27 representatives based on an “actual Enumeration” of the residents of each state.

28 ¹ *Fed’n for Am. Immigration Reform (FAIR) v. Klutznick*, 486 F. Supp. 564, 576 (D.D.C. 1980) (three-judge
district court) (quoting 86 Cong. Rec. 4372 (1940)).

1 The Founders disagreed on a great many things. The process of debating and ratifying the
2 Constitution was tumultuous, discordant, and heavily politicized. *See generally* MICHAEL J.
3 KLARMAN, *THE FRAMERS’ COUP* (2016). But the Founders were in accord on one very important
4 thing: that members of Congress should represent *all* of the persons within their districts—not just
5 citizens, and not just voters. *See Evenwel*, 136 S. Ct. at 1132 (“As the Framers of the Constitution
6 and the Fourteenth Amendment comprehended, representatives serve all residents, not just those
7 eligible or registered to vote.”); *see also* GORDON S. WOOD, *THE CREATION OF THE AMERICAN*
8 *REPUBLIC, 1776-1787*, at 170 (2d ed. 1998) (Of all “the electoral safeguards for the representational
9 system,” none “was as important to Americans as equality of representation.”).

10 John Adams, a Federalist, and Thomas Jefferson, a Democratic Republican, agreed that
11 equality of representation was a core principle of the new American political order. *See* John Adams,
12 Letter to Joseph Hawley (Aug. 25, 1776), quoted in *FOUNDING FAMILIES: DIGITAL EDITIONS OF THE*
13 *PAPERS OF THE WINTHROPS AND THE ADAMSES* (C. James Taylor ed., 2015) (“Equality of
14 Representation in the Legislature, is a first Principle of Liberty, and the Moment, the least departure
15 from such Equality takes Place, that Moment an Inroad is made upon Liberty.”); Thomas Jefferson,
16 Letter to William King (1819), Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress, Vol. 216, p. 38616 (“Equal
17 representation [was] so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice [could] justify its
18 violation . . .”). Alexander Hamilton likewise said, “[t]here can be no truer principle than this—that
19 every individual of the community at large has an equal right to the protection of government.”
20 *Evenwel*, 136 S. Ct. at 1127; *see also New York*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6954, at *275 n.49.

21 This foundational principle of representational equality ultimately found its way into Article
22 I, Section 2 of the Constitution, which provides that “Representatives . . . shall be apportioned
23 among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective
24 Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons . . . three fifths
25 of all other Persons.” U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 3; *see also Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 18
26 (1964) (stating that “equal representation for equal numbers of people” is “the fundamental goal for
27 the House of Representatives”). Obviously and infamously, the Constitution as originally drafted, in
28 distinguishing between “free Persons” and “all other Persons” and thereby ratifying slavery, fell

1 woefully short of giving full effect to the principle. But even as written, Article I, Section 2 of the
2 Constitution bases political representation on an individual’s status as a “Person”—not as a citizen or
3 a voter.

4 **B. The Constitution resolves the tension between the broad right to equal**
5 **representation and the then-narrow right to vote by distinguishing between**
6 **those who can vote and those who are counted for census purposes.**

7 Although the original Constitution provided for a broad right to representation for free
8 persons, it did not give every free person the right to vote. Rather, the Constitution envisioned a
9 system where a limited subset of all persons would vote for the representatives who would represent
10 all (free) persons. *See Evenwel*, 136 S. Ct. at 1127 (“[T]he basis of *representation* in the House was
11 to include all inhabitants—although slaves were counted as only three-fifths of a person—even
12 though States remained free to deny many of those inhabitants the right to participate in the selection
13 of their representatives.”); *id.* at 1129 (“[I]t remains beyond doubt that the principle of
14 representational equality figured prominently in the decision to count people, whether or not they
15 qualify as voters.”).

