

# **A G E N D A**

**TO:** Mayor and City Council

**ITEM NO.** 24

**FROM:** Chris Freeland  
City Manager

**DATE** March 1, 2016

**SUBJECT: REQUEST FROM MAYOR JAMES TOMA REQUESTING THE CITY COUNCIL'S CONSENSUS TO FILE AN AMICUS BRIEF WITH THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES' EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION**

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the City Council direct staff accordingly.

## **DISCUSSION:**

Per the City Council's Standing Rules, Mayor James Toma is seeking the City Council's consensus to file an amicus brief with the United States Supreme Court supporting the President of the United States' executive action on immigration. This is an action item, as the deadline to submit the amicus brief is March 8, 2016.

On November 20, 2014, President Barack Obama addressed the Nation to outline a series of proposals to address issues with the United States immigration system. A copy of the text of his speech is attached (Attachment No. 1). Specifically, President Obama utilized his authority under executive order to protect millions of undocumented immigrants from deportation. This decision has sparked support and controversy across the United States, including a lawsuit brought forward by the State of Texas that has made its way to the United States Supreme Court. A copy of the petition to the Supreme Court is attached (Attachment No. 2).

The United States Conference of Mayors has reached out to cities across the United States to seek support of communities to sign onto an amicus brief, which is similar to a letter of support to the President's action, for the Supreme Court case. Attached is a press release from the United States Conference of Mayors and a request from the City of New York, seeking cities from across the United States to file an amicus brief before March 8, 2016 (Attachment No. 3).

## **FISCAL IMPACT:**

None.

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CF', is positioned above a horizontal line.

Chris Freeland  
City Manager

Attachments:

Attachment No. 1-President Obama's Comments of November 20, 2014

Attachment No. 2-United States Supreme Court Petition

Attachment No. 3-United States Conference of Mayor's Press Release and Request for Support

## REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON IMMIGRATION

CROSS HALL 8:01 P.M. EST

---

THE PRESIDENT: My fellow Americans, tonight, I'd like to talk with you about immigration. For more than 200 years, our tradition of welcoming immigrants from around the world has given us a tremendous advantage over other nations. It's kept us youthful, dynamic, and entrepreneurial. It has shaped our character as a people with limitless possibilities — people not trapped by our past, but able to remake ourselves as we choose.

But today, our immigration system is broken — and everybody knows it.

Families who enter our country the right way and play by the rules watch others flout the rules. Business owners who offer their workers good wages and benefits see the competition exploit undocumented immigrants by paying them far less. All of us take offense to anyone who reaps the rewards of living in America without taking on the responsibilities of living in America. And undocumented immigrants who desperately want to embrace those responsibilities see little option but to remain in the shadows, or risk their families being torn apart.

It's been this way for decades. And for decades, we haven't done much about it.

When I took office, I committed to fixing this broken immigration system. And I began by doing what I could to secure our borders. Today, we have more agents and technology deployed to secure our southern border than at any time in our history. And over the past six years, illegal border crossings have been cut by more than half. Although this summer, there was a brief spike in unaccompanied children being apprehended at our border, the number of such children is now actually lower than it's been in nearly two years. Overall, the number of people trying to cross our border illegally is at its lowest level since the 1970s. Those are the facts.

Meanwhile, I worked with Congress on a comprehensive fix, and last year, 68 Democrats, Republicans, and independents came together to pass a bipartisan bill in the Senate. It wasn't perfect. It was a compromise. But it reflected common sense. It would have doubled the number of border patrol agents while giving undocumented immigrants a pathway to citizenship if they paid a fine, started paying their taxes, and went to the back of the line. And independent experts said that it would help grow our economy and shrink our deficits.

Had the House of Representatives allowed that kind of bill a simple yes-or-no vote, it would have passed with support from both parties, and today it would be the law. But for a year and a half now, Republican leaders in the House have refused to allow that simple vote.

Now, I continue to believe that the best way to solve this problem is by working together to pass that kind of common sense law. But until that happens, there are actions I have the legal authority to take as President — the same kinds of actions taken by Democratic and Republican presidents before me — that will help make our immigration system more fair and more just. Tonight, I am announcing those actions.

First, we'll build on our progress at the border with additional resources for our law enforcement personnel so that they can stem the flow of illegal crossings, and speed the return of those who do cross over.

Second, I'll make it easier and faster for high-skilled immigrants, graduates, and entrepreneurs to stay and contribute to our economy, as so many business leaders have proposed.

Third, we'll take steps to deal responsibly with the millions of undocumented immigrants who already live in our country.

I want to say more about this third issue, because it generates the most passion and controversy. Even as we are a nation of immigrants, we're also a nation of laws. Undocumented workers broke our immigration laws, and I believe that they must be held accountable — especially those who may be dangerous. That's why, over the past six years, deportations of criminals are up 80 percent. And that's why we're going to keep focusing enforcement resources on actual threats to our security. Felons, not families. Criminals, not children. Gang members, not a mom who's working hard to provide for her kids. We'll prioritize, just like law enforcement does every day.

But even as we focus on deporting criminals, the fact is, millions of immigrants in every state, of every race and nationality still live here illegally. And let's be honest — tracking down, rounding up, and deporting millions of people isn't realistic. Anyone who suggests otherwise isn't being straight with you. It's also not who we are as Americans. After all, most of these immigrants have been here a long time. They work hard, often in tough, low-paying jobs. They support their families. They worship at our churches. Many of their kids are American-born or spent most of their lives here, and their hopes, dreams, and patriotism are just like ours. As my predecessor, President Bush, once put it: "They are a part of American life."

Now here's the thing: We expect people who live in this country to play by the rules. We expect that those who cut the line will not be unfairly rewarded. So we're going to offer the following deal: If you've been in America for more than five years; if you have children who are American citizens or legal residents; if you register, pass a criminal background check, and you're willing to pay your fair share of taxes — you'll be able to apply to stay in this country temporarily without fear of deportation. You can come out of the shadows and get right with the law. That's what this deal is.

Now, let's be clear about what it isn't. This deal does not apply to anyone who has come to this country recently. It does not apply to anyone who might come to America illegally in the future. It does not grant citizenship, or the right to stay here permanently, or offer the same benefits that citizens receive — only Congress can do that. All we're saying is we're not going to deport you. I know some of the critics of this action call it amnesty. Well, it's not. Amnesty is the immigration system we have today — millions of people who live here without paying their taxes or playing by the rules while politicians use the issue to scare people and whip up votes at election time.

That's the real amnesty — leaving this broken system the way it is. Mass amnesty would be unfair. Mass deportation would be both impossible and contrary to our character. What I'm describing is accountability — a common-sense, middle-ground approach: If you meet the criteria, you can come out of the shadows and get right with the law. If you're a criminal, you'll be deported. If you plan to enter the U.S. illegally, your chances of getting caught and sent back just went up.

The actions I'm taking are not only lawful, they're the kinds of actions taken by every single Republican President and every single Democratic President for the past half century. And to those members of Congress who question my authority to make our immigration system work better, or question the wisdom of me acting where Congress has failed, I have one answer: Pass a bill.

I want to work with both parties to pass a more permanent legislative solution. And the day I sign that bill into law, the actions I take will no longer be necessary. Meanwhile, don't let a disagreement over a single issue be a dealbreaker on every issue. That's not how our democracy works, and Congress certainly shouldn't shut down our government again just because we disagree on this. Americans are tired of gridlock. What our country needs from us right now is a common purpose — a higher purpose.

Most Americans support the types of reforms I've talked about tonight. But I understand the disagreements held by many of you at home. Millions of us, myself included, go back generations in this country, with ancestors who put in the painstaking work to become citizens. So we don't like the notion that anyone might get a free pass to American citizenship.

I know some worry immigration will change the very fabric of who we are, or take our jobs, or stick it to middle-class families at a time when they already feel like they've gotten the raw deal for over a decade. I hear these concerns. But that's not what these steps would do. Our history and the facts show that immigrants are a net plus for our economy and our society. And I believe it's important that all of us have this debate without impugning each other's character.

Because for all the back and forth of Washington, we have to remember that this debate is about something bigger. It's about who we are as a country, and who we want to be for future generations.

Are we a nation that tolerates the hypocrisy of a system where workers who pick our fruit and make our beds never have a chance to get right with the law? Or are we a nation that gives them a chance to make amends, take responsibility, and give their kids a better future?

