

**AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN  
CALIFORNIA**

JOHN THOMAS H. DO (SBN 285075)

jdo@aclunc.org

EMI YOUNG (SBN 311238)

eyoung@aclunc.org

GRAYCE ZELPHIN (SBN 279112)

gzelphin@aclunc.org

39 Drumm Street

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: (415) 293-6333

Facsimile: (415) 255-8437

**ASIAN LAW CAUCUS**

CARL TAKEI (SBN 256229)

carlt@asialawcaucus.org

MEGAN VEES (SBN 325184)

meganv@asianlawcaucus.org

55 Columbus Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: (415) 896-1701

Facsimile: (415) 896-1702

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Chang, et al.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**GER CHONG ZE CHANG, MAI NOU VANG,  
RUSSELL MATHIS, YING SUSANNA VA, and**  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**COUNTY OF SISKIYOU and JEREMIAH  
LARUE, in his official capacity as Sheriff,**

Defendants.

**COVINGTON & BURLING LLP**

STANLEY YOUNG (SBN 121180)

syoung@cov.com

3000 El Camino Real

5 Palo Alto Square, 10th Floor

Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112

Telephone: (650) 632-4700

Facsimile: (650) 632-4800

MICHAEL PLIMACK (SBN 133869)

mplimack@cov.com

ALISON WALL (SBN 319562)

awall@cov.com

ELLEN CHOI (SBN 326291)

echoi@cov.com

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Salesforce Tower

415 Mission St., Suite 5400

San Francisco, CA 94105-2533

Telephone: (415) 591-6000

Facsimile: (415) 591-6091

CASE NO.: 2:22-cv-01378-KJM-AC

**SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT**

1 This filing supplements Plaintiffs’ previously amended complaint, pursuant to Federal Rule of  
2 Civil Procedure 15(d).

3 ***The County’s Novel Interpretation and Discriminatory Application of its Zoning Ordinance to***  
4 ***Continue to Deprive Asian American Communities of Water***

5 288. As part of its campaign to restrict water to Asian Americans and drive them from the  
6 County, Siskiyou County has adopted and applied a novel interpretation of the County Zoning  
7 Ordinance. The County, through or with its Community Development Department (“CDD”), its  
8 Director Richard J. Dean, the District Attorney, and the Sheriff’s Department, has utilized this  
9 interpretation to investigate, cite, fine, and sue well owners who provide water to Asian Americans,  
10 while ignoring or even facilitating the extraction of water by well owners who do not predominantly  
11 serve Asian American communities. As Defendants are aware,<sup>1</sup> Asian American communities in  
12 Siskiyou County rely on off-parcel water for domestic use, including maintaining health, fire protection,  
13 hygiene, bathing/cleaning, cooking, and caring for livestock, pets, and gardens.<sup>2</sup> Yet Defendants have  
14 affirmatively implemented this policy, custom, or practice despite the danger that it would deprive Asian  
15 American communities of necessary access to water, creating a water crisis.

16 289. Siskiyou County’s Zoning Ordinance is codified at Title 10, Chapter 6 of the County  
17 Code. The Zoning Ordinance sets forth several districts that the County can establish in the  
18 unincorporated County area. Among these are the “Prime Agricultural District” (AG-1), the “Non-  
19 Prime Agricultural District” (AG-2), the “Rural Residential Agricultural District” (R-R), the “Light  
20 Industrial District” (M-M), and the “Heavy Industrial District” (M-H). Siskiyou County Code 10-6.202.

21 290. The vast majority of the properties in and around the areas of the County where Asian  
22 Americans are concentrated are zoned AG-1, AG-2, or Rural Residential, as are properties with wells  
23 that provide water to those communities.

24  
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>1</sup> Asian Americans community members have informed Defendants that they rely on off-parcel water.

27 <sup>2</sup> Most Asian Americans in Siskiyou County live in rural areas without access to municipal water  
28 systems and do not have wells on their properties. In addition to the high cost of having a well drilled,  
the County has created further barriers for Asian Americans who seek permits to install a well, including  
failing to carry out necessary inspections and failing to respond to permit applications.

