

Honorable Richard A. Jones 1 Honorable J. Richard Creatura 2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 4 5 No. 2:20-cv-01323-RAJ-JRC EL PAPEL, LLC; BERMAN 2, LLC; and KARVELL LI, an individual, 6 [PROPOSED] BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE CITIES AND COUNTIES Plaintiffs, 7 V. 8 JAY R. INSLEE, in his official capacity as Governor of the State of Washington; JENNY A. DURKAN, in her official 9 capacity as the Mayor of the City of Seattle; and THE CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipal NOTED ON MOTION CALENDAR: 10 Corporation, October 21, 2020 Defendants. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 1 **CASES** 2 3 Auracle Homes, LLC v. Lamont, No. 3:20-cv-0829 (VAB), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 141500 4 5 Baptiste v. Kennealy, No. 1:20-cv-11335-MLW, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 176264 6 7 Chong Yim v. City of Seattle, 8 Elmsford Apt. Assocs., LLC et al. v. Cuomo, 10 Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Md., 437 U.S. 117 (1978) ......8 11 Friends of Danny Devito v. Wolf, 12 13 Golden Gate Rest. Ass'n v. City & Cty. of San Francisco, 14 HAPCO v. City of Philadelphia, 15 No. 20-3300, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156327 16 Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 17 18 Kelley v. Johnson, 19 Massachusetts Bd. of Ret. v. Murgia, 20 21 Matorin v. Massachusetts, BRADLEY BERNSTEIN SANDS, LLP i 113 Cherry Street, PMB 62056 [PROPOSED] BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE CITIES AND COUNTY Seattle, WA 98104

Tel: 503-734-2480

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-05193-DDP-JEM

1	No. 20-CV-01334 (Mass. Sup. Ct. Aug. 26, 2020)
2	Pennell v. San Jose, 485 U.S. 1 (1988)
3	
4	San Francisco Apartment Ass'n v. City & Cty. of San Francisco,         881 F.3d 1169, 1179 (9th Cir. 2018)
5	S. Bay United Pentecostal Church v. Newsom, 590 U.S, 140 S. Ct. 1613 (2020)
6	
7	Schnuck v. City of Santa Monica,           935 F.2d 171 (9th Cir. 1991)         3
8	State v. Dexter, 202 P.2d 906, 907 (Wash. 1949)
9	
10	Sylvia Landfield Trust v. City of Los Angeles,
11	
	STATUTES, RULES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES
<ul><li>11</li><li>12</li></ul>	STATUTES, RULES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES  Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15 16	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15 16	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15 16	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15 16 17	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020)

## **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

2	
3	the p
4	corn
7	Ame
5	exec
6	all o
7	secu
8	City
9	Olyn
	Holl
10	Cou
11	1

1

At a moment of unprecedented crisis, state and local governments have been indispensable to the public health and economic response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Standing at a crucial cornerstone of health and welfare, and integral to that overall response, is housing security. Across America, state and local governments—through a variety of means, including legislative actions, executive orders, and judicial rules—have restricted or barred eviction proceedings during some or all of the current pandemic. Because of the critical role that eviction restrictions and other housing security measures will continue to play in our collective and long-term response to COVID-19, the City of Chicago, along with the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Dayton, Gary, Los Angeles, Oakland, Olympia, Portland, Santa Cruz, Santa Monica, Seattle, St. Paul, Somerville, Tucson, and West Hollywood as well as Cook County, and Santa Clara County (collectively, "Amici Cities and Counties"), submit this brief as amicus curiae in opposition to the motion for preliminary injunction and in support of Defendants the City of Seattle, Governor Jay R. Inslee and Mayor Jenny A. Durkan.

Amici Cities and Counties address arguments in this case that have broad ranging implications for state and local governments across the country. In summation, all of Plaintiffs' arguments challenging Seattle, Wash., Resolution 31938 (Mar. 16, 2020), Seattle., Wash., Ordinance 126075 (May 6, 2020), and Seattle, Wash., Ordinance 126081 (May 15, 2020) (together, the "eviction moratorium") should be rejected by this Court. First, the eviction moratorium falls squarely within the City's police power to promote public health, safety, and welfare during a pandemic and implicates no fundamental rights. The moratorium has done so by enabling residents to shelter in place and socially distance. Additionally, by maintaining the economic welfare of tenants, the moratorium protects individuals and neighborhoods against the dangers and risks

21

20

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

associated with evictions, including health and safety harms. These housing stability safeguards are crucial as a matter of both the public health and economic response to the current crisis.