Are we a nation that accepts the cruelty of ripping children from their parents' arms? Or are we a nation that values families, and works together to keep them together?

Are we a nation that educates the world's best and brightest in our universities, only to send them home to create businesses in countries that compete against us? Or are we a nation that encourages them to stay and create jobs here, create businesses here, create industries right here in America? That's what this debate is all about. We need more than politics as usual when it comes to immigration. We need reasoned, thoughtful, compassionate debate that focuses on our hopes, not our fears. I know the politics of this issue are tough. But let me tell you why I have come to feel so strongly about it.

Over the past few years, I have seen the determination of immigrant fathers who worked two or three jobs without taking a dime from the government, and at risk any moment of losing it all, just to build a better life for their kids. I've seen the heartbreak and anxiety of children whose mothers might be taken away from them just because they didn't have the right papers. I've seen the courage of students who, except for the circumstances of their birth, are as American as Malia or Sasha; students who bravely come out as undocumented in hopes they could make a difference in the country they love.

These people — our neighbors, our classmates, our friends — they did not come here in search of a free ride or an easy life. They came to work, and study, and serve in our military, and above all, contribute to America's success.

Tomorrow, I'll travel to Las Vegas and meet with some of these students, including a young woman named Astrid Silva. Astrid was brought to America when she was four years old. Her only possessions were a cross, her doll, and the frilly dress she had on. When she started school, she didn't speak any English. She caught up to other kids by reading newspapers and watching PBS, and she became a good student. Her father worked in landscaping. Her mom cleaned other people's homes. They wouldn't let Astrid apply to a technology magnet school, not because they didn't love her, but because they were afraid the paperwork would out her as an undocumented immigrant — so she applied behind their back and got in. Still, she mostly lived in the shadows — until her grandmother, who visited every year from Mexico, passed away, and she couldn't travel to the funeral without risk of being found out and deported. It was around that time she decided to begin advocating for herself and others like her, and today, Astrid Silva is a college student working on her third degree.

Are we a nation that kicks out a striving, hopeful immigrant like Astrid, or are we a nation that finds a way to welcome her in? Scripture tells us that we shall not oppress a stranger, for we know the heart of a stranger — we were strangers once, too.

My fellow Americans, we are and always will be a nation of immigrants. We were strangers once, too. And whether our forebears were strangers who crossed the Atlantic, or the Pacific, or the Rio Grande, we are here only because this country welcomed them in, and taught them that to be an American is about something more than what we look like, or what our last names are, or how we worship. What makes us Americans is our shared commitment to an ideal -- that all of us are created equal, and all of us have the chance to make of our lives what we will.

That's the country our parents and grandparents and generations before them built for us. That's the tradition we must uphold. That's the legacy we must leave for those who are yet to come.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless this country we love.

END

No. 15-674

---

IN THE  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

*Petitioners,*

*v.*

STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

---

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR  
THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

BRIEF FOR AMICI CURIAE THE MAYORS OF  
NEW YORK, LOS ANGELES, ATLANTA,  
EIGHTY-ONE ADDITIONAL MAYORS, COUNTY  
EXECUTIVES, AND LOCALITIES, THE UNITED  
STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, AND THE  
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

---

ZACHARY W. CARTER  
*Corporation Counsel of the  
City of New York*  
RICHARD DEARING\*  
CECELIA CHANG  
JEREMY W. SHWEDER  
New York City Law  
Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, NY 10007  
(212) 356-2500  
rdearing@law.nyc.gov  
*Attorneys for the City of  
New York and Mayor  
Bill de Blasio*

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

MICHAEL N. FEUER  
*City Attorney*  
JAMES P. CLARK  
*Chief Deputy City Attorney*  
WENDY SHAPERO  
*Deputy City Attorney*  
*Attorneys for the City of Los  
Angeles and Mayor Eric  
Garcetti*

CATHY HAMPTON  
*City Attorney*  
*Attorney for Kasim Reed,  
Mayor of Atlanta*

\* *Counsel of Record*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	5
THERE IS PRESSING NEED FOR IMMEDIATE REVIEW BY THIS COURT .....	5
I. Immediate Review Is Necessary to Protect the Integrity of Millions of Families .....	6
II. Immediate Review Will Avoid Harms to Law Enforcement and Public Safety Efforts .....	12
III. Immediate Review Is Critical Because of the Economic Costs of the Preliminary Injunction for Local Governments Nationwide .....	15
IV. The Court's Review Is Vital to Clarify for This and Future Cases When Plaintiffs May Have Standing to Obtain Nationwide Injunctions That Harm Residents In Other Jurisdictions .....	18
CONCLUSION.....	24



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Moore v. City of East Cleveland</i> , 431 U.S. 494 (1977).....	6
<i>Stanley v. Illinois</i> , 405 U.S. 645 (1972).....	7
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Ajay Chaudry, <i>et al.</i> , Urban Institute, <i>Facing Our Future: Children in the Aftermath of Immigration Enforcement</i> (February 2010).....	8, 11, 12
Audrey Singer, <i>et al.</i> , Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings, <i>Local Insights From DACA for Implementing Future Programs for Unauthorized Immigrants</i> (June 2015) .....	20

Joanna Dreby, Center for American Progress, <i>Executive Action on Immigration Will Help Children and Families</i> (March 3, 2015) .....	12
Joanna Dreby, Center for American Progress, <i>How Today's Immigration Enforcement Policies Impact Children, Families, and Communities</i> (August 2012) .....	7
Laurel Lucia, <i>et al.</i> , UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, <i>Health Insurance and Demographics of California Immigrants Eligible for Deferred Action</i> (March 26, 2015) .....	21
Matthew Gardner, <i>et al.</i> , Institute on Taxation & Economic Policy, <i>Undocumented Immigrants' State &amp; Local Tax Contributions</i> (April 2015) .....	16, 17

Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, <i>Giving and Getting, Regional Distribution of Revenue and Spending in the New York State Budget, Fiscal Year 2009-10</i> .....	17
<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> , Nos. 14-556, 14- 562, 14-571, 14-574, Brief of Louisiana, <i>et al.</i> , as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents.....	2
<i>Oversight of the Administration’s Misdirected Immigration Enforcement Policies: Examining the Impact on Public Safety and Honoring the Victims</i> , Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 114th Cong. (July 21, 2015) (statement of Tom Manger, Major Cities Chiefs Association) .....	14
Paul Taylor, <i>et al.</i> , Pew Research Center, <i>Unauthorized Immigrants: Length of Residency, Patterns of Parenthood</i> (Dec. 1, 2011).....	9

Press Release, Cities United for Immigration Action, As Court Hears Argument Today on Obama's Immigration Reforms, Cities Nationwide Announce New Actions (April 15, 2015).....	20
Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, North American Integration and Development Center, UCLA, <i>The Economic Benefits of Expanding the Dream: DAPA and DACA Impacts on Los Angeles and California</i> (Jan. 26, 2015).....	16
Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, North American Integration and Development Center, UCLA, <i>The Economic Benefits of Expanding the Dream: DAPA and DACA Impacts on the State of Texas and Harris, Tarrant, and Dallas Counties</i> (Feb. 2, 2015).....	4
Seth Freed Wessler, Applied Research Center, <i>Shattered Families: The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System</i> (November 2011).....	8

*United States v. Windsor*, No. 12-307,  
Brief Addressing the Merits of the  
State of Indiana and 16 Other  
States As Amici Curiae in Support  
of Respondent The Bipartisan  
Legal Advisory Group of the U.S.  
House of Representatives ..... 7

## INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE<sup>1</sup>

Amici signatories to this brief represent a broad coalition of local governments across the nation—from the largest cities in the United States to small towns throughout the country.<sup>2</sup> More than 1.25 million children and parents potentially eligible for relief under the enjoined executive guidance, representing over 30 percent of the undocumented immigrants so eligible, reside in amici's towns and cities. Amici submit this brief to explain the compelling need for this Court to grant review. The nationwide injunction entered by a single federal district court and upheld by two circuit judges is unprecedented and sweeping in scope: it has profound daily impact on the lives, safety, and integrity of millions of families and children, and imposes daily harm on all of our residents.