1           291. Various sections of the County Code define the permitted uses of the different zoning  
2 districts, as well as additional uses that are permitted in each zoning district subject to obtaining a use  
3 permit (“conditional uses”). Agricultural uses and “[a]ccessory uses incidental to agriculture” are  
4 permitted on both AG-1 and AG-2 land. Siskiyou County Code 10-6.4902, 10-6.5002. In the Rural  
5 Residential district, accessory uses normally incidental to farming are permitted. Siskiyou County Code  
6 10-6.4802.

7           292. The County first adopted its Zoning Ordinance in 1953. The sections of the Zoning  
8 Ordinance that establish the permitted uses of the relevant zoning districts were enacted in 1986.  
9 Despite this decades-long history, the County never used the Zoning Ordinance to regulate extraction or  
10 distribution of water until 2020.

11           293. Around 2020, the County developed a new interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance.  
12 Under this new interpretation, the County asserts that it is a zoning violation to transfer water off-parcel  
13 in most types of zoning districts, including AG-1, AG-2, and Rural Residential. Specifically, the County  
14 interprets the permitted and conditional uses of these districts to exclude *any* water distribution, while  
15 maintaining that the only districts that allow water distribution are those that permit “bottling works and  
16 spring and mineral bottling works at the source.” The Zoning Ordinance provides for water bottling  
17 facilities in Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial districts. The County adopts this interpretation  
18 regardless of the manner, amount, or use of extracted water; regardless of whether it is sold or given  
19 away; and regardless of whether it is potable or non-potable.

20           294. Because the County now views water transfers as neither a permitted nor conditional use  
21 in non-industrial zoning districts, well owners on AG-1, AG-2, or Rural Residential land cannot obtain a  
22 permit that would allow them to provide water off-parcel in any amount or for any purpose, including  
23 for accessory uses incidental to agriculture or small farming. The County’s new interpretation of the  
24 Zoning Ordinance is therefore a stricter prohibition on water extraction and distribution than the 2021  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 water extraction ordinance,<sup>3</sup> which allowed for water extraction permits (though in practice those  
2 permits were not generally available to Asian Americans).

3 295. This interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance marks a departure from prior policy, custom,  
4 or practice within Siskiyou County and across the state.

5 296. The extraction and transportation of groundwater off the parcel where it was extracted is  
6 commonplace in rural areas across California, and counties throughout the state typically do not rely on  
7 zoning restrictions to limit water use. Nor do other counties generally outright bar water transfers within  
8 watersheds or within a county. Under Siskiyou’s extreme reading of its Zoning Ordinance, moving  
9 water to a neighboring parcel in any amount, even for necessary domestic use, is prohibited.

10 297. The County’s new interpretation and application of its Zoning Ordinance is also a  
11 departure from its own past practice. During the decades the Zoning Ordinance has been in place, the  
12 County never used it to restrict water transfers until 2020. This is not because no water distribution was  
13 taking place. Moving water between parcels was and is a common practice among farmers and ranchers  
14 in Siskiyou County. The County is aware of this practice<sup>4</sup> and has even taken steps to *preserve and*  
15 *promote* non-Asian farmers’ and ranchers’ ability to transfer water.

16 298. For example, after the passage of the water extraction ordinance, the County’s  
17 Agricultural Commissioner contacted certain well owners, whom he referred to as “legal and legitimate  
18 operators,” to advise them they would now need to obtain permits to extract water from their wells for  
19 off-parcel use. On information and belief, these well owners have not provided water to Asian  
20 American communities and are not themselves Asian American. Under the County’s current  
21 interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance, *any* extraction of water from these well owners’ properties,  
22  
23  
24

---

25 <sup>3</sup> “Water extraction ordinance” refers to Siskiyou County Urgency Ordinance 21-07 and later Ordinance  
26 21-13, codified at Siskiyou Cnty. Code § 3.5-13.101 et seq.