16 The Founders frankly did not believe in the principle of universal enfranchisement. They
17 limited the franchise to adult white males who satisfied various state-imposed religious tests and
18 property requirements—amounting to only about 10%–20% of the total national population at the
19 time. Richard Briffault, *Legal History: The Contested Right to Vote*, 100 MICH. L. REV. 1506, 1510
20 (2002); CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUND., *Who Voted in Early America?*, BILL OF RIGHTS IN ACTION
21 (Fall/Winter 1991). Even today, many persons who reside in the United States cannot vote. For
22 instance, many states permanently disenfranchise people with prior felony convictions. Minors
23 cannot vote. Non-citizen immigrants who are authorized to be in the United States for work or
24 education cannot vote in federal elections. Nor can the 11 million undocumented immigrants who
25 live here. Jens Manuel Krogstad et al., *5 Facts About Illegal Immigration in the U.S.*, PEW RES. CTR.
26 (Apr. 27, 2017), <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/27/5-facts-about-illegal-immigration-in-the-u-s/>.

27 Despite having unjustly limited views of the right to vote, the Founders believed that all
28 persons, voters or non-voters, deserved representation in Congress. As James Madison wrote in *The*

1 *Federalist*,

2 It is a fundamental principle of the proposed Constitution, that as the
3 aggregate number of representatives allotted to the several States is to
4 be determined by a federal rule, founded on the aggregate number of
5 inhabitants, so the right of choosing this allotted number in each State
is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may
designate.

6 THE FEDERALIST No. 54 (James Madison); *see also Evenwel*, 136 S. Ct. at 1127. Thus,
7 representatives would be apportioned based on the state’s “aggregate number of inhabitants,” while
8 the state itself would decide which particular “part of the inhabitants” would be permitted to vote for
9 those representatives.

10 The Founders included this concept in Article I by providing that those who cast their ballots
11 as “Electors” do so on behalf of the broader “People”:

12 The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen
13 every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors
14 in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the
most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

15 U.S. CONST., art. 1, § 2, cl. 1 (emphasis added). *Cf. Evenwel*, 136 S. Ct. at 1132 (“By ensuring that
16 each representative is subject to requests and suggestions from the same number of constituents,
17 total-population apportionment promotes equitable and effective representation.”); *Shaw v. Reno*,
18 509 U.S. 630, 648 (1993) (congressional representatives are “obligat[ed]” to “represent . . . their
19 constituency as a whole”). By permitting states to determine who shall qualify as an “Elector,”
20 while also apportioning representation uniformly based on the number of “People,” the Constitution
21 therefore provides for a hybrid system of representation.

22 **C. The Fourteenth Amendment reaffirmed the representation of all persons as a**
23 **foundational principle of our democracy.**

24 The Fourteenth Amendment, which amended Article I, Section 2, reaffirmed and perfected
25 the principle of representational equality. *See id.* at 1128–29. The first sentence of the Fourteenth
26 Amendment defines “citizen.” U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1. The next sentence contains the Equal
27 Protection Clause, which protects “any person within [the] jurisdiction [of the states].” *Id.* This
28 juxtaposition makes clear that the Equal Protection Clause protects “all *persons* within [a state’s]

1 territorial jurisdiction,” and “is not confined to the protection of citizens.” *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118
2 U.S. 356, 369 (1886) (emphasis added). The Fourteenth Amendment went on to replace Article I,
3 Section 2’s reference to “the whole Number of free Persons” in the state with “the whole number of
4 persons” in the state. In reaffirming and expanding the principle of representation for “persons” in
5 the same breath that it provided a new definition of “citizens,” the Fourteenth Amendment
6 unmistakably provides that the right to political representation flows to persons, not citizens.