Amici mayors, county officials, local governments, and their city councils confront a reality that no injunction or lawsuit can erase. The

---

<sup>1</sup> No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no party or counsel for a party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. No person other than amici or their counsel made a monetary contribution to this brief's preparation or submission. All counsel of record provided blanket consent for the filing of amicus briefs or received timely notice and consented to the filing of this brief.

<sup>2</sup> The signature pages to this brief contain a list of all amici.

parents and children directly harmed by the injunction in this case are longstanding members of our communities and are also members of families that include millions of citizen children. The challenged executive guidance responds to those realities in two main ways. The guidance establishes a process for eligible parents and children to apply for discretionary deferred action relief, providing key assurance that families will not be split apart by deportation during the periods covered by the guidance. Also, by expanding access to deferred action relief, the guidance opens a path to work authorization and basic economic security for qualifying individuals. The nationwide injunction impairs the humanitarian aims of the guidance, harming our communities as a whole.

Keeping families together is of enormous importance to our residents. The threat of separating even one parent from a child imposes substantial harm, as does the inability of a parent to work lawfully to support his or her family. The impact is greater when magnified across local communities nationwide. Just last year, many of the respondent states emphasized to this Court the importance of stable marriages and strong parental support to successfully raise children.<sup>3</sup> The same

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Obergefell v. Hodges*, Nos. 14-556, 14-562, 14-571, 14-574, Brief of Louisiana, *et al.*, as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents, at 11-12.

interests those states espoused then confirm the urgent need for this Court to review the challenged injunction now. The harm to children, millions of whom are U.S. citizens, and the ripple effects across their home communities, do not depend on the reason why children are threatened with deprivation of parental care and support.

Likewise, amici know from running local governments that the safety and welfare of all residents are interconnected. The enjoined guidance was issued to encourage undocumented residents who are longstanding and law-abiding members of our communities to come out of the shadows, be counted, and more fully participate in civic and economic life. Amici local governments cannot act in the best interest of all residents if some live in fear, distrustful of government and isolated from their communities.

Immigration status has little or no bearing on many of the issues most important to our residents' daily lives, and for which local governments bear primary responsibility. Preventing crime, for example, is a compelling interest that unites all residents. Yet undocumented immigrants are often understandably reluctant to cooperate with local law enforcement. All residents suffer as a result. Crimes go unreported and unsolved on a daily basis because undocumented immigrants fear interacting with law enforcement. For the victims of those crimes, as well as the victims' loved ones and



neighbors, delay in implementing the enjoined guidance has irreparable consequences.

Likewise, the contribution of all residents is essential for the economic stability and growth of amici's cities and towns. Many amici are still struggling to recover from the lingering economic recession. Implementing the enjoined guidance will increase municipalities' economic activity and tax base by hundreds of millions of dollars. Harris County, Texas—home of Houston—could alone collect more than \$400 million in additional personal, business, and sales taxes over the life of the guidance due to the wage growth of currently undocumented immigrants who would qualify for deferred action.<sup>4</sup> Loss of economic growth on this scale has immense, immediate impact on residents of amici cities and towns.

Finally, amici local governments have a further compelling interest in immediate review of the standing question raised by the petition because the lower courts' rulings raise a harmful prospect that extends far beyond the present case and controversy. The lower courts' decisions block

---

<sup>4</sup> Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, North American Integration and Development Center, UCLA, *The Economic Benefits of Expanding the Dream: DAPA and DACA Impacts on the State of Texas and Harris, Tarrant, and Dallas Counties* 4 (Feb. 2, 2015), available at [http://www.naid.ucla.edu/uploads/4/2/1/9/4219226/tx\\_draft\\_final\\_v2.pdf](http://www.naid.ucla.edu/uploads/4/2/1/9/4219226/tx_draft_final_v2.pdf).

implementation of the guidance across all jurisdictions nationally, when only a single plaintiff state purportedly demonstrated harm, and this is not a nationwide class action.

Those rulings are a formula for vast disruption not only of the guidance here, but also of future federal initiatives and related local programs in other areas. Without receiving evidence from numerous affected jurisdictions that support the guidance, the lower courts approved an injunction that imposed substantial harm on the residents of absent jurisdictions. This Court should grant review to clarify for this and future cases whether and when such nationwide injunctions may be appropriately entered.

## ARGUMENT

### THERE IS PRESSING NEED FOR IMMEDIATE REVIEW BY THIS COURT

Amici local governments submit this brief to support petitioners' argument that immediate review by this Court is warranted (Petition at 32-35). The effect of the preliminary injunction here is unprecedented and sweeping in scope. About 4 million individuals are potentially affected—even more if family members, neighbors, colleagues, and classmates in local communities are counted. More than 1.25 million of those directly affected live in amici's jurisdictions. Amici local governments confront and address the needs of their residents

every day and have firsthand experience with the harmful impact of delaying review of the injunction.

As this brief explains, any delay in review impairs the stability of millions of families, impedes law enforcement on a daily and recurring basis, and deprives local communities of significant economic benefits. None of these consequences can be isolated; they apply to all of amici's residents without regard to citizenship or immigration status.

Immediate review is also critical to clarify when plaintiffs have standing to obtain nationwide injunctions—a question that is important to local governments not only for the purpose of this case but also for understanding how to proceed when future federal guidance or initiatives may be threatened with similar orders.

**I. Immediate Review Is Necessary to Protect the Integrity of Millions of Families**

The enjoined guidance specifically targets children and parents—undocumented immigrants with family connections to the United States and their local communities. Few principles are as deeply embedded in the nation's history and tradition as the importance of family. *See, e.g., Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 503 (1977) (“Our decisions establish that the

Constitution protects the sanctity of the family precisely because the institution of the family is deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition."); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645, 651 (1972) (noting that "[t]he Court has frequently emphasized the importance of the family"). The integrity of family is a shared goal regardless of partisan political position, and a goal that many of respondent states have confirmed is critical to collective social welfare.<sup>5</sup>

Communities are harmed when deportation and the threat of deportation ruptures family unity and impairs stable home lives for children. The splitting of families through deportation results in direct financial costs for communities. Children in single-parent households are over four times more likely to live in poverty than are children with married parents,<sup>6</sup> and households that lose the family

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., *United States v. Windsor*, No. 12-307, Brief Addressing the Merits of the State of Indiana and 16 Other States As Amici Curiae in Support of Respondent The Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives, at 16-17 (arguing that "children and society at large" benefit when both biological parents are able to "nurture and raise the children they beget").

<sup>6</sup> Joanna Dreby, Center for American Progress, *How Today's Immigration Enforcement Policies Impact Children, Families, and Communities* 9 (August 2012), available at <http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/DrebyImmigrationFamiliesFINAL.pdf>.

breadwinner due to immigration enforcement experience "steep declines" in income, housing instability, and food shortages, resulting in increased reliance on public benefits.<sup>7</sup> Deportations that split up families also strain already overburdened social service networks. One study estimates that in 2011 alone, there were 5,100 children in foster care nationwide whose parents had been either detained or deported,<sup>8</sup> stretching the resources of local governments and separating children from parents capable and willing to provide care.

Moreover, a formalized deferred action process has enormous benefits for our undocumented residents, even in cases where deportation is already unlikely. In fact, it is in those very cases that the challenged guidance has the most positive impact for our communities. The immigration

---

<sup>7</sup> Ajay Chaudry, *et al.*, Urban Institute, *Facing Our Future: Children in the Aftermath of Immigration Enforcement* viii-ix (February 2010), available at [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/412020\\_FacingOurFuture\\_final.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/412020_FacingOurFuture_final.pdf) (examining consequences of parental arrest, detention, and deportation on 190 children in 85 families in six locations in the U.S.).

<sup>8</sup> Seth Freed Wessler, Applied Research Center, *Shattered Families: The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System* 6 (November 2011), available at [http://www.atlanticphilanthropies.org/sites/default/files/uploads/ARC\\_Report\\_Shattered\\_Families\\_FULL\\_REPORT\\_Nov2011Release.pdf](http://www.atlanticphilanthropies.org/sites/default/files/uploads/ARC_Report_Shattered_Families_FULL_REPORT_Nov2011Release.pdf).

status of a parent or child does not tell the full story about a family, nor does it define the scope and strength of family bonds: it is estimated that more than 9 million people in the United States live in mixed status families with at least one unauthorized immigrant.<sup>9</sup> Parents may lack documentation, but their children or partners are often legal residents or citizens. The same is true for long-term child residents: their siblings and other members of the household may be legal residents as well.

