

EXHIBIT B(1)

Department of Transportation Stipulation

Erwin Chemerinsky (*pro hac vice*)
echemerinsky@law.berkeley.edu
Claudia Polsky (CA Bar No. 185505)
cpolsky@law.berkeley.edu
U.C. BERKELEY SCHOOL OF LAW
Law Building
Berkeley, CA 94720-7200
Telephone: 510.642.6483

Elizabeth J. Cabraser (CA Bar No. 83151)
ecabraser@lchb.com
Richard M. Heimann (CA Bar No. 63607)
rheimann@lchb.com
Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.956.1000

Anthony P. Schoenberg (CA Bar No. 203714)
tschoenberg@fbm.com
FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 954-4400

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class
[Additional counsel listed on signature page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NEETA THAKUR, et al.,	)	CASE NO. 3:25-cv-04737-RL
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Parties' Stipulations and Agreement to Obviate
	)	Discovery as to DoT and DoT's Stipulations of
DONALD J. TRUMP, ET AL.,	)	Fact and Agreement to Produce Grants
	)	Spreadsheet
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Plaintiffs and DoT hereby agree that, with respect to the claims and defenses in this litigation as to DoT, neither Plaintiffs nor DoT shall seek discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, whether written, by deposition, or otherwise, subject to the terms in this stipulation. The Parties further agree that this agreement withdraws the requests for production and interrogatories served on DoT on March 17, 2026, and anticipated deposition notices. The Parties further agree that this agreement applies to any discovery, whether written, by deposition, or otherwise, that could otherwise be sought and served as to any Plaintiff, as to DoT, as to any other Defendant, or as to any non-party to this suit, to the extent that discovery seeks to establish a claim or defense as to DoT.

In exchange for obviating already-served discovery and discovery that could otherwise be sought and served, DoT agrees to produce the spreadsheet of grants described below and to the stipulations set forth below.

I. Spreadsheet of Grants

DoT agrees to produce a spreadsheet with the categories of information listed in this section. The spreadsheet will consist of all grants that the agency has identified as involving University of California researchers, including faculty, staff, academic appointees, and employees across the University of California system who are named as principal researchers, investigators, or project leaders on the grant applications for previously awarded research grants at DoT that were terminated or indefinitely suspended. The produced spreadsheet will be signed by a DoT official.

DoT agrees that Plaintiffs have the right, within 7 days of production of DoT's spreadsheet, to meet and confer and raise any identified technical errors, omissions, or formatting issues with the spreadsheet. DoT will make reasonable, good-faith efforts to resolve any

identified issues. If DoT and Plaintiffs are unable to resolve any remaining disputes regarding the spreadsheet, the Parties agree to submit their disagreement to the Court for resolution in accordance with the Court's procedures regarding discovery disputes.

Spreadsheet Columns

Grant details:

1. Granting Agency (including sub-agency if applicable, e.g., HHS-NIH)
2. Federal Award ID # (FAIN)
3. Project Name/Description/Title of Award/Project Summary
4. Recipient/Grantee Name (i.e., the direct grantee entity, e.g., "UC Irvine" or "Brown University")
5. UC location (for direct or, if applicable, sub-awards, e.g., "UCLA")
6. UC principal researcher, investigator, and/or project leader on the grant application(s)
7. Date obligated
8. Grant term (both start & end dates)
9. Date terminated or suspended
10. Date reinstated

Funding Details:

11. Amount awarded
12. Amount funded as of March 30, 2026 or to date (agency's best estimate)
13. Amount remaining when terminated or suspended
14. Statute(s) directing/authorizing the grant funds

Termination details:

15. EO(s) or executive directive(s) or agency priority implicated in the grant's termination
16. Term(s) or phrases identified in grant that resulted in termination
17. Other than the EO(s) or executive directive(s) identified above, any legal basis DoT contends allowed it to terminate the grant

II. Stipulations

Solely for the purposes of the present litigation and for no other purpose, with respect to the grants at issue in this litigation, DoT stipulates to the following facts:

1. DoT acted pursuant to Executive Orders or executive directives, meaning an agency memorandum, or other formal written articulation of agency priorities, when reviewing grants for termination.
2. DoT terminated the grants at issue in a uniform manner based on Executive Orders or executive directives.
3. When identifying grants for termination review, DoT used:
 - a. search terms, keywords, or phrases to identify grants for termination review.
 - i. The search terms and/or phrases used by DoT are described in the DoT-specific stipulation to be provided at the time DoT completes production of the Spreadsheet described above.¹
 - b. artificial intelligence tools or software.²
 - i. If AI tool(s) were used by DoT, the AI tool(s) and the prompts used will be provided at the time DoT completes production of the Spreadsheet described above.
4. DoT identified grants at issue for termination pursuant to the Executive Orders or executive directives, meaning an agency memorandum or formal, written description of agency priorities, which are to be provided at the time DoT completes production of the Spreadsheet described above.³
5. When identifying grants for termination, DoT selected those that expressed, or were presumed to express, viewpoints disfavored by the Administration, as set forth in Executive Orders or DoT's executive directives, because DoT no longer wished to subsidize those grants' viewpoints, or presumed viewpoints, such as the subject and/or topic of the grant.

¹ The provisions of search terms and/or phrases shall be made in the following format:

DoT used search terms, keywords, or phrases to identify and terminate grants presumed to express viewpoints—such as subjects and/or topics of the grant—that DoT no longer wished to subsidize. DoT used the following search terms, keywords, or phrases to identify grants for termination:

List.

² DoT will identify whether artificial intelligence tools or software were used at the time it completes production of the Spreadsheet described above and does not concede any such tools or software were used by signing these stipulations.