## **ARGUMENT**

The City of Seattle's eviction moratorium falls well within the expansive police power authority granted to Washington cities to uphold public health and safety. Plaintiffs improperly import a least restrictive means test into the police power context and mischaracterize the governments' interests as limited to preventing homelessness. Pls.'s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. 13-17, ECF No. 16 (Sept. 21, 2020). This framing completely fails to address the evidence that the moratorium rationally protects the health of all Seattle residents, including but not limited to individuals at high risk of becoming homeless. The public health evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that access to stable housing is a crucial component of containing the novel coronavirus ("COVID-19"). Eviction moratoriums have a substantial relation to public health when they ensure that all tenants maintain this access.

In the seminal case of *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Massachusetts's authority to enforce its compulsory vaccination law. 197 U.S. 11 (1905). The Court concluded that public health measures are constitutional so long as they demonstrate a "real or substantial relation" to the protection of public health. *Id.* at 30-31; *accord Golden Gate Rest. Ass'n v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 546 F.3d 639, 648 (9th Cir. 2008) (recognizing tradition of local and state responsibility for public health and upholding local healthcare services ordinance). Here, the eviction moratorium undoubtedly maintains a real and substantial relation to protecting the public health in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic by increasing housing stability and allowing Seattle to implement social distancing and quarantining measures.

1	The eviction moratorium, moreover, does not discriminate against members of a protected	
2	class nor implicate a fundamental right. Because a limitation on the use of property does not	
3	implicate a fundamental right, it need only be rational. See, e.g., Schnuck v. City of Santa Monica,	
	935 F.2d 171, 174 (9th Cir. 1991) ("Rent controls violate due process only if 'arbitrary,	
4	discriminatory, or demonstrably irrelevant' to a legitimate governmental purpose") (quoting <i>Pennell</i>	
5	v. San Jose, 485 U.S. 1, 11 (1988)). As described in more detail below, Seattle's eviction	
6	moratorium is rationally related to the City's intertwined interests in protecting the health of its	
7	residents and promoting their economic security.	
8	A. The Eviction Moratorium Promotes Public Health and Safety by Ensuring Residents Have Stable Housing in Which to Social Distance and Shelter-in-Place	
9	Federal and Washington law require public health regulations to have a rational connection	
10	with the promotion of public health and safety. See Kelley v. Johnson, 425 U.S. 238, 247 (1976);	
11	State v. Dexter, 202 P.2d 906, 907 (Wash. 1949) ("The police power of a state is declared to	
12	include all those regulations designed to promote the public convenience, the general welfare, the	
	general prosperity, and extends to all great public needs, as well as regulations designed to promote	
13	the public health, the public morals, or the public safety") (citations omitted). <sup>2</sup> The eviction	
14		
15	<sup>1</sup> Unless public health legislation impermissibly interferes with the "exercise of a fundamental right" or disadvantages a	
16	"suspect class," courts under the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses use rational basis review. <i>See, e.g.</i> , <i>Massachusetts Bd. of Ret. v. Murgia</i> , 427 U.S. 307, 312 (1976). Both federal and Washington courts have found that landlords are not a protected class. <i>Sylvia Landfield Trust v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 729 F.3d 1189, 1191 (9th Cir. 2013)	
17	("We apply rational basis review because landlords are not a protected class"); San Francisco Apartment Ass'n v. C. & Cnty. of San Francisco, 881 F.3d 1169, 1179 (9th Cir. 2018) (same); accord Chong Yim v. City of Seattle, 451 P.3d 694, 702 (Wash. 2019) ("Laws regulating the use of property are therefore not subject to heightened scrutiny".)	
18	<sup>2</sup> Federal and state courts have upheld public health measures on this basis in the context of COVID-19, including eviction moratoriums. <i>S. Bay United Pentecostal Church v. Newsom</i> , 590 U.S, 140 S. Ct. 1613, 1613-14 (2020)	
19	(Roberts, C.J., concurring); <i>Friends of Danny Devito v. Wolf</i> , 227 A.3d 872 (Pa. 2020) (holding that the Pennsylvania Governor could close all "non-life-sustaining" businesses by executive order); <i>Baptiste v. Kennealy</i> , No. 1:20-cv-11335-MLW, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 176264 (D. Mass. Sept. 25, 2020) (upholding eviction moratorium); <i>HAPCO v. City of</i>	
20	Philadelphia, No. 20-3300, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156327 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 27, 2020 (same); Matorin v. Massachusetts, Civil Action No. 20-CV-01334 (Mass. Sup. Ct. Aug. 26, 2020) (same); Auracle Homes, LLC v. Lamont, No. 3:20-cv-0829 (VAB), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 141500 (D. Conn. Aug. 7, 2020) (same); San Francisco Apt. Ass'n v. City & Cty. of	
21	San Francisco, No. CPF-20-517136 (Cal. Super. Ct., Cty. of San Francisco Aug. 3, 2020), appeal abandoned, No. A160924 (Cal. Ct. App. Oct. 1, 2020) (same); JL Props. Grp. B, LLC v. Pritzker, No. 20-CH-601 (12th Cir. Ct., Will	

other congregate settings, increasing in-person contacts and making COVID-19 transmission likelier.)