Because the consequences of deportation are so drastic, millions of families in mixed-status households live under an ongoing fear of deportation and separation from their loved ones. The threat of deportation prevents affected families in our towns and cities from planning for the future—even from counting on basic measures of security, like the ability to keep the family intact and to work legally to support the household. Lack of documentation for one family member can have cascading consequences for the entire family—for instance, when an undocumented parent fears taking a child to obtain needed medical treatment or when a family fails to seek housing or other

---

<sup>9</sup> Paul Taylor, *et al.*, Pew Research Center, *Unauthorized Immigrants: Length of Residency, Patterns of Parenthood* (Dec. 1, 2011), available at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/12/01/unauthorized-immigrants-length-of-residency-patterns-of-parenthood>.

benefits for fear of disclosing the immigration status of undocumented family members.

For decades, a vast array of government programs on the federal, state, and local levels have worked to alleviate the public harms from unstable and financially impoverished families. Those injuries are not reduced one iota because their cause is lack of documentation for one family member, rather than other economic or social circumstances.

The challenged guidance recognizes all of these realities by implementing a process to provide targeted deferred action relief. In formulating the guidance, the federal government has appropriately decided that preserving family unity and promoting family welfare should weigh heavily in decisions about how to allocate enforcement resources. The government has thus recognized and reasonably determined that the undocumented parents and long-term child residents who would be eligible for deferred action under the guidance are unlikely to be deported. Making this reality concrete for families through an application process that allows for case-by-case review *before* immigration status is challenged or becomes a potential legal problem is critical for family security and stability.

By providing a process for individuals to apply and qualify for deferred action relief and obtain work authorization, the guidance allows families with undocumented members to take basic steps

vital for their future and the future of the communities they live in. Those steps range from enabling parents to care for their children by living in the same household, to parents and other family members being able to work lawfully and provide economic security for the family as a whole.

The Court's immediate review is crucial because delayed implementation of the guidance harms families. Every day that a family's stability is impaired can impose lasting injury on its children. Children who lack secure families and parental care lose crucial momentum during the most critical period of their life. For instance, interviews with a sample of children who had experienced separation from a parent within the last six months due to immigration detention found that the vast majority had trouble eating and sleeping, more than 40 percent were "anxious" or "withdrawn," and only slightly fewer were "angry or aggressive."<sup>10</sup> The same study also reported instances where families were afraid to return their children to school after the arrest of one parent on immigration-related charges. Older students also dropped out of school to help support the household and take care of younger children after one parent

---

<sup>10</sup> Chaudry, *supra* note 7, at 41-42; *see also id.* at 41-53 (detailing short-term and long-term behavior changes among children who experienced separation from parents due to immigration enforcement).



was sent to immigration detention.<sup>11</sup> These educational, psychological, and social repercussions will endure even when the children become adult members of their communities.

By establishing a process for temporary relief from deportation for both children and parents, the executive guidance in this case aims to protect families. Withdrawing that protection imposes an immediate and irreparable toll on both families and the wider communities in which they reside.<sup>12</sup>

## **II. Immediate Review Will Avoid Harms to Law Enforcement and Public Safety Efforts**

The Court's review is also urgently needed because of the nationwide injunction's daily impact on local law enforcement and public safety efforts. In most areas of the nation, local governments are responsible for police protection and public safety.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 49-50.

<sup>12</sup> See Joanna Dreby, Center for American Progress, *Executive Action on Immigration Will Help Children and Families* (March 3, 2015), available at <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2015/03/03/107769/executive-action-on-immigration-will-help-children-and-families/?elqTrackId=1728770977694509a243555a81ef9d2e&elqaid=24822&elqat=1> (emphasizing the toll that immigration system has on American families and the potential for improvement due to the executive guidance).

For purposes of preventing and investigating crime, the immigration status of witnesses and victims has little if any relevance. Instead, local police departments rely on the trust and cooperation of all residents, including members of immigrant communities, to ensure public safety.

But, as local leaders are keenly aware—and as police chiefs, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officials have emphasized to this Court<sup>13</sup>—undocumented immigrants and their families often fear interactions with law enforcement because of concerns that officers will inquire into their immigration status or the status of a family member or friend, resulting in potentially harmful exposure of undocumented status.

Because millions of our residents live in mixed-status families, millions are potentially inhibited from cooperating with police and law enforcement out of fears of having a loved one deported or subject to adverse immigration action. As a result, any delay in the implementation of the guidance directly impairs the ability of local law enforcement to protect our communities because a significant segment of our communities fears contacting and working with police.

---

<sup>13</sup> See Amicus Curiae Brief of Major Cities Chiefs Association, Police Executive Research Forum, and Individual Sheriffs and Police Chiefs in Support of Petitioners 7-11 (No. 15-674).

The harm resulting from distrust of police is immediate, and accrues every day. As the president of the Major Cities Chiefs Association testified in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee earlier this year: "When immigrants come to view their local police and sheriffs with distrust because they fear deportation, it creates conditions that encourage criminals to prey upon victims and witnesses alike."<sup>14</sup>

While the guidance will not eliminate all concerns about cooperating with law enforcement, by extending deferred action to a larger number of otherwise law-abiding immigrants, the guidance will increase trust and reduce fear about engaging with police officers and other government officials. To enhance amici's goal of improving public safety for the entire community, encouraging initial cooperation is a first and necessary step in the right direction.

Police cannot respond to unreported crimes, nor arrest suspects if witnesses and victims are afraid

---

<sup>14</sup> *Oversight of the Administration's Misdirected Immigration Enforcement Policies: Examining the Impact on Public Safety and Honoring the Victims*, Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 114th Cong. 2 (July 21, 2015) (statement of Tom Manger, Major Cities Chiefs Association), available at [https://www.majorcitieschiefs.com/pdf/news/manger\\_judiciary\\_testimony\\_july\\_2015\\_final.pdf](https://www.majorcitieschiefs.com/pdf/news/manger_judiciary_testimony_july_2015_final.pdf).

to come forward. If communities must continue to bear these public safety costs, that should result from a decision by this Court rather than from a nationwide preliminary injunction issued by a single district court and affirmed by a divided court of appeals.

### **III. Immediate Review Is Critical Because of the Economic Costs of the Preliminary Injunction for Local Governments Nationwide**

This case also warrants immediate review because of the economic costs imposed by the preliminary injunction. Many amici, like other local governments nationwide, are still struggling to recover from the economic downturn, which left many of our residents unemployed, local businesses struggling, and local tax bases depleted even as the need for public services increased. For current economic recovery and future growth, amici can ill afford to have substantial numbers of residents and households isolated from the workforce and not fully contributing to local economies.

Cities and counties forgo substantial economic gains when undocumented immigrants with family ties and connections to our communities cannot enter the workforce lawfully. By allowing a greater number of qualifying undocumented workers to obtain authorization to work, the guidance furthers the significant and immediate economic interest of

all of amici's residents. The preliminary injunction forestalls those gains, day upon day.

Nationwide, it is estimated that the deferred-action programs outlined in both the 2012 executive action and in the 2014 guidance challenged here would increase state and local tax contributions by \$845 million per year.<sup>15</sup>

These economic benefits can be quantified locally as well: In Los Angeles County, for instance, where more than 450,000 undocumented immigrants could be eligible for deferred action under the guidance, expanded DACA- and DAPA-eligible workers could see wages grow by a combined \$1.6 billion over the life of the guidance, leading to an estimated \$1.1 billion in new tax revenue between personal, sales, and business taxes.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Matthew Gardner, *et al.*, Institute on Taxation & Economic Policy, *Undocumented Immigrants' State & Local Tax Contributions* 2 (April 2015), available at <http://www.itep.org/pdf/undocumentedtaxes2015.pdf>. Moreover, providing work authorization to individuals covered under the Guidance is certain to improve worker protections, minimizing wage theft and the loss in tax revenue from wage theft.

<sup>16</sup> Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, North American Integration and Development Center, UCLA, *The Economic Benefits of Expanding the Dream: DAPA and DACA Impacts on Los Angeles and California* 1 (Jan. 26, 2015), available at

The loss of this additional tax revenue has an immediate and significant economic cost for local governments. For example, the State of New York would receive more than \$85.5 million annually in additional tax revenues if the 2012 and 2014 executive actions were fully implemented,<sup>17</sup> leading to an estimated \$35 million in additional funds for New York City alone.<sup>18</sup> As a result, each day the injunction remains in place New York City loses about \$100,000 in additional funds, an amount sufficient to hire two new public school teachers *every day*. And that is the harm just to New York City, only one of the over 80 signatories to this brief.