27 <sup>4</sup> During the Board of Supervisors’ debate on the water extraction ordinance, supervisors raised concerns  
28 that requiring a permit to extract and transfer water off-parcel would “be an encumbrance” for “our  
agriculture people, farmers, ranchers,” especially those who “provide services to other ranchers,” such  
as water hauling.

1 regardless of permitting status, is prohibited.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, the County has not cited any of these well  
2 owners for violating the Zoning Ordinance by extracting water for off-parcel use.

3 299. Likewise, during the first few months of enforcement of the water extraction ordinance,  
4 the County issued permits to white property owners to haul water from their parcels. Though such water  
5 distribution apparently violates the Zoning Ordinance under the County’s current interpretation, the  
6 County has not cited any of these property owners. In fact, in issuing the permits, County staff *explicitly*  
7 notated that the requested water hauling was compliant with the County’s Zoning Ordinance.

8 *A. The County’s Use of its Zoning Ordinance as a New Tool to Restrict Water to Asian*  
9 *Americans*

10 300. Around 2020, Siskiyou County began testing a new interpretation of the Zoning  
11 Ordinance to target well owners who provide water to Asian American communities.

12 301. Steve Griset was one such well owner. The lawsuit Siskiyou County brought against Mr.  
13 Griset, *see* First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) ¶ 154, included a claim for violation of the County  
14 Zoning Ordinance under the theory that “bulk groundwater extraction, collection, and distribution” are  
15 not permitted in the AG-1 zoning district where his property is located. As a result of that lawsuit, Mr.  
16 Griset has been discouraged from providing water and generally refrains from providing water from his  
17 well out of fear of further prosecution.

18 302. The County’s targeting of the Ellison Ranch, *see* FAC ¶ 156, also included a claim for  
19 violation of the Zoning Ordinance by extracting and distributing groundwater. In October 2023, the  
20 County and the owners of Ellison Ranch entered into a settlement agreement that prohibited the well  
21 owners from “providing water from the Property for off-site use by a third party, or otherwise allowing  
22 the Property to be a place of water supply and distribution for third party use.”

23 303. County officials, including the Sheriff’s Department at the request of the Community  
24 Development Department, continue to track, surveil, and tail vehicles and water trucks, and now use  
25 these activities to identify well owners to cite under the new interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>5</sup> On information and belief, these well owners’ properties are zoned for agricultural, not industrial, uses.  
28 Under the County’s new interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance, the only zoning districts that allow any  
type of water distribution are Light Industrial and Heavy Industrial districts.

1           304. In late 2023 and 2024, the County sharply increased its use of the Zoning Ordinance,  
2 under its newly adopted interpretation, to go after well owners who provide water to Asian Americans.  
3 From December 2023 to July 2024, the County issued notices and citations for violation of the Zoning  
4 Ordinance to owners of small wells on four properties. The owners of each of these four wells provided  
5 water to Asian Americans and are Asian American themselves.

6           305. Bill Yang was one of these well owners. He lives in the Big Springs area of Siskiyou  
7 County, near the Mount Shasta Vista subdivision (“Shasta Vista”). He has provided water from his well  
8 to other Asian Americans who live in Shasta Vista and do not have wells on their properties. On  
9 December 18, 2023, Siskiyou County Code Enforcement Officer John Ottenberg issued a Notice to  
10 Comply to Mr. Yang, indicating that AG-2 zoning did not allow for a “water distribution enterprise.”  
11 Mr. Yang talked with Code Enforcement later that month and was told he could not bring water from his  
12 well to other properties, even if he owned those properties. On May 15, 2024, Code Enforcement  
13 Officer Ottenberg cited Mr. Yang for violating the Zoning Ordinance by “unpermitted Removal of water  
14 from property” and fined him \$100. Mr. Yang is afraid that if he continues providing water to his Asian  
15 American neighbors, the County will sue or fine him.

16           306. On June 18, 2024, Code Enforcement Officer Ottenberg issued a Notice to Comply to the  
17 Asian American owners of another well. Similarly, the notice indicated, “Ag-2 zoning makes no  
18 allowance for a water distribution enterprise.”