7 This reaffirmation was intentional. During the debates over the Fourteenth Amendment,
8 many in Congress sought a drastic change in our constitutional principles of equal representation,
9 arguing that only citizens or voters should be counted in determining representation. *See Evenwel*,
10 136 S. Ct. at 1128. But, in the end, the Amendment retained—with its framers’ and ratifiers’ full
11 awareness of the available alternatives—the commitment to apportionment based on total
12 population. *See id.* (“The product of these debates was § 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, which
13 retained total population as the congressional apportionment base.”). The Framers of the Fourteenth
14 Amendment decisively rejected apportionment based on a privileged subset of the whole population,
15 choosing to cement the Constitution’s commitment to apportionment based on total population,
16 without regard to citizenship or enfranchisement. *See id.* (quoting Senator Jacob Howard
17 introducing the final version of the Amendment: “[The] basis of representation is numbers . . . this is
18 the theory of the Constitution.”).

19 **II. CENSUS RESULTS DRIVE BOTH POLITICAL REPRESENTATION AND FUNDING FOR LARGE**
20 **GROUPS OF PEOPLE IN BROAD AREAS.**

21 Because the enumeration of all persons is so fundamental to our system of representational
22 equality, census results inevitably drive political representation and government policymaking. *See*
23 Justin Levitt, *Citizenship and the Census*, 119 COLUM. L. REV. (forthcoming 2019) at 20 (“The
24 enumeration drives the apportionment of congressional districts; redistricting for federal, state, and
25 local districts of all kinds; and the distribution of billions of dollars in government grants tied by
26 formula to population. Communities that are undercounted lose political voice and substantial
27 government aid.”). Each year, census results are used to allocate more than \$600 billion in funding
28 to over a hundred federal programs, including programs for healthcare, nutrition assistance, highway

1 planning and construction, student financial aid, housing assistance, and childcare. U.S. CENSUS,
2 USES OF CENSUS BUREAU DATA IN FEDERAL FUNDS DISTRIBUTION 3-8 (2017), *available at*
3 [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-
5 papers/Uses-of-Census-Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/working-
4 papers/Uses-of-Census-Bureau-Data-in-Federal-Funds-Distribution.pdf).

6 When fear and distrust depress the census response in some areas more than others, those
7 areas in which the response has been reduced lose political clout as well as funding for local
8 programs, hurting long-time residents, citizens, and newly arrived immigrants. Differential
9 undercounts do not merely impact undocumented individuals, or lawful permanent residents, or
10 minority citizens; everyone in an area with depressed census participation also loses clout and cash.
11 Adding a citizenship question to the 2020 Census will cause an undercount in any community that
12 thrives because of non-citizens by depressing response rates—whether that area is an urban minority
13 community or a rural area dependent on immigrant farm laborers .

14 Of course, the vast majority of non-citizens reside in cities and large urban areas, which are
15 magnets for immigrants drawn to build new lives in this country. *See, e.g.*, U.S. CENSUS, FOREIGN-
16 BORN: 2014 CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY DETAILED TABLES tbl.1.1 (2014), *available at*
17 <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2014/demo/foreign-born/cps-2014.html>. The concentration of
18 foreign-born residents in cities and urban areas is almost always greater—sometimes vastly
19 greater—than the concentration in the rest of the states in which they are situated. Cities need
20 representation commensurate with their population in order to ensure they receive their fair share of
21 federal resources so that they can provide the services their many residents require.

22 But many rural communities are also home to a disproportionate number of non-citizens,
23 millions of whom work as agricultural laborers. In fact, the vast majority—approximately 73%—of
24 America’s agricultural laborers are foreign-born. *National Demographic Characteristics*, U.S.
25 DEP’T OF LABOR, [*Table1.NAWS_National_Demographics.xlsx*](https://www.doleta.gov/naws/pages/research/docs/) (last visited Oct. 15, 2018). Adding a citizenship
26 question to the 2020 Census would undoubtedly harm the rural communities in which these
27 agricultural laborers live. Levitt, *supra*, at 21.

28 The state of California, which contains both of these kinds of areas, provides an illuminating

1 example. Its major cities such as Los Angeles and Oakland contain huge immigrant non-citizen
2 populations. Its rural areas such as the Central Valley are heavily dependent on immigrant or
3 migrant farmworkers, predominantly from Mexico.² If the 2020 Census count is not accurate,
4 California stands to lose federal aid and congressional seats.