Each dollar in lost tax revenue caused by the preliminary injunction means services withheld from all residents of amici's cities and counties. On a daily basis, the injunction deprives amici's residents of funds for important municipal services

---

[http://www.naid.ucla.edu/uploads/4/2/1/9/4219226/la\\_ca\\_final\\_draft\\_v2.pdf](http://www.naid.ucla.edu/uploads/4/2/1/9/4219226/la_ca_final_draft_v2.pdf).

<sup>17</sup> Gardner, *supra* note 15, at 3, 17.

<sup>18</sup> Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, *Giving and Getting, Regional Distribution of Revenue and Spending in the New York State Budget, Fiscal Year 2009-10*, at 4-5, available at [http://www.rockinst.org/pdf/nys\\_government/2011-12-Giving\\_and\\_Getting.pdf](http://www.rockinst.org/pdf/nys_government/2011-12-Giving_and_Getting.pdf) (explaining that New York City receives about 40 percent of state expenditures).

like the construction of affordable housing units, the building of new schools in overcrowded neighborhoods, and the creation and completion of innumerable other projects that would improve the lives of all residents in our cities and towns.

#### **IV. The Court's Review Is Vital to Clarify for This and Future Cases When Plaintiffs May Have Standing to Obtain Nationwide Injunctions That Harm Residents In Other Jurisdictions**

Beyond the urgent reasons explained above, there are additional compelling grounds for the Court to grant review to address, in particular, the standing questions raised in the petition (Petition at 14-18). As the petition notes, the theory of standing endorsed by the lower courts as sufficient to obtain a nationwide injunction extends well beyond the challenged guidance or even the field of immigration (Petition at 18).

Here, the only purportedly proven injury-in-fact was the expenditure of additional funds based on a state's voluntary decision to issue drivers' licenses to residents with deferred action status, and even that claimed injury was established only by one plaintiff state as grounds for enjoining the executive guidance everywhere in the nation. But there was no proof of injury on a nationwide basis. This is not, for example, a nationwide class action. Yet the preliminary injunction here burdens residents in *every* state and locality in the nation—

without the procedural protections that would apply in a class action suit or other similar standing inquiry for testing and justifying the scope of the injunction. As a result, the injunction affects millions of residents in thousands of jurisdictions across the country that never had an opportunity to demonstrate the benefits they would receive from the guidance and the harms that would arise if the guidance were enjoined.

As the dissenting circuit judge recognized (App. 103a), such an expansive view of standing threatens to halt many federal initiatives in their tracks in all areas, because it invites plaintiffs with political objectives to seek injunctions targeted at denying residents in other states and cities the benefits of federal relief provided to individual residents.

That is a formula for vast disruption, not only of the guidance in this case, but of a whole host of federal initiatives and related state and local programs as well. This Court should clarify the threshold standing requirements for obtaining nationwide injunctions to provide guidance for all affected parties.

The standing question has direct and practical consequences for local governments. *First*, local governments are often key partners for implementing federal actions because local governments are closest to the ground and are best situated to reach residents. Outreach efforts by



local governments have been key to implementing the earlier DACA initiative,<sup>19</sup> and many cities have invested substantial time and effort to inform residents about the guidance, and to assist residents in applying for federal relief.<sup>20</sup> New York City alone has invested almost \$8 million to prepare legal aid providers and community groups for the implementation of the guidance.

A broad standing rule would chill these local efforts—now and in the future—to assist in the effective implementation of federal initiatives, since few local governments will invest time and effort if the federal initiative could be blocked nationwide because of a lawsuit brought by a single plaintiff anywhere in the nation.

---

<sup>19</sup> See Audrey Singer, *et al.*, Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings, *Local Insights From DACA for Implementing Future Programs for Unauthorized Immigrants* 7-8 (June 2015), available at [http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/2015/06/04-daca/bmpp\\_srvy\\_dacaimmigration\\_june3b.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/2015/06/04-daca/bmpp_srvy_dacaimmigration_june3b.pdf) (noting that the efforts of local government and community organizations were a significant factor in ensuring that a large number of people applied for DACA 2012 in the first quarter that the program was available).

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., Press Release, Cities United for Immigration Action, As Court Hears Argument Today on Obama's Immigration Reforms, Cities Nationwide Announce New Actions (April 15, 2015), available at <http://citiesforaction.us/statement041715/>.

*Second*, local governments need guidance on the standing question from this Court because, on some issues, like the denial of basic humanitarian relief to millions of our residents, local governments cannot afford to sit on the sidelines. The lower courts' standing rulings leave local governments with few options, however, if they want to meaningfully protect their residents.

The impact of federal initiatives like the guidance here is often broader than the scope of the initiatives themselves, because related state and local programs are also affected. For example, both state and local governments have voluntarily extended and tied important local benefits to deferred action status. In California, for instance, income-eligible undocumented immigrants who qualify for deferred action would be able to obtain comprehensive health service under the state's Medi-Cal program.<sup>21</sup> As many as 500,000 California residents could qualify for these significant health services after full implementation of the guidance.<sup>22</sup> The injunction in this case has damaging spillover

---

<sup>21</sup> Laurel Lucia, *et al.*, UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, *Health Insurance and Demographics of California Immigrants Eligible for Deferred Action* (March 26, 2015), available at <http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/publications/search/pages/detail.aspx?PubID=1374>.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

effects to health care in local California communities and counties because of the undue burden that small clinics and hospital emergency rooms in those municipalities currently shoulder. But because the preliminary injunction was issued based on Texas' claim of injury alone, there is no record of the injunction's collateral harm in California, or in the vast majority of jurisdictions where the injunction is in effect.

The standing theory endorsed by the lower courts—if left in place without this Court's review—imposes significant burdens on local governments seeking to protect their residents. To guard against the harmful local effects of enjoining federal action, including harm to local programs, local governments would be forced to intervene in lawsuits around the nation to protect their residents. Smaller localities may lack the resources to intervene to protect against expansive nationwide injunctions. Larger cities and towns might have the ability to oppose such injunctions, but would still need to divert scarce resources to ward off the threat of expansive injunctions issued without any factual record of the harms imposed on their own residents.

As the petition warns, the standing theory in this case presents an acute danger of turning policy disputes and political disagreements into nationwide injunctions that affect millions of individuals not before the court (Petition at 18). Local governments are especially vulnerable

because they will most directly experience the impact when residents are deprived of essential services, protections, and remedies because of such future injunctions. This case provides a snapshot of that harm, but the dangers extend far beyond the present controversy. For this reason, too, the Court should grant review of the petition and, in particular, the standing question that is presented.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ZACHARY W. CARTER  
*Corporation Counsel of  
the City of New York,  
Attorney for the City of  
New York and Mayor  
Bill de Blasio*

MICHAEL N. FEUER  
*City Attorney of the  
City of Los Angeles,  
Attorney for the City of  
Los Angeles and Los  
Angeles City Mayor  
Eric Garcetti*

CATHY HAMPTON  
*City Attorney,  
Attorney for Kasim Reed,  
Mayor of Atlanta*

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

RICHARD DEARING\*  
CECELIA CHANG  
JEREMY W. SHWEDER  
New York City Law  
Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, NY 10007  
(212) 356-2500  
rdearing@law.nyc.gov

JAMES P. CLARK  
WENDY SHAPERO  
City Attorney's Office  
City of Los Angeles  
200 N. Main St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

\*Counsel of Record

John J. Reilly  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Katherine M. Sheehan,  
Mayor of Albany, New York*

James L. Banks, Jr.  
City Attorney  
Christopher P. Spera  
Deputy City Attorney  
*Attorneys for the City of Alexandria, Virginia,  
and Mayor William D. Euille*

Stephen A. MacIsaac  
County Attorney  
*Counsel for the County Board  
of Arlington County, Virginia*

Anne L. Morgan  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for City of Austin, Texas  
Mayor Steve Adler*

George A. Nilson  
Baltimore City Solicitor  
*Attorney for Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake  
acting on behalf of the Mayor and City Council of  
Baltimore*