19           307. Another of the well owners was Vue Moua. In March 2024, Mr. Moua bought a property  
20 with a well in the Big Springs area, near Shasta Vista. The property is zoned AG-2. Before Mr. Moua  
21 bought the property, water trucks would fill up there with the permission of the owner at the time, who  
22 was white. The former owner was never cited for violating the Zoning Ordinance.

23           308. After Mr. Moua bought the property, he continued to allow water trucks to fill up there.  
24 Much of the water pumped from his well went to Asian Americans living nearby who lacked wells on  
25 their properties.

26           309. On April 24, 2024, a few weeks after closing on the property, Mr. Moua received a  
27 Notice to Comply from Siskiyou County Code Enforcement Officer Ottenberg. The notice stated Mr.  
28 Moua was violating the Zoning Ordinance by allowing water trucks to fill up at the property.

1           310. On May 15, 2024, Mr. Moua received a citation with a \$100 fine. A cover letter  
2 accompanying the citation stated that it was a “zoning violation to operate a water distribution center”  
3 on his property.

4           311. On May 23, 2024, Code Enforcement went to Mr. Moua’s property to inspect it. They  
5 told him that he would need to change his zoning designation if he wanted to provide water off-parcel.

6           312. Mr. Moua contacted the Community Development Department to inquire about changing  
7 the zoning designation on his property, explaining that he wanted to provide water to friends and  
8 relatives for their daily use because they did not have wells on their properties. CDD responded that,  
9 “The only zoning districts that allow for any sort of water distribution are the Light Industrial and Heavy  
10 Industrial zoning districts.” Mr. Moua was informed that he could not get a zoning change because an  
11 industrial zoning district would not be compatible with the neighborhood, which was made up of AG-1,  
12 AG-2, and Rural Residential districts.

13           313. Mr. Moua received subsequent citations for pumping water in violation of the Zoning  
14 Ordinance on June 4, 2024; June 20, 2024; and July 10, 2024. The citations included fines for \$200,  
15 \$500, and \$1000, respectively.

16           314. Mr. Moua knows members of his Asian American community rely on him for water;  
17 without water from his well, they will be unable to bathe in the extreme heat, care for their animals, and  
18 protect against wildfires. However, he does not know if he can continue providing water if the County  
19 persists in issuing escalating fines against him.

20           315. The fourth well owner was Neng Vue. Mr. Vue and his wife live in Shasta Vista. They  
21 previously provided water to their neighbors without wells, who are also Asian American. On July 25,  
22 2024, Mr. Vue received a notice from the County stating that he was violating the Zoning Ordinance by  
23 operating a “water distribution center” by allowing water to be pumped at his property. After Mr. Vue  
24 received the notice, he and his wife stopped providing water to their neighbors because they were scared  
25 the County would fine them.

26           316. Defendants have not used the Zoning Ordinance to restrict well owners who do not  
27 provide water to Asian Americans from extracting or distributing water.  
28



1           317. Defendants' actions have had a chilling effect on well owners who provided water to  
2 Asian Americans in Siskiyou County. Afraid that they will become targets of citations and fines, well  
3 owners have ceased allowing water to be pumped on their properties. As intended, Defendants'  
4 targeting of water providers under its Zoning Ordinance has led to a reduction in the provision of water,  
5 uniquely impacting Asian American communities, who rely on off-parcel water.

6           318. The County's recent use of the Zoning Ordinance against well owners is leading to  
7 another humanitarian crisis, similar to what Asian Americans experienced in the County in the summer  
8 of 2021. Once again, many Asian Americans are experiencing scarcity of water, which poses a grave  
9 danger to their health and safety. They lack water to meet their basic health and hygiene needs, care for  
10 pets, maintain livestock and gardens, and prevent and fight fires that are all too common.

11           *B. Allegations of Plaintiff Mathis*

12           319. The County's recent use of the Zoning Ordinance to stop off-parcel water extraction has  
13 again made it difficult for Plaintiff Russell Mathis to obtain water for his health, hygiene, cooling off,  
14 fire protection, cooking, and caring for his dogs.