5 New Hampshire is another illustrative example. Approximately 37% of New Hampshire
6 residents live in rural communities.³ Additionally, for smaller states, such as New Hampshire,
7 domestic migration patterns can have an outsized effect. Among the states east of the Mississippi
8 River, New Hampshire has the second largest percentage of residents that were not born in the state
9 in the United States.⁴ An accurate census count is essential to track population changes and ensure
10 that New Hampshire is receiving the federal funding it needs to serve its residents. New
11 Hampshire counts on over \$2 billion dollars per year that is based on census data, amounting
12 to \$1,590 per capita.⁵ Even in smaller states, an undercount would have an outsized impact.

13 Adding a citizenship question to the 2020 Census will result in a differential undercount in
14 areas with large non-citizen populations—whether those areas are cosmopolitan metropolises with
15 vibrant immigrant communities, or rural areas dependent on foreign-born agricultural labor. This
16 will cause these areas to lose ground in the competition for federal resources, depriving their
17 residents of vital services and programs, and hurting everyone who lives there in the process.

18 **III. SECRETARY ROSS’S FAILURE TO CONSIDER THE RISK THAT INCLUDING A CITIZENSHIP**
19 **QUESTION ON THE 2020 CENSUS WOULD UNDERMINE EQUALITY OF REPRESENTATION**
20 **CONFIRMS THAT HIS DECISION TO ADD THE QUESTION VIOLATES THE ENUMERATION**
21 **CLAUSE AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.**

22 **A. Being counted, and being included in the apportionment process, is integral to**
23 **the fundamental right to political representation.**

24 As discussed above, the history of Article I and the Fourteenth Amendment demonstrates that

25 ² See, e.g., UNIV. OF CAL. AGRIC. ISSUES CTR., AGRICULTURAL WORKFORCE (2009), available at
26 https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/agvission/docs/Agricultural_Workforce.pdf.

27 ³ See, e.g., *Rural Health for New Hampshire*, RURAL HEALTH INFO. HUB (June 5, 2017),
28 <https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/states/new-hampshire>.

⁴ See, e.g., Michael Kitch, *State’s Population Growth All Depends on Migration*, N.H. BUS. REV. (Sept. 13,
2018), <https://www.nhbr.com/September-14-2018/States-population-growth-all-depends-on-migration/>.

⁵ See, e.g., REAMER, *supra* note **Error! Bookmark not defined.** (data for New Hampshire), available at
<https://gwipp.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2181/f/downloads/New%20Hampshire%20CFD%2008-18-17.pdf>.

1 the concern animating both the enactment and the subsequent modification of the Enumeration
2 Clause is that all persons living in the United States be counted for the purposes of apportionment.
3 This core constitutional commitment is embodied in Article I, Section 2 and the Fourteenth
4 Amendment, which provide that representatives and direct taxes be apportioned based on “the whole
5 number of persons.” U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 2 (modifying U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 3).
6 Because this value is embodied directly in the text of the Constitution,⁶ both as ratified at the
7 Founding and as improved by the Fourteenth Amendment, it should be treated as a foundational right
8 worthy of protection. *Cf. New York*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6954, at *275 n.49 (explaining that the
9 “Article III injury that a person suffers when his or her state loses a representative in congressional
10 reapportionment, ultimately traces to a legally protected interest that does not depend on that
11 person's citizenship status or eligibility to vote” because there is an injury to the “representational
12 rights of every individual of the community at large,” regardless of eligibility to vote).