David J. Aleshire  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for the City of Bell, California*

Thomas Bentley, III  
Deputy City Attorney  
*Attorney for William A. Bell, Sr.,  
Mayor of Birmingham, Alabama*

Robert B. Luce  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for David H. Bieter,  
Mayor of the City of Boise, Idaho*

Eugene L. O'Flaherty  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Martin J. Walsh,  
Mayor of the City of Boston, Massachusetts*

Timothy A. Ball  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Byron W. Brown,  
Mayor of Buffalo, New York*

Nancy E. Glowa  
City Solicitor  
*Attorney for the City of  
Cambridge, Massachusetts*

Matthew T. Jerzyk  
City Solicitor  
*Attorney for James Diossa,  
Mayor of the City of Central Falls, Rhode Island*

Charlton deSaussure, Jr.  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Joseph P. Riley, Jr.,  
Mayor of the City of Charleston, South Carolina*

Stephen R. Patton  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Rahm Emanuel,  
Mayor of Chicago, Illinois*

Richard C. Pfeiffer, Jr.  
City Attorney  
*Counsel for Michael B. Coleman,  
Mayor of the City of Columbus, Ohio*

Anita Alvarez  
State's Attorney  
Donald J. Pechous  
Paul A. Castiglione  
Assistant State's Attorneys  
*Attorneys for Cook County, Illinois*

Harriet A. Steiner  
City Attorney  
Best Best & Krieger LLP  
*Attorney for Dan Wolk,  
Mayor of the City of Davis, California*

John C. Musto  
Assistant City Attorney  
*Attorney for City of Dayton, Ohio,  
and Nan Whaley, Mayor of the City of Dayton, Ohio*



D. Scott Martinez  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Michael B. Hancock,  
Mayor of the City & County of Denver*

John B. Murphey  
Rosenthal, Murphey, Coblentz & Donahue  
*Attorney for the Village of Dolton, Illinois*

Ricardo Palacios  
Palacios, Garza, & Thompson, P.C.  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for City of Edinburg, Texas,  
and Mayor Richard H. Garcia*

Jo Anne Bernal  
El Paso County Attorney  
*Attorney for El Paso County, Texas*

W. Grant Farrar  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Elizabeth Tisdahl,  
Mayor of Evanston, Illinois*

Roger N. Knutson  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Peter Lindstrom,  
Mayor of Falcon Heights, Minnesota*

Gregory L. Thomas  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Karen Freeman-Wilson,  
Mayor of Gary, Indiana*

Andrew P. Oddo, Esq.  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Domenick Stampone,  
Mayor, Borough of Haledon, New Jersey*

Henri Alexander  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Pedro Segarra,  
Mayor of the City of Hartford, Connecticut*

Debra Urbano DiSalva  
Village Attorney  
*Attorney for the Incorporated  
Village of Hempstead, New York*

Benjamin E. Gehrt  
Partner  
Clark Baird Smith LLP  
*Attorney for Nancy R. Rotering,  
Mayor of the City of Highland Park, Illinois*

Melissa L. Longo, Esq.  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Mayor Dawn Zimmer  
and the City of Hoboken*

Kara Lamb Cunha  
Assistant City Solicitor  
*Attorney for Alex B. Morse,  
Mayor of Holyoke, Massachusetts*

Judith Ramsey  
Section Chief, General Litigation Section  
City of Houston Legal Department  
*Attorney for Annise D. Parker,*  
*Mayor of Houston*

Aaron O. Lavine  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Svante L. Myrick,*  
*Mayor of Ithaca, New York*

Jeremy Farrell  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Steven M. Fulop,*  
*Mayor of the City of Jersey City, New Jersey*

William D. Geary  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Sylvester "Sly" James,*  
*Mayor of the City of Kansas City, Missouri*

Thomas M. Carpenter  
Office of the City Attorney  
*City Attorney for Mark Stodola,*  
*Mayor of Little Rock, Arkansas*

Charles Parkin  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Robert Garcia,*  
*Mayor of Long Beach, California*

Mary C. Wickham  
County Counsel  
*Attorney for Los Angeles County*

Michael P. May  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Paul R. Soglin,  
Mayor of Madison, Wisconsin*

Kori Termine Wisneski  
Deputy General Counsel  
Office of the General Counsel  
*Attorney for Daniel T. Drew,  
Mayor of the City of Middletown, Connecticut*

Grant F. Langley  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for the City of Milwaukee*

Susan L. Segal  
Minneapolis City Attorney  
*Attorney for Betsy Hodges,  
Mayor of Minneapolis, and the City of Minneapolis*

Marc P. Hansen  
County Attorney  
*Attorney for Montgomery County, Maryland*

John Rose, Jr.  
Acting Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Toni N. Harp,  
Mayor of New Haven, Connecticut*

Kathleen E. Gill, Esq.  
Chief of Staff for Policy and Government Affairs/  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Mayor Noam Bramson  
and the City of New Rochelle, New York*

Willie L. Parker, Esq.  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Ras J. Baraka, Mayor of the City of  
Newark, New Jersey*

Donnalyn B. Lynch Kahn  
City Solicitor  
*Attorney for Setti D. Warren,  
Mayor of the City of Newton, Massachusetts*

Craig H. Johnson  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Paul A. Dyster,  
Mayor of Niagara Falls, New York*

Barbara J. Parker  
City Attorney for the City of Oakland  
*Attorney for Mayor Libby Schaaf and  
the City of Oakland, California*

Domenick Stampone  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Jose "joey" Torres,  
Mayor of Paterson, New Jersey*

Shelley R. Smith  
City Solicitor  
*Attorney for Michael A. Nutter,  
Mayor of Philadelphia*

Lourdes Sanchez Ridge  
City Solicitor  
Chief Legal Officer  
*Attorney for William Peduto,  
Mayor of Pittsburgh*

David L. Minchello  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Adrian O. Mapp,  
Mayor of Plainfield, New Jersey*

Tracy Reeve  
City Attorney  
Harry Auerbach  
Chief Deputy City Attorney  
*Attorneys for Charlie Hales, Mayor of Portland,  
on behalf of the City Council  
of the City of Portland, Oregon*

M. Andree Green  
County Attorney  
*Attorney for Prince George's County, Maryland*

Trishka W. Cecil  
Mason, Griffin & Pierson, P.C.  
*Attorney for Princeton, New Jersey*

Jeff Dana  
City Solicitor  
*Attorney for Jorge O. Elorza,  
Mayor of the City of Providence, Rhode Island*

Bruce Reed Goodmiller  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for the City of Richmond  
and Mayor Tom Butt, City of Richmond, California*

Brian F. Curran  
Corporation Counsel  
Law Department  
*Attorney for Lovely Warren,  
Mayor of the City of Rochester, New York*

Margaret D. Plane  
Salt Lake City Attorney  
*Attorney for Ralph Becker,  
Mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah*

Dennis J. Herrera  
San Francisco City Attorney  
*Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco  
and Mayor Edwin M. Lee*

Richard Doyle  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Mayor Sam Liccardo  
and the City of San Jose, California*

Sonia R. Carvalho  
City Attorney  
*City Attorney for the City of Santa Ana, California*  
*Miguel Pulido, Mayor*

Orry P. Korb  
County Counsel  
*Attorney for the County of Santa Clara, California*

Charlene Laplante  
Chief Civil Deputy  
*Attorney for the Board of Supervisors*  
*Santa Cruz County, Arizona*

Kelley A. Brennan  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico*  
*Javier M. Gonzales, Mayor*

Marsha Jones Moutrie  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for the City of Santa Monica, California*

Carl G. Falotico  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Gary R. McCarthy,*  
*Mayor of Schenectady, New York*

Ian Warner  
General Counsel to the Mayor of Seattle  
*Attorney for Edward B. Murray, Mayor of Seattle*



Francis X. Wright, Jr.  
City Solicitor  
*As attorney for Joseph A. Curtatone,  
Mayor of Somerville, Massachusetts*

Bruce Goldstein  
County Counsel  
*Attorney for Sonoma County, California*

Cristal C. Brisco  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Pete Buttigieg,  
Mayor of South Bend, Indiana*

Michael A. Garvin  
City Counselor  
*Attorney for Francis G. Slay,  
Mayor of the City of St. Louis, Missouri*

Terry J. Williams  
Solicitor  
*Attorney for State College Borough Council,  
Pennsylvania, and Mayor Elizabeth A. Goreham*