15           320. In addition to Steve Griset, another person who otherwise would have provided water to  
16 Mr. Mathis recently declined to do so out of fear that the County would target him for enforcement.

17           321. With local well owners increasingly afraid to provide water due to the County's zoning  
18 enforcement actions, it has been challenging for Mr. Mathis to obtain enough water for his basic needs,  
19 putting his health and safety in serious danger. He has not secured a consistent or reliable water source,  
20 and the water he has obtained is poor quality. In order to conserve the small amount of water he has,  
21 Mr. Mathis uses only about five gallons of water per day.

22           322. This scarcity of water is especially dangerous during the summer months, when there is a  
23 high risk of wildfires. There have already been a number of fires in Shasta Vista, the subdivision where  
24 Mr. Mathis lives, during the summer of 2024, including a large fire in June that occurred less than a mile  
25 from him. Local volunteer firefighters have struggled to secure enough water to control or put out fires.  
26 And, if a fire reaches his property, Mr. Mathis will not have enough water in his depleted water tanks to  
27 fight it.  
28



**CLAIM THIRTEEN**

**Violation of Equal Protection – Racial Discrimination – Zoning**

**Under the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**

***Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983***

**(Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass<sup>6</sup> against Defendants)**

323. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

324. Plaintiff Mathis and members of the Water Subclass are Asian American and are, therefore, members of a protected class under the Equal Protection Clause.

325. Defendants, acting under color of state law, have a policy, practice, or custom of using the Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance to stop well owners from providing water to members of the Water Subclass. Along with other water restrictions imposed by Defendants, like the water ordinances and permitting, the zoning policy, practice or custom was adopted with racial animus against the intended water recipients as an unlawful, motivating factor.

326. Defendants targeted well owners who supplied water to Plaintiff Mathis and other members of the Water Subclass based on their race. Defendants’ unlawful policy, practice, or custom of using the Zoning Ordinance to target well owners who provide water to Asian Americans was and is the moving force causing the ultimate injury to the Water Subclass, including Plaintiff Mathis.

**CLAIM FOURTEEN**

**Violation of Equal Protection – Racial Discrimination – Zoning**

**Under Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution**

**(Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass against Defendants)**

327. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Water Subclass is defined as “All Asian Americans who, since August 4, 2020, have resided or will reside within Siskiyou County without access to a residential well or municipal water at their property.” FAC ¶ 214.

1 328. The Equal Protection right under the California Constitution is comparable to, if not more  
2 expansive than, the Equal Protection Clause under the U.S. Constitution.

3 329. Plaintiff Mathis and members of the Water Subclass are Asian American and are,  
4 therefore, members of a protected class under the Equal Protection Clause.

5 330. Defendants, acting under color of state law, have a policy, practice, or custom of using  
6 the Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance to stop well owners from providing water to members of the  
7 Water Subclass. Along with other water restrictions imposed by Defendants, like the water ordinances  
8 and permitting, the zoning policy, practice or custom was advanced and adopted with racial animus  
9 against the intended water recipients as an unlawful, motivating factor.

10 331. Defendants targeted well owners who supplied water to Plaintiff Mathis and other  
11 members of the Water Subclass based on their race. Defendants' unlawful policy, practice, or custom of  
12 using the Zoning Ordinance to target well owners who provide water to Asian Americans was and is the  
13 moving force causing the ultimate injury to the Water Subclass, including Plaintiff Mathis.

14  
15 **CLAIM FIFTEEN**

16 **Violation of Substantive Due Process – State Created Danger – Zoning**

17 **Under the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**

18 ***Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983***

19 **(Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass against Defendants)**

20 332. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent paragraphs as though  
21 fully set forth herein.

22 333. Defendants affirmatively, despite the danger, put Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass  
23 in great physical and bodily danger by depriving them of water to hydrate, bathe, protect against  
24 wildfire, and otherwise sustain life and health.

