

1 DROR LADIN*
 NOOR ZAFAR*
 2 JONATHAN HAFETZ*
 HINA SHAMSI*
 3 OMAR C. JADWAT*
 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION
 4 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
 New York, NY 10004
 5 Tel: (212) 549-2660
 dladin@aclu.org
 6 nzafar@aclu.org
 jhafetz@aclu.org
 7 hshamsi@aclu.org
 ojadwat@aclu.org
 8 *Admitted pro hac vice

9 CECILLIA D. WANG (SBN 187782)
 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION
 10 39 Drumm Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 11 Tel: (415) 343-0770
 cwang@aclu.org

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs* (Additional counsel listed on following page)

13
 14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 **SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND DIVISION**

16 SIERRA CLUB and SOUTHERN BORDER
 COMMUNITIES COALITION,

17 *Plaintiffs,*

18 v.

19 DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United
 20 States, in his official capacity; PATRICK M.
 SHANAHAN, Acting Secretary of Defense, in his
 21 official capacity; KEVIN K. MCALEENAN,
 Acting Secretary of Homeland Security, in his
 22 official capacity; and STEVEN MNUCHIN,
 Secretary of the Treasury, in his official capacity,

23 *Defendants.*

Case No.: 4:19-cv-00892-HSG

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION
 AND MOTION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION;
 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
 THEREOF**

Date: October 3, 2019
 Judge: Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
 Dept: Oakland
 Date Filed: May 29, 2019
 Trial Date: Not set

1 Additional counsel for Plaintiffs:

2 SANJAY NARAYAN (SBN 183227)**
3 GLORIA D. SMITH (SBN 200824)**
4 SIERRA CLUB ENVIRONMENTAL LAW PROGRAM
5 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
6 Oakland, CA 94612
7 Tel: (415) 977-5772
8 sanjay.narayan@sierraclub.org
9 gloria.smith@sierraclub.org
10 **Counsel for Plaintiff SIERRA CLUB

11 MOLLIE M. LEE (SBN 251404)
12 CHRISTINE P. SUN (SBN 218701)
13 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
14 FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.
15 39 Drumm Street
16 San Francisco, CA 94111
17 Tel: (415) 621-2493
18 Fax: (415) 255-8437
19 mlee@aclunc.org
20 csun@aclunc.org

21 DAVID DONATTI*
22 ANDRE I. SEGURA (SBN 247681)
23 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION
24 OF TEXAS
25 P.O. Box 8306
26 Houston, TX 77288
27 Tel: (713) 325-7011
28 Fax: (713) 942-8966
ddonatti@aclutx.org
asegura@aclutx.org
**Admitted pro hac vice*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION 1

3 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES..... 1

4 INTRODUCTION..... 1

5 FACTS..... 2

6 ARGUMENT 3

7 I. Plaintiffs Are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Claims 3

8 II. Plaintiffs Have Shown Irreparable Harm 6

9 III. The Balance of Harms and Public Interest Favor Plaintiffs 7

10 CONCLUSION 8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, the San Pedro
2 River, the San Bernardino National Wildlife Refuge, and the El Centro valley. Construction of a 30-
3 foot wall on these lands, along with the accompanying lighting and roads, will irreparably harm
4 Plaintiff Sierra Club’s members’ recreational and aesthetic interests in the borderlands they live in,
5 use, and treasure.

6 Defendants’ proposed wall construction in California and Arizona is not authorized by the
7 statutes they invoke, and violates both the restrictions Congress imposed in the Consolidated
8 Appropriations Act, 2019, and by the Constitution. The Court should accordingly enjoin the
9 unauthorized use of funds for construction of these additional wall sections.

10 **FACTS**

11 On May 9, 2019, “Defendant Shanahan authorized an additional \$1.5 billion in funding for
12 border barrier construction, in further response to DHS’s February 25, 2019 request for support
13 under Section 284, for four projects: one located in California—El Centro Project 1—and three
14 located in Arizona—Tucson Sector Projects 1–3.” PI Order at 11–12. In addition to Section 8005 of
15 the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, Defendants invoked Section 9002 of the
16 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, and Section 1512 of the John S. McCain National
17 Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (“NDAA”). PI Order at 12. Defendant Shanahan’s
18 reprogramming notices state that the \$1.5 billion would be diverted from accounts that Congress
19 appropriated for military pay and retirement plans, aircraft and missile funding, chemical weapon
20 destruction, and support for Afghanistan National Defense and Security Forces. *See* Dkt. No. 131-2
21 (“Rapuano Third Decl.”), Ex. A. Defendant Shanahan further ordered that reprogramming should
22 occur “without regard to comity-based policies that require prior approval from congressional
23 committees.” Dkt. No. 118-1 (“Rapuano Second Decl.”), Ex. B at 2.