13 The right to be counted, and thereby to be represented in our constitutional system, is no less
14 important than the other “fundamental rights” that the Court has sought to protect. For instance, in
15 *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections*, the Supreme Court concluded that a denial of the right to vote
16 on the basis of indigency (an unprotected class in other contexts⁷) was an equal protection violation
17 because it implicated a “fundamental right” explicitly protected by the Constitution. 383 U.S. at
18 667. As discussed above, the right to be counted, and thereby represented, is as essential for non-
19 citizens as the right to vote is for citizens. It works to further their interests and guarantee that their
20 voices are heard. In *Shapiro*, the Supreme Court concluded that strict scrutiny was warranted not
21 based on the nature of the classification being made, but rather based on the foundational nature of
22 the right in question: the right to interstate travel. *See* 394 U.S. at 629-30. In *Skinner*, the Court
23 concluded that strict scrutiny was warranted because the legislation at issue touched on “[m]arriage
24 and procreation,” which are “one of the basic civil rights of man” and “fundamental to the very

25 ⁶ *Cf. Lindsey v. Normet*, 405 U.S. 56, 74 (1972) (“[T]he Constitution does not provide judicial remedies for
26 every social and economic ill. We are *unable to perceive in that document* any constitutional guarantee of
access to dwellings of a particular quality.” (emphasis added)).

27 ⁷ *See Kadrmas v. Dickinson Pub. Sch.*, 487 U.S. 450, 458 (1988) (“We have previously rejected the suggestion
28 that statutes having different effects on the wealthy and the poor should on that account alone be subjected to
strict equal protection scrutiny.”).

1 existence and survival of the race.” 316 U.S. at 541.

2 The right to be counted is the essential right for representation in American government, and
3 it has clear roots in the text of the Constitution. It is, therefore, a fundamental constitutional right.
4 Secretary Ross’s decision to include a citizenship question in the on the 2020 Census violates that
5 fundamental constitutional right, and thereby violates the Enumeration Clause.

6 **B. Secretary Ross’s decision to add the citizenship question—and thereby**
7 **undermine a core constitutional commitment—violates both the substantive and**
8 **procedural protections of the APA.**

9 The Court’s analysis of Plaintiffs’ APA claims should be informed by the Secretary’s failure
10 to adequately consider the way that his decision undermines the core constitutional commitment to
11 representational equality. By willfully turning a blind eye to the constitutional issues with his
12 decision to add the citizenship question to the 2020 Census, Secretary Ross violated both the
13 procedural and substantive requirements of the APA.

14 As Plaintiffs articulate, the Secretary’s politically motivated decision did not consider the
15 relevant data or articulate a satisfactory explanation. *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut.*
16 *Auto Ins. Co. (State Farm)*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). His explanation for the decision—that it would
17 aid in enforcement of the Voting Rights Act (“VRA”)—was irrational, because to the contrary it
18 would undermine representation of those whom the VRA is intended to protect. *See id.* (an agency
19 may not make a “decision that runs counter to the evidence”); *see also New York*, 2019 U.S. Dist.
20 LEXIS 6954, at *376 (“[I]n a startling number of ways, Secretary Ross’s explanations for his
21 decision were unsupported by, or even counter to, the evidence before the agency.”); *id.* at *386
22 (“[T]here was no evidence in the Administrative Record that would support a finding that more
23 granular CVAP data is ‘necessary’ for enforcement of the VRA and plenty of evidence to the
24 contrary.”). It was also pre-textual, as demonstrated by the Secretary’s now-admitted conversations
25 with anti-immigrant advisors to the President, Steve Bannon and Kris Kobach. *See id.* at *404
26 (“[T]he evidence is clear that Secretary Ross’s rationale was pretextual.”). A decision that lacks a
27 coherent rationale violates the APA. *See, e.g., State Farm*, 463 at 43–44. So too does a decision that
28 violates the APA to “entirely fail[] to consider an important aspect of the problem”).