25 334. Defendants were aware of, and expressly indifferent to, the danger its actions inflicted  
26 upon Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass yet refused to take obvious steps to address the risks  
27 created.  
28

1 335. Along with other water restrictions imposed by Defendants, like the water ordinances and  
2 permitting, the use of the Zoning Ordinance against those who provide water to Asian Americans is so  
3 closely related as to be the moving force causing the ultimate injury to Plaintiff Mathis and members of  
4 the Water Subclass and places them at continuing risk of such harm.

5  
6 **CLAIM SIXTEEN**

7 **Violation of Substantive Due Process – State Created Danger – Zoning**

8 **Under Article I, Section 7(a) of the California Constitution**

9 **(Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass against Defendants)**

10 336. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent paragraphs as though  
11 fully set forth herein.

12 337. Governmental action that affirmatively places a person in a position of danger deprives  
13 that person of substantive due process rights guaranteed by the California Constitution. Cal. Const., art.  
14 I, § 7(a). The substantive due process protections under the California Constitution are at least as  
15 expansive as those under the U.S. Constitution.

16 338. Defendants affirmatively, despite the danger, put Plaintiffs Mathis and the Water  
17 Subclass in great physical and bodily danger by depriving them of water to hydrate, bathe, protect  
18 against wildfire, and otherwise sustain life and health.

19 339. Defendants were aware of, and expressly indifferent to, the danger Defendants' actions  
20 inflicted upon Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass, yet refused to take obvious steps to address the  
21 risks created.

22 340. Along with other water restrictions imposed by Defendants, like the water ordinances and  
23 permitting, the use of the Zoning Ordinance against those who provide water to Asian Americans is so  
24 closely related as to be the moving force causing the ultimate injury to Plaintiff Mathis and members of  
25 the Water Subclass and places them at continuing risk of such harm.

26  
27 **CLAIM SEVENTEEN**

28 **California Government Code Section 11135 - Zoning**

1 **(Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass against Defendants)**

2 341. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent paragraphs as though  
3 fully set forth herein.

4 342. California Government Code section 11135 sets forth a nondiscrimination requirement  
5 for state programs. It provides that in pertinent part:

6 [n]o person in the State of California shall, on the basis of race, national  
7 origin, ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation,  
8 color, genetic information or disability, be unlawfully denied full and equal  
9 access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under,  
10 any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the  
11 state or by any state agency, is funded directly by the state, or receives any  
12 financial assistance from the state.

13 Cal. Gov't Code § 11135(a).

14 343. Defendants are recipients of financial assistance from the State of California.

15 344. Defendants were, at all times relevant to this action, and are currently operating or  
16 administering a program or activity that receives state financial assistance, within the meaning of section  
17 11135.

18 345. Defendants have violated the rights of Plaintiff Mathis and the Water Subclass, secured  
19 by Cal. Gov't Code § 11135 et seq., by applying the Zoning Ordinance to prohibit others from providing  
20 water to them, and those violations were and are a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs' harms. The  
21 zoning policy, practice or custom was adopted with racial animus as an unlawful, motivating factor and  
22 has a disparate impact on Asian Americans who uniquely rely on hauled water.

23 **CLAIM EIGHTEEN**

24 **Conspiracy to Violate Constitutional Rights Under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment to the**

25 **U.S. Constitution Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 - Zoning**

26 **(All Plaintiffs against Defendants)**

27 346. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent paragraphs as though  
28 fully set forth herein.



1 E. An award to Plaintiffs of costs and expenses incurred in the filing and prosecution of this  
2 action; and

3 F. Such other and further relief in favor of Plaintiffs as is just and proper.

4  
5 DATED this 8th day of August 2024.

6 /s/ John Thomas H. Do (approved 8/8/2024)

7 John Thomas H. Do

8 Emi Young

9 Grayce Zelphin

10 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

11 FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN

12 CALIFORNIA

13 /s/ Megan Vees

14 Megan Vees

15 Carl Takei

16 ASIAN LAW CAUCUS

17 /s/ Stanley Young (approved 8/8/2024)

18 Stanley Young

19 Alison Wall

20 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

21 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Chang, et al.*