20

paper clean-636pm.pdf.

19

<sup>12</sup> Dennis P. Culhane et al., Estimated Emergency and Observational/Quarantine Capacity Need for the US Homeless Population Related to COVID-19 Exposure by County; Projected Hospitalizations, Intensive Care Units and Mortality, Nat'l All, to End Homelessness, 2-5 (Mar. 27, 2020), https://endhomelessness.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/COVID-

broader public health. While shelters in Washington have implemented a range of COVID-19 safety protocols to reduce spread, infection control remains very difficult and several Seattle homeless shelters have experienced spikes in COVID-19 outbreaks since August. 

3
3. Overcrowding

Overcrowding or "doubling up" of households in non-shelter housing presents similar risks. Multiple studies have found that neighborhoods with a higher proportion of overcrowded homes had higher rates of infection, with greater risks especially for the elderly living in close quarters with younger people. These studies reinforce the data and other evidence submitted by the Defendants, which demonstrates that communities with higher percentages of overcrowding generally have had higher case infection rates. Household members cannot effectively socially distance when they share common areas such as restrooms and may even share sleeping quarters. Essential workers in sectors with exposure to the general public, like food service and healthcare, also face disproportionate overcrowding, heightening the risk of overcrowding-related COVID-19 exposure to themselves, their households, and the community. Households are community.

13

16

10

11

12

5

6

7

21

<sup>14</sup> Residents Face Social Distancing, Staying Clean, Tex. Trib. (May 24, 2020), https://www.texastribune.org/2020/05/24/texas-homeless-shelters-coronavirus-houston-austin-dallas/.

<sup>15</sup> Scott Greenstone & Sydney Brownstone, *COVID-19 Spike in Seattle Shelter Amplifies the Many Uncertainties Facing King County's Homeless in the Fall*, Seattle Times (Aug. 25, 2020), https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-

news/homeless/covid-19-spike-in-seattle-shelter-amplifies-the-many-uncertainties-facing-king-countys-homeless-in-the-fall/; see also Emily Mosites et al., Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Prevalence in Homeless Shelters — Four U.S. Cities, March 27–April 15, 2020, 69 Mortality & Morbidity Wkly. Rep. 521 (May 1, 2020),

https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6917e1.htm (documenting outbreaks in three shelters in Seattle that infected 17% of residents and staff members).

<sup>18</sup> COVID-19 Cases in New York City, a Neighborhood-Level Analysis, NYU Furman Ctr. (Apr. 10, 2020), https://furmancenter.org/thestoop/entry/covid-19-cases-in-new-york-city-a-neighborhood-level-analysis; see also Lofy Dec., ¶¶ 18-19); Jackie Botts & Lo Bénichou, The Neighborhoods Where COVID Collides with Overcrowded Homes, CalMatters (June 12, 2020), https://calmatters.org/projects/california-coronavirus-overcrowded-neighborhoods-homes/.

CalMatters (June 12, 2020), https://calmatters.org/projects/california-coronavirus-overcrowded-neighborhoods-homes/.

16 See Lofy Dec. ¶ 19.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Marisol Cuellar Mejia & Paulette Cha, *Overcrowded Housing and COVID-19 Risk Among Essential Workers*, Pub. Pol'y Inst. of Cal. (May 12, 2020), https://www.ppic.org/blog/overcrowded-housing-and-covid-19-risk-among-essential-workers/.

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

evicted from their residences could spark new outbreaks and undermine Washington's continuing efforts to address the pandemic.<sup>24</sup>

## B. The Eviction Moratorium Promotes Public Health and Safety by Maintaining Economic Welfare

The eviction moratorium is also essential to maintaining the economic security of Seattle residents. The severe harms caused by the nearly unparalleled national economic crisis instigated by the pandemic imperil the public welfare of our communities. Even if the eviction moratorium is considered solely through the lens of economic regulation (rather than as a public health measure, which it is as well), state and local governments are still granted broad deference in review. See, e.g., Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Md., 437 U.S. 117, 125-26 (1978); Yim v. City of Seattle, 451 P.3d 694, 702 (Wash. 2019) ("We have returned to the original constitutional proposition that courts do not substitute their social and economic beliefs for the judgment of legislative bodies, who are elected to pass laws.") (quotations omitted). Under the Washington Constitution, when cities exercise their police power to promote public welfare, "ordinances are presumed valid, and this presumption is overcome only by a clear showing of arbitrariness and irrationality." See Yim, 451 P.3d at 702, 704. Given the scale of the economic crisis faced by Seattle and the rest of the country, and the devastating consequences of eviction on economic stability and public health and safety, a temporary eviction moratorium against cases that do not involve an imminent threat to health and safety during the emergency and a limited moratorium on nonpayment cases after the emergency lifts is an appropriate exercise of the City's authority.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> See Lofy Dec., ¶34 ("While mitigation efforts in Washington State helped reduce the spread of COVID-19...cases have recently begun to rebound, likely due at least in part to the cooler fall weather leading people to spend more time indoors.")