Kimberly A. Kisslan  
City Attorney  
*Attorney for Michael J. Ryan,  
Mayor of Sunrise, Florida*

Robert P. Stamey  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Stephanie A. Miner,  
Mayor of Syracuse, New York*

Elizabeth A. Pauli  
City of Tacoma  
*Attorney for Marilyn Strickland,*  
*Mayor of the City of Tacoma, Washington*

Julia C. Mandell, Esq.  
City Attorney  
*City of Tampa Attorney for Bob Buckhorn,*  
*Mayor of the City of Tampa, Florida*

Betsy Cavendish  
General Counsel  
*Attorney for Muriel Bowser,*  
*Mayor of Washington, D.C.*

Michael Jenkins  
City Attorney  
Jenkins & Hogin, LLP  
*Attorney for Lindsey P. Horvath,*  
*Mayor of West Hollywood, California*

Michael V. Curti, Esq.  
Corporation Counsel  
*Attorney for Mike Spano,*  
*Mayor of the City of Yonkers, New York*

Carolyn Coleman, Esq.  
Director, Federal Advocacy  
*Attorney for National League of Cities*

John Daniel Reaves  
General Counsel  
*Attorney for the United States Conference of Mayors*

THE CITY OF NEW YORK  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10007

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:** January 23, 2015

**CONTACT:** [pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov](mailto:pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov), (212) 788-2958

**MAYORS DE BLASIO AND GARCETTI ANNOUNCE MAYORAL COALITION  
TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S  
EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM**

*More than 30 mayors sign on in Texas vs. United States in defense of President  
Obama's reform action*

**WASHINGTON**—Mayors Bill de Blasio of New York City and Eric Garcetti of Los Angeles announced today plans by more than 30 mayors to file an amicus brief in the *Texas vs. United States* lawsuit to support President Obama's recent executive action on immigration reform. The brief opposes a lawsuit pending in Brownsville, TX brought by states seeking to block President Obama's immigration reform efforts.

The two mayors led the effort to organize more than 30 cities, the National League of Cities, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors in filing a brief arguing that the public interest across the country is served clearly and overwhelmingly by implementing immigration reform by executive action. The brief also argues that blocking executive action with preliminary injunction will stall desperately needed changes to the federal government's immigration policies. The cities represented by the amici mayors together account for approximately 28.2 million people, including 7.5 million immigrants.

"Our mission is urgent. Delaying implementation of the President's executive action will further hurt our families, negatively impact our economies, and create unnecessary insecurity in our communities," said **Mayor Bill de Blasio**. "Cities are where immigrants live, and cities are where the President's executive action will be successfully executed. We are organized, and we will fight for the changes this nation needs and deserves, and fight those who oppose immigration reform, be it in the courtroom, in Congress, or in our communities. Our voices will be heard."

"Our cities cannot afford delays to immigration reforms that will strengthen our economy and help families," said **Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti**, who established a Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs. "This isn't a blue or red issue, but a human and economic one."

This joint effort to offer the court the crucial perspective of American cities is an outcome of the December immigration summit hosted by Mayor Bill de Blasio at Gracie Mansion and the organizing efforts of the Cities United for Immigration Action (CUIA) coalition. By submitting this "friend of the court" brief, America's mayors are making a

strong statement in support of the President's plan to grant administrative relief to over 4 million undocumented children and adults. The amicus brief will demonstrate to the Court that executive action will benefit cities by providing work authorization to millions, increasing local tax revenue, and stimulating local economies, facilitating the civic engagement of immigrants, keeping families together, and improving public safety by strengthening our neighborhoods and communities.

In December, 25 states led by Republican governors brought a lawsuit captioned *Texas vs. United States* in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Texas, seeking to halt the implementation of the President's executive action. In response, a group of 12 states in January joined by the District of Columbia filed an amicus brief challenging the lawsuit by arguing that, contrary to the plaintiffs' claims, the President's immigration reform will in fact "further the public interest" of states and their residents, both immigrants and citizens. A group of 27 law enforcement leaders and other groups have also filed amicus briefs in support of the President's executive action on immigration reform.

This is the first submission to the court from the city perspective.

"San Francisco is proud to file an Amicus Brief joining cities large and small from across the country and the U.S. Conference of Mayors to support our President's bold action on immigration and create the change to help our residents succeed," said **San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee**. "As the son of immigrant parents, this issue is very personal to me. Mayors must lead on this reform to provide all of our residents with hope, opportunities, and the services they deserve. We know our diversity drives our cities' economies and makes us all stronger."

"The President's executive action on immigration is a step forward for America," said **Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker**. "We need to support his efforts to address our broken immigration system."

"Filing an Amicus Brief is our way of saying: Pittsburgh stands on the right side of history. The President's action on immigration was an important first step towards progress—for the growth and prosperity of our nation. We must not go backwards," said **Pittsburgh Mayor William Peduto**.

"The City of Dayton is proud to be a leader in welcoming people from diverse backgrounds to its community," said **Dayton Mayor Nan Whaley**. "This order will strengthen our commitment to inclusion by allowing all residents to fully participate and help grow the economic vitality of the region. It is essential that all citizens feel safe and engaged in the place they call home."

"This proposal is fair, economically beneficial for everyone, and the right thing to do," said **Madison Mayor Paul Soglin**.

"Right now, our immigration system invites the best and brightest from all over the world to come and study at our top universities, including Washington University and St. Louis University, and then once they've gotten the training they need to build a new invention or create a new business, our system too often tells them to go back home so that other countries can reap the benefits, the new jobs, the new businesses, the new industries," said **St. Louis Mayor Francis Slay**. "It's evidence of the broken system we have today and why we must fight to fix it."

The following Mayors have signed on to the amicus brief:

Mayor Bill de Blasio, New York, New York  
Mayor Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles, California  
Mayor Kasim Reed, Atlanta, Georgia  
Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake, Baltimore, Maryland  
Mayor Byron Brown, Buffalo, New York  
Mayor Rahm Emanuel, Chicago, Illinois  
Mayor Steve Benjamin, Columbia, South Carolina  
Mayor Nan Whaley, Dayton, Ohio  
Mayor Michael Hancock, Denver, Colorado  
Mayor Muriel Bowser, Washington, D.C.  
Mayor Pedro Segarra, Hartford, Connecticut  
Mayor Annise Parker, Houston, Texas  
Mayor Steven Fulop, Jersey City, New Jersey  
Mayor Paul Soglin, Madison, Wisconsin  
Mayor Ras Baraka, Newark, New Jersey  
Mayor Michael Nutter, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
Mayor Bill Peduto, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
Mayor Charles Hales, Portland, Oregon  
Mayor John Dickert, Racine, Wisconsin  
Mayor Tom Butt, Richmond, California  
Mayor Lovely Warren, Rochester, New York  
Mayor Ralph Becker, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Mayor Ed Lee, San Francisco, California  
Mayor Gary McCarthy, Schenectady, New York  
Mayor Ed Murray, Seattle, Washington  
Mayor Francis Slay, St. Louis, Missouri  
Mayor Marilyn Strickland, Tacoma, Washington  
Mayor Mike Spano, Yonkers, New York

The following mayors have expressed their support and will sign on to the brief, pending final local approvals:

Mayor Karen Majewski, Hamtramck, Michigan  
Mayor Virg Bernero, Lansing, Michigan  
Mayor Tom Barrett, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
Mayor Betsy Hodges, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Mayor Greg Stanton, Phoenix, Arizona  
###



ZACHARY W. CARTER  
*Corporation Counsel*

THE CITY OF NEW YORK  
**LAW DEPARTMENT**  
100 CHURCH STREET  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007

RICHARD DEARING  
*Chief of Appeals*

CECELIA CHANG  
*Deputy Chief of Appeals*

**CITIES AND COUNTIES PROPOSED AMICUS BRIEF:  
SUPREME COURT APPEAL ON IMMIGRATION EXECUTIVE ACTION**

---

New York City, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Birmingham and a coalition of local governments are preparing an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court supporting the President's executive action on immigration. We expect the brief to be due in early March. This memo provides instructions for how your city, county, mayor, or county leader can sign on to the brief. It also includes specific requests for information from participating cities, counties, and local government leaders.