24 Defendants intend to use the diverted \$1.5 billion to construct “78.25 miles of 30-foot
25 pedestrian fencing,” accompanied by roads and lighting, in Arizona and California. Rapuano Second
26 Decl., Ex. A at 1. Many miles of the proposed construction run along the Organ Pipe National
27 Monument, and replace the wildlife-permeable vehicle barriers that currently exist in the National
28 Park. According to the Department of Interior, the current barrier “has not been breached, and

1 monitoring has revealed a dramatic decline in illegal off-road vehicle activity.” U.S. Dep’t of
2 Interior, *International Border Vehicle Barrier*, Nat’l Park Serv. (May 13, 2018),
3 <https://www.nps.gov/orpi/planyourvisit/barrier.htm>. The current “barrier design allows water, and
4 animals, including the highly endangered Sonoran Pronghorn, to safely roam their natural ranges
5 uninterrupted.” *Id.* Defendants’ proposed new fence is much higher, much denser, and impermeable
6 to most animals.

7 If not enjoined, construction of the fence sections at issue here could begin as early as July
8 1, 2019. *See* PI Order at 31 n.15 (noting representation from counsel for Defendants that “no
9 construction will start [with those funds] until at least 45 days from’ the May 17, 2019 hearing
10 date”).

11 ARGUMENT

12 Defendants’ efforts to divert an additional \$1.5 billion to the President’s wall suffer from the
13 same legal flaws identified by the Court in its previous Order. Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the
14 merits of their claim that Defendants’ proposed wall construction in El Centro Project 1 and Tucson
15 Sector Projects 1–3 is unlawful. Congress did not appropriate funds for Defendants’ proposed wall
16 construction in these areas, and Defendants may not use Sections 8005 and 9002 of the Department
17 of Defense Appropriations Act, 2019, and Section 1512 of the John S. McCain National Defense
18 Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (“NDAA”) to circumvent Congress’s considered judgment.

19 In addition to their likely success on the merits, the declarations filed in support of this
20 motion demonstrate a likelihood of irreparable harm to Plaintiffs’ members’ aesthetic and
21 recreational interests in the areas identified as El Centro Project 1 and Tucson Projects 1–3. For the
22 reasons set forth in the Court’s PI Order, the balance of equities and public interest tip in favor of
23 Plaintiffs. The Court should issue a preliminary injunction to preserve the status quo while this
24 matter is pending.

25 I. Plaintiffs Are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Claims.

26 The wall projects at issue in this motion are funded entirely through transfers from accounts
27 that were appropriated for uses other than counter-narcotics support under 10 U.S.C. § 284. *See*
28 Second Rapuano Decl. ¶ 7, Ex. B; Third Rapuano Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. A. “In other words, every dollar of

1 Section 284 support to DHS and its enforcement agency, CBP is attributable to reprogramming
2 mechanisms.” PI Order at 16. Because “Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success as to their
3 argument that Congress previously denied ‘the item for which funds are requested,’” PI Order at 32,
4 and because each of the reprogramming mechanisms that Defendants seek to use may not be used
5 for an item that has been denied by Congress, the additional wall sections should be enjoined. In
6 addition, because “Plaintiffs also have shown a likelihood of success as to their argument that
7 Defendants fail to meet the ‘unforeseen military requirement’ condition for the reprogramming of
8 funds under Section 8005,” PI Order at 35, and because 10 U.S.C. § 2214 imposes an identical
9 condition on all DoD transfer authorities (other than military construction), the additional wall
10 sections should be enjoined.²

11 Defendants invoke three reprogramming authorities to justify their diversion of funds, each
12 of which is subject to the limitation that it may not be used for an item that has been denied by
13 Congress. Section 8005 may not be used “where the item for which funds are requested has been
14 denied by Congress.” PI Order at 41. Likewise, “Defendants’ Section 9002 authority is, at a
15 minimum, subject to Section 8005’s limitations.” PI Order at 12 n.7. Finally, Section 1512 is subject
16 to the restrictions contained in Section 1001 of the NDAA. *See* NDAA, Pub. L. 115-232 § 1512(b)
17 (“Transfers under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as transfers under
18 section 1001.”); *see also* Dkt. No. 131, at 4 (acknowledging that “§ 1512 of NDAA incorporates the
19 requirements of § 1001 by reference”). Section 1001, in turn, provides that transfer authorizations
20 “may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.”
21 NDAA § 1001(b)(2).

22 As the Court held with respect to the Yuma and El Paso wall sections, “the reality is that
23 Congress was presented with—and declined to grant—a \$5.7 billion request for border barrier
24 construction. Border barrier construction, expressly, is the item Defendants now seek to fund via the
25 Section 8005 transfer, and Congress denied the requested funds for that item.” PI Order at 34.