<sup>30</sup> Dottie Rosenbaum, *Boost SNAP to Capitalize on Program's Effectiveness and Ability to Respond to Need*, Ctr. on Budget & Pol'v Priorities (July 18, 2020), https://cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/boost-snap-to-capitalize-on-

programs-effectiveness-and-ability-to-respond.

19

20

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Increases in Food Needs in King County, WA Spring-Summer 2020, King Cnty. Dep't of Pub. Health (Aug. 2020), https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/impacts/~/media/depts/health/communicable-diseases/documents/C19/food-insecurity-brief-report-august-2020.ashx.

Problems 54, 59 (2016) (finding that forced moves, including evictions, increase the likelihood of job loss among low-

income workers by 15 to 22 percentage points.)

1	Respectfully submitted,	
2	2 \frac{\sizetas/Darin Sands}{Darin Sands (WSBA # 35865)}	
3	, F	
4	BRADLEY BERNSTEIN SANDS, LLP 113 Cherry Street PMB 62056	
5	Seattle, WA 98104 dsands@bradleybernsteinllp.com	
6	Tel: 503-734-2480	
6	Jonathan B. Miller	
7	LiJia Gong Sophia TonNu	
8	PUBLIC RIGHTS PROJECT	
O	4096 Piedmont Avenue #149 Oakland, CA 94611	
9	$\Theta$	
10	Counsel for Amici Cities and Counties	
11	Stephen J. Kane Rebecca Hirsch	
12	CITY OF CHICAGO DEPARTMENT OF	LAW
13	$3 \parallel$	
14	Counsel for the City of Chicago	
	Dated. October 21, 2020	
15	5	
16	5	
17	7	
18	3	
19		
20		
21		

Seattle, WA 98104 Tel: 503-734-2480

1 LIST OF ADDITIONAL COUNSEL 2 MICHAEL N. FEUER EUGENE L. O'FLAHERTY 3 City Attorney Corporation Counsel 200 North Main Street, City Hall, Room 615 8th Floor Boston MA, 02201 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Attorney for the City of Attorney for the City of Boston, Massachusetts 5 Los Angeles, California NANCY E. GLOWA BARBARA J. PARKER City Solicitor City Attorney City of Cambridge One Frank Ogawa Plaza, 795 Massachusetts Avenue Sixth Floor Cambridge, MA 02139 Oakland, CA 94612 Attorney for the City of Attorney for the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts Oakland, California 9 JESSICA M. SCHELLER MARK BARBER Chief; Advice, Business & City Attorney 10 Complex Litigation Division City of Olympia Cook County State's Attorney's Office P.O. Box 1967 500 Richard J. Daley Center 11 Olympia, WA 98507-1967 Chicago, IL 60602 Attorney for the City of Attorney for Cook County, Illinois 12 Olympia, Washington BARBARA J. DOSECK TRACY REEVE 13 City Attorney City Attorney 101 W. Third Street 1221 SW Fourth Avenue P.O. Box 22 14 **Room 430** Dayton, OH 45401 Portland, OR 97204 Attorney for the City of Attorney for the City of 15 Dayton, Ohio Portland, Oregon 16 RODNEY POL, JR. LYNDSEY M. OLSON City Attorney City Attorney 401 Broadway, Suite 101 17 400 City Hall and Courthouse Gary, IN 46402 15 West Kellogg Boulevard Attorney for the City of Saint Paul, MN 55102 18 Gary, Indiana Attorney for the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota 19

20

1	JAMES R. WILLIAMS County Counsel
2	70 W. Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Floor
3	San Jose, CA 95110 Attorney for the County of Santa Clara, California
4	ANTHONY P. CONDOTTI
5	City Attorney Atchinson, Barisone & Condotti
6	P.O. Box 481 Santa Cruz, CA 95061 Attorney for the City of
7	Santa Cruz, California
8	GEORGE S. CARDONA Interim City Attorney
9	1685 Main Street, Third Floor Santa Monica, CA 90401 Counsel for the City of
10	Santa Monica, California
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

FRANCIS X. WRIGHT, JR. City Solicitor
93 Highland Avenue
Somerville, MA 02143
Attorney for the City of
Somerville, Massachusetts

MICHAEL RANKIN City Attorney P.O. Box 27210 Tucson, AZ 85726 Attorney for the City of Tucson, Arizona

MICHAEL JENKINS City Attorney Best Best & Krieger, LLP 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Ste 110 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 Attorney for the City of West Hollywood, California