1 Based on the pre-trial record, it is evident that the Secretary’s stated rationale of enforcing the
2 VRA is a mere pretext to obscure his actual purpose: artificially depressing the response rate of both
3 documented and undocumented immigrants, and diminishing the representation and provision of
4 government services to the communities in which they live. *Cf. Utah v. Evans*, 536 U.S. at 500-01
5 (Thomas, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (“The Framers knew that the calculation of
6 populations could be and often were skewed for political or financial purposes. Debate about
7 apportionment and the census consequently focused for the most part on creating a standard that
8 would limit political chicanery.”). To achieve this political objective, Secretary Ross sought to
9 undermine the core constitutional principle embodied in the Enumeration Clause.

10 In analyzing Plaintiffs’ APA claims, the Court should weigh the Secretary’s intentions to
11 directly undermine this core constitutional value. Here, the intended attack on a core constitutional
12 principle that guided the Secretary’s decision to add the citizenship question gives additional weight
13 to the already persuasive evidence supporting a finding that the decision violated the APA because
14 the decisionmaking process was marred by bad faith. *Cf. Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe*,
15 401 U.S. 402, 420 (1971) (explaining that, while “inquiry into the mental processes of administrative
16 decisionmakers is usually to be avoided,” “[t]he court may require the administrative officials who
17 participated in the decision to give testimony explaining their action,” where there is either “a strong
18 showing of bad faith” or there have been no “formal findings” such that “the only way there can be
19 effective judicial review is by examining the decisionmakers themselves”), *overruled on other
20 grounds by Califano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99 (1977). Had the Secretary engaged in that undertaking
21 in good faith—looking at the core constitutional objective furthered by the census and the past
22 practices and legislative enactments that have sought to effective it—there would have been no
23 possible conclusion that he could have drawn except that the addition of this question to the census
24 would likely undermine the primary purpose of the census, a core constitutional objective, the
25 accurate accounting of the entire population of people living within the United States.

26 **CONCLUSION**

27 The Court should enjoin Secretary Ross’s decision to add the unnecessary citizenship
28 question to the 2020 Census because it violates both the Enumeration Clause and the procedural and

1 substantive requirements of the APA. As described here, Secretary Ross’s decision is inconsistent
2 with the values enshrined in the Constitution by the Founders and reaffirmed by the Congress that
3 enacted the Fourteenth Amendment. The addition of this question will depress representation of
4 communities in California—both urban and rural—with significant immigrant populations that
5 deserve to be adequately represented. Further, it undermines the core constitutional value that the
6 Enumeration Clause of Article I, Section 2 seeks to protect. The Court’s analysis should be informed
7 by the unavoidable reality that Secretary Ross’s decision will undermine the very purpose for which
8 the Census exists, namely the “actual Enumeration” of “the whole number of persons in each state.”
9 U.S. CONST. art. 1, § 2, cl. 3; *id.* amend. XIV, § 2. Even if the court finds that the challenged
10 question does not have such an unusual impact that it violates the Enumeration Clause, the principles
11 embodied in Article I, Section 2 should nonetheless inform the Court’s decision in favor of Plaintiffs.

12
13 Dated: February 1, 2019

14 /s/ Mary Kelly Persyn
15 Mary Kelly Persyn (CABN 264782)
16 PERSYN LAW & POLICY
17 912 Cole Street PMB 124
18 San Francisco, CA 94117
19 (628) 400-1254
20 marykelly@persynlaw.com

21 Gregory L. Diskant*
22 Aron Fischer*
23 Benjamin F. Jackson*
24 Jacob Newman*
25 PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP
26 1133 Avenue of the Americas
27 New York, New York 10036
28 (212) 336-2000
gldiskant@pbwt.com
afischer@pbwt.com
bjackson@pbwt.com
jnewman@pbwt.com
*not admitted in this jurisdiction

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae Common Cause,
Trevor Potter, Rep. Jody L. McNally, and
Justice Robert Orr (Ret.)*

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California by using the CM/ECF system on February 1, 2019. I further certify that counsel of record for all parties in this case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 1st day of February, 2019.

/s/ Mary Kelly Persyn
Mary Kelly Persyn