26
27 ² Plaintiffs have standing to challenge the antecedent transfers because the wall construction
28 is fairly traceable to the transfers. *See* PI Order at 23–25. In addition, because Plaintiffs “seek[]
equitable relief against a defendant for exceeding its statutory authority, the zone-of-interests test is
inapposite.” PI Order at 30.

1 Moreover, Defendants' crabbed and implausible interpretation of the restriction on denied items,
2 which would require Defendants to make and Congress to reject "a specific request for an
3 appropriation to the Section 284 drug interdiction fund," would raise serious constitutional questions
4 and "likely would violate the Constitution's separation of powers principles." PI Order at 38.

5 The three reprogramming authorities Defendants invoke are also subject to the condition
6 that they be based on "unforeseen military requirements." Section 8005 incorporates this
7 requirement explicitly, and Section 9002 incorporates it by reference to Section 8005. Section 1512
8 of the NDAA is similarly restricted because it is subject to the general restrictions on transfer
9 authorities imposed in 10 U.S.C. § 2214. *See* 10 U.S.C. § 2214(a) (section applies "[w]henver
10 authority is provided in an appropriation Act to transfer amounts in working capital funds or to
11 transfer amounts provided in appropriation Acts for military functions of the Department of Defense
12 (other than military construction) between such funds or appropriations (or any subdivision
13 thereof)"). Section 2214(b)(1) restricts transfers "except to provide funds for a higher priority item,
14 based on unforeseen military requirements, than the items for which the funds were originally
15 appropriated."

16 Just as was true for the El Paso and Yuma projects, "Defendants' argument that the need for
17 the requested border barrier construction funding was 'unforeseen' cannot logically be squared with
18 the Administration's multiple requests for funding for exactly that purpose dating back to at least
19 early 2018." PI Order at 35. "There is no logical reason to stretch the definition of 'unforeseen
20 military requirement' from requirements that the government as a whole plainly cannot predict (like
21 the need to repair hurricane damage) to requirements that plainly *were* foreseen by the government
22 as a whole (even if DoD did not realize that it would be asked to pay for them until after Congress
23 declined to appropriate funds requested by another agency)." PI Order at 36. Moreover, "if
24 'unforeseen' has the meaning that Defendants claim, Section 8005 would give the agency making a
25 request for assistance under Section 284 complete control over whether that condition is met, simply
26 by virtue of the timing of the request. As here, DHS could wait and see whether Congress granted a
27 requested appropriation, then turn to DoD if Congress declined, and DoD could always characterize
28 the resulting request as raising an 'unforeseen' requirement because it did not come earlier." PI

1 Order at 40. Such an “interpretation likely would pose serious problems under the Appropriations
2 Clause, by ceding essentially boundless appropriations judgment to the executive agencies.” PI
3 Order at 40.

4 **II. Plaintiffs Have Shown Irreparable Harm.**

5 Plaintiff Sierra Club’s members face irreparable harm to their aesthetic and recreational
6 interests if Defendants construct a border wall in the areas identified as El Centro Project 1 and
7 Tucson Sector Projects 1, 2, and 3. As the Court noted in its Order, “it is well-established in the
8 Ninth Circuit that an organization can demonstrate irreparable harm by showing that the challenged
9 action will injure its members’ enjoyment of public land.” PI Order at 49. Here, Plaintiffs’ members
10 have demonstrated precisely the type of harm to their recreational and aesthetic interests that the
11 Court previously found to be irreparable. *See* PI Order at 49–50 (recognizing harm stemming from
12 additional construction and accompanying lighting to members’ interests in hiking, camping, fishing,
13 bird watching, and overall enjoyment of natural environment).

14 Sierra Club members’ ability to hike, camp, and birdwatch in these areas will be impaired if
15 a wall is constructed. *See, e.g.*, Declaration of Gayle Hartmann ¶ 9 (“The proposed wall segments
16 will fundamentally alter my experience of these lands, by intruding upon the natural beauty, and
17 historical connectedness of people and species, that I visit these areas to experience.”); Declaration
18 of Ralph Hudson ¶ 7 (“I cannot fathom seeing an 18 to 30 foot barrier when I focus my camera on
19 Kino Peak or seeing a tall barrier strung out behind Monument Bluff These are special places
20 which fulfill the Wilderness Act’s goal of being places ‘untouched by the hand of man.’”);
21 Declaration of Kevin Arthur Dahl ¶ 7 (“Construction of a wall at and near Quitobaquito Springs will
22 impede wildlife from crossing from Mexico to get to this vital source of water, impeding my
23 enjoyment of wildlife observation at this biologically rich oasis.”); Declaration of Bill Broyles ¶ 10
24 (“proposed barrier construction will blight a landscape whose core attractions include unimpeded
25 views across the border”); Declaration of Patricia Gerrodette ¶ 8 (“noise, dust and unsightliness” will
26 cause declarant to avoid visiting lands); Declaration of Margaret Case ¶ 8 (“The construction and
27 expansion of the border wall, both as the construction proceeds and in the hard infrastructure that it
28 will produce, will diminish the values that caused me to choose these borderlands as my home.”);