**Background:** On January 19, 2016, the Supreme Court agreed to review a preliminary injunction blocking the nationwide implementation of the President's executive action on immigration. The executive action provides important humanitarian relief to an estimated 4 million undocumented immigrants who have been in the country since January 2010 and who have children who are citizens or permanent residents or who came to the United States as children and meet certain educational requirements. The executive action prevents families from being split apart and harmed by allowing qualifying parents and young people who merit a favorable exercise of discretion to stay in the United States temporarily and work lawfully.

Cities and counties play a key role in explaining how our local residents, families, and communities are harmed by the preliminary injunction. Earlier in the case, a coalition of cities, counties, and local government leaders filed amicus briefs in the district court (over 30 signatories), the circuit court (over 70 signatories), and the Supreme Court at the certiorari stage (over 80 signatories). The cities of New York, Los Angeles, Atlanta, and Birmingham are again preparing an amicus brief supporting the executive action. It is crucial that the Supreme Court hear the voices of local governments as the Court prepares to review the injunction blocking the executive action.

**Focus of the brief:** The brief will provide a powerful counterpoint to the plaintiff states' claim of harm by outlining the immense local benefits of the

executive action: promoting family unity and child welfare; strengthening local communities and economies; and encouraging open communication and engagement between residents and local authorities.

On the standing question, the brief will also argue that plaintiff states failed to represent the interests of the cities and counties (and millions of residents of those cities and counties) that support the executive action, and that a nationwide injunction was unjustified.

Based on feedback from other cities and counties, additional points may be added.

**Timing: We expect to be filing the amicus brief no later than Tuesday March 8, 2016. Due to the compressed timeline, we encourage you to immediately engage your colleagues, including your city or county attorney, and take steps to obtain authorization to sign on to the brief as soon as possible.**

**Sign ons:** We will need written confirmation that your city, county, mayor, or county leader will sign on, as well as the signature block of the attorney representing them in their public capacity. The deadline for sign-ons will be set when we have a firm filing date, likely early March, but you should not delay in making arrangements to sign on. A sample signature block is below.

Sample signature block:

ZACHARY W. CARTER  
*Corporation Counsel*  
*of the City of New York*  
100 Church Street  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 356-2500  
*Attorney for the City of New York*  
*and Mayor Bill de Blasio*

#### **Requests for information:**

- Please contact us if your city or county is in one of the plaintiff states.<sup>1</sup> We would like to hear about your experience and, in particular, whether the state notified or solicited input from your city or county about the impact of the executive action or the state's participation in this lawsuit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Texas, Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, or Wisconsin.

- Please contact us if your city or county has relevant experience from past deferred action programs, like those for refugees from Haiti and Central America; the late 1980s policy granting deferred action to spouses and children of people with legal status; or the 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program.

**To join the amicus brief, share your city's or county's experience, or ask any questions, please contact one of the following individuals:**

JEREMY SHWEDER  
Senior Counsel  
New York City Law Department  
jshweder@law.nyc.gov  
(212) 356-2611

EMMA GRUNBERG  
Assistant Corporation Counsel  
New York City Law Department  
egrunber@law.nyc.gov  
(212) 356-0841

SONIA LIN  
General Counsel  
New York City Mayor's Office of  
Immigrant Affairs  
slin@cityhall.nyc.gov  
(212) 788-2831

**For sign-ons, please copy:**

OMAR HAKIM  
New York City Mayor's Office of  
Immigrant Affairs  
ohakim@moia.nyc.gov  
(212) 676-3156

For reference, the following officials, localities, and organizations signed on to the amicus brief filed with the Supreme Court in support of the federal government's petition for certiorari. Individuals and localities that previously joined the brief should notify the individuals above if they intend to sign on to the merits brief and confirm that the signature block remains the same.

- Mayor Bill de Blasio of New York City
- Mayor Eric Garcetti of Los Angeles, California
- Mayor Kasim Reed of Atlanta, Georgia
- Mayor Katherine M. Sheehan of Albany, New York
- Mayor William D. Euille and the City of Alexandria, Virginia
- The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia
- Mayor Steve Adler of Austin, Texas
- Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake and the City Council of Baltimore



- The City of Bell, California
- Mayor William A. Bell, Sr. of Birmingham, Alabama
- Mayor David H. Bieter of Boise, Idaho
- Mayor Martin J. Walsh of Boston, Massachusetts
- Mayor Byron W. Brown of Buffalo, New York
- The City of Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Mayor James Diossa of Central Falls, Rhode Island
- Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr., of Charleston, South Carolina
- Mayor Rahm Emanuel of Chicago, Illinois
- Mayor Michael B. Coleman of Columbus, Ohio
- Cook County, Illinois
- Mayor Dan Wolk of Davis, California
- Mayor Nan Whaley and the City of Dayton, Ohio
- Mayor Michael B. Hancock of the City & County of Denver, Colorado
- The Village of Dolton, Illinois
- Mayor Richard H. Garcia and the City of Edinburg, Texas
- El Paso County, Texas
- Mayor Elizabeth Tisdahl of Evanston, Illinois
- Mayor Peter Lindstrom of Falcon Heights, Minnesota
- Mayor Karen Freeman-Wilson of Gary, Indiana
- Mayor Domenick Stampone of the Borough of Haledon, New Jersey
- Mayor Pedro Segarra of Hartford, Connecticut
- The Incorporated Village of Hempstead, New York
- Mayor Nancy R. Rotering of Highland Park, Illinois
- Mayor Dawn Zimmer and the City of Hoboken, New Jersey
- Mayor Alex B. Morse of Holyoke, Massachusetts
- Mayor Annise D. Parker of Houston, Texas
- Mayor Svante L. Myrick of Ithaca, New York
- Mayor Steven M. Fulop of Jersey City, New Jersey
- Mayor Sylvester "Sly" James of Kansas City, Missouri
- Mayor Mark Stodola of Little Rock, Arkansas
- Mayor Robert Garcia of Long Beach, California
- Los Angeles County, California
- Mayor Paul R. Soglin of Madison, Wisconsin
- Mayor Daniel T. Drew of Middletown, Connecticut
- The City of Milwaukee
- Mayor Betsy Hodges and the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota
- Montgomery County, Maryland
- Mayor Toni N. Harp of New Haven, Connecticut
- Mayor Noam Bramson and the City of New Rochelle, New York
- Mayor Ras J. Baraka of Newark, New Jersey
- Mayor Setti D. Warren of Newton, Massachusetts
- Mayor Paul A. Dyster of Niagara Falls, New York
- Mayor Libby Schaaf and the City of Oakland, California
- Mayor Jose "Joey" Torres of Paterson, New Jersey
- Mayor Michael A. Nutter of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Mayor William Peduto of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
- Mayor Adrian O. Mapp of Plainfield, New Jersey
- Mayor Charlie Hales and the City Council of Portland, Oregon
- Prince George's County, Maryland
- Princeton, New Jersey
- Mayor Jorge O. Elorza of Providence, Rhode Island
- Mayor Tom Butt and the City of Richmond, California

- Mayor Lovely Warren of Rochester, New York
  - Mayor Ralph Becker of Salt Lake City, Utah
  - Mayor Edwin M. Lee and the City and County of San Francisco
  - Mayor Sam Liccardo of San Jose, California
  - Mayor Miguel Pulido and the City of Santa Ana, California
  - The County of Santa Clara, California
  - The Board of Supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Arizona
  - Mayor Javier M. Gonzales and the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico
  - The City of Santa Monica, California
  - Mayor Gary R. McCarthy of Schenectady, New York
  - Mayor Edward B. Murray of Seattle, Washington
  - Mayor Joseph A. Curtatone of Somerville, Massachusetts
  - Sonoma County, California
  - Mayor Pete Buttigieg of South Bend, Indiana
  - Mayor Francis G. Slay of St. Louis, Missouri
  - Mayor Elizabeth A. Goreham and the State College Borough Council, Pennsylvania
  - Mayor Michael J. Ryan of Sunrise, Florida
  - Mayor Stephanie A. Miner of Syracuse, New York
  - Mayor Marilyn Strickland of Tacoma, Washington
  - Mayor Bob Buckhorn of Tampa, Florida
  - Mayor Muriel Bowser of Washington, D.C.
  - Mayor Lindsey P. Horvath of West Hollywood, California
  - Mayor Mike Spano of Yonkers, New York
  - The National League of Cities
  - The United States Conference of Mayors
-