1 Declaration of Carmina Ramirez ¶ 5 (“A great part of the aesthetic to me lies in the visually
 2 unimpaired, 360-degree views of the land, and mountains, on both sides of the border and
 3 putting up a big wall would have tremendous cultural and aesthetic impacts.”); Declaration of Cyndi
 4 Tuell ¶ 10 (“construction of new border walls to replace the existing ‘wildlife friendly’ walls will
 5 destroy wildlife migration through these protected lands which will harm the wilderness character”);
 6 Declaration of Roy Armenta Sr. ¶ 6 (“The unimpeded views, in all directions, are centrally important
 7 to my enjoyment of this landscape. A wall will make us feel like we’re in a prison, incarcerated in
 8 our own lands.”).

9 Moreover, Sierra Club members will experience harm “from not only the bollard wall
 10 construction but also the accompanying lighting, which does not currently exist.” PI Order at 50. The
 11 supporting declarations explain how increased lighting will disrupt their enjoyment of border lands.
 12 *See* Hudson Decl. ¶ 10 (“light pollution” will “drastically impact” present “ability to stargaze in this
 13 beautiful border region”); Dahl Decl. ¶ 8 (“[L]ights will prevent me from seeing the neighboring El
 14 Pinacate, impede the desert dark skies that are a hallmark of this landscape, and generally degrade
 15 my camping experience.”); Case Decl. ¶ 12 (“In our part of the world, dark night skies are a pride
 16 and joy; law enforcement lighting, which I understand will be exacerbated by the proposed project,
 17 is an intrusive nuisance and decreases my enjoyment of the area.”); Broyles Decl. ¶ 8 (“incessant
 18 lighting associated with the wall and its construction . . . will disrupt night flights of migrating birds,
 19 and mar my and others’ view of the night skies—a central attraction of the Organ Pipe Cactus
 20 National Monument and other public lands in the area”).

21 Absent an order from the Court enjoining construction in El Centro Project 1 and Tucson
 22 Sector Projects 1, 2, and 3, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm.

23 **III. The Balance of Harms and Public Interest Favor Plaintiffs.**

24 Just as was true for Plaintiffs’ injuries with respect to the El Paso and Yuma projects,
 25 Plaintiffs’ injuries “are not speculative, and will be irreparable in the absence of an injunction.” PI
 26 Order at 54. Moreover, “the public also has an interest in ensuring that statutes enacted by their
 27 representatives are not imperiled by executive fiat.” PI Order at 54 (quoting *E. Bay Sanctuary*
 28 *Covenant v. Trump*, 909 F.3d 1219, 1255 (9th Cir. 2018)). “Accordingly, this factor favors Plaintiffs,

1 and counsels in favor of a preliminary injunction, to preserve the status quo until the merits of the
2 case can be promptly resolved.” PI Order at 54.

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 For the reasons stated above, the Court should grant Plaintiffs a Preliminary Injunction.

5
6 Dated: May 29, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

7 /s/ Dror Ladin

8 Mollie M. Lee (SBN 251404)
9 Christine P. Sun (SBN 218701)
10 American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of
Northern California, Inc.
11 39 Drumm Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
12 Tel.: (415) 621-2493
Fax: (415) 255-8437
13 mlee@aclunc.org
csun@aclunc.org

Dror Ladin*
Noor Zafar*
Jonathan Hafetz*
Hina Shamsi*
Omar C. Jadwat*
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel.: (212) 549-2660
Fax: (212) 549-2564
dladin@aclu.org
nzafar@aclu.org
jhafetz@aclu.org
hshamsi@aclu.org
ojadwat@aclu.org

14 David Donatti*
15 Andre I. Segura (SBN 247681)
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
of Texas
16 P.O. Box 8306
Houston, TX 77288
17 Tel.: (713) 325-7011
Fax: (713) 942-8966
18 ddonatti@aclutx.org
asegura@aclutx.org

Cecillia D. Wang (SBN 187782)
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
39 Drumm Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel.: (415) 343-0770
Fax: (415) 395-0950
cwang@aclu.org

19
20
21
22 Counsel for Plaintiffs

Sanjay Narayan (SBN 183227)**
Gloria D. Smith (SBN 200824)**
Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel.: (415) 977-5772
sanjay.narayan@sierraclub.org
gloria.smith@sierraclub.org

23 *Admitted pro hac vice
24 **Counsel for Plaintiff Sierra Club