³ DoT agrees to identify where Plaintiffs can find the relevant EO or directive, including producing such document if it is not publicly available.

6. DoT accepts that the search terms, keywords, or other criteria used to determine which grants to terminate were designed to identify grants that expressed, or were presumed to express, viewpoints the Administration no longer wished to subsidize, as set forth in Executive Orders or DoT's executive directives. DoT accepts that the search terms, keywords, or other criteria were used to identify subjects and/or topics of the grant encompassing, or presuming to encompass, the relevant viewpoints.
7. DoT used standardized or form termination letters to notify grantees of the termination of the grants, rather than letters tailored to the specific circumstances of each grant.
8. DoT accepts that it did not consider the reliance interests of individual researchers prior to termination of grants.
9. DoT identified grants for termination using general criteria, rather than a grant-specific assessment of each award's compliance, or performance.
10. The grants at issue were funded through funds appropriated for the purpose of grant-making.
11. DoT has not re-allocated the terminated funds to other grant-making programs.
12. DoT's enabling statute or other legislation includes grant-making as a directive from Congress to DoT.
13. DoT did not terminate any grants based on alleged noncompliance with the terms of the grant.
14. DoT agrees that the number of terminated grants renders joinder of all class members impracticable, except as to Count III which does not apply to DoT.

DoT further agrees that the portions of stipulations 3 and 4 that so indicate shall be finalized and signed alongside production of the Spreadsheet described above.

**BRITAIN CATLIN
BRUNER**

Digitally signed by BRITAIN
CATLIN BRUNER
Date: 2026.05.11 15:35:56
-04'00'

Dr. Britain Bruner
Grant Manager and Transportation Specialist
Office of Research, Development and Technology, University Grants Programs
U.S. Department of Transportation

Dated: May 12, 2026

By: /s/ Elizabeth J. Cabraser

Elizabeth J. Cabraser (CA Bar No. 83151)
ecabraser@lchb.com
Richard M. Heimann (CA Bar No. 63607)
rheimann@lchb.com
Kevin R. Budner (CA Bar No. 287271)
kbudner@lchb.com
Annie M. Wanless (CA Bar No. 339635)
awanless@lchb.com
LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.956.1000

Anthony P. Schoenberg (CA Bar No. 203714)
tschoenberg@fbm.com
Linda S. Gilleran (CA Bar No. 307107)
lgilleran@fbm.com
Kyle A. McLorg (CA Bar No. 332136)
kmclorg@fbm.com
Katherine T. Balkoski (CA Bar No. 353366)
kbalkoski@fbm.com
FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: 415. 954.4400

Erwin Chemerinsky (*pro hac vice*)
echemerinsky@law.berkeley.edu
Claudia Polsky (CA Bar No. 185505)
cpolsky@law.berkeley.edu
U.C. BERKELEY SCHOOL OF LAW
Law Building
Berkeley, CA 94720-7200
Telephone: 510.642.6483

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

Date: May 10, 2026

By: /s/ Jason Altabet

Respectfully submitted,

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

ERIC J. HAMILTON
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JOSEPH E. BORSON
Assistant Branch Director

/s/ Jason Altabet
JASON ALTABET (Md. Bar No. 2211280012)
Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: (202) 305-0727
Email: jason.k.altabet2@usdoj.gov

KATHRYN BARRAGAN (D.C. Bar No. 90026294)
Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch

Attorneys for DoT

Department of Transportation Stipulations

Case No. 25-04737

Pursuant to the Parties Agreement, “Parties’ Stipulations and Agreement to Obviate Discovery as to DoT and DoT’s Stipulations of Fact and Agreement to Produce Grants Spreadsheet” DoT hereby stipulates the following:

3. When identifying grants for termination review, DoT used:
 - a. DoT used search terms, keywords, or phrases to identify and terminate grants presumed to express viewpoints—such as subjects and/or topics of the grant—that DoT no longer wished to subsidize. DoT used the following search terms, keywords, or phrases to identify grants for termination:
 - i. The National Center for Sustainable Transportation (“NCST”) addresses “accelerating reductions in greenhouse gas emissions while simultaneously enhancing transportation equity.” NCST’s objectives “to prioritize disadvantaged communities,” “reduce impacts associated with infrastructure...for disadvantaged populations,” and “support a Transportation Equity and Environmental Justice Advisory Group” are inconsistent the DOT’s priority to cease promoting DEI initiatives that discriminate on the basis of race, national origin, or another protected characteristic. (DoTAR_00197).
 - ii. The Pacific Southwest Region University Transportation Center (“PSRUTC”) promotes equitable access and furthers research themes regarding “uneven transportation access across PSR’s enormously diverse region, particularly among transportation-disadvantaged travelers and communities.” PSRUTC’s research priorities that “deepen commitments to diversifying the transportation workforce; draw a more diverse pool of students; and focuses on Equity” are inconsistent with DOT’s priority to cease promoting DEI initiatives that discriminate on the basis of race, national origin, or another protected characteristic. Furthermore, PSRUTC’s EV statement (“perspective on equity in the transition to electric vehicles”) and environmental justice themes (“addressing EJ problems in the goods movement system”) promote discriminatory consideration and “green new deal” principles that are inconsistent with DOT’s priorities. (DoTAR_00199).
 - b. DoT did not use artificial intelligence tools or software when identifying grants for termination review.
4. All relevant directives and Executive Orders were produced with the Administrative Record:
 - a. DOT Secretary's January 29, 2025 Memorandum (DoTAR_00222);
 - b. DOT Order 2100.7 (DoTAR_00224);

This document was produced solely for the purposes of the present litigation and for no other purpose, with respect to the grants at issue in Case No. 25-04737.

- c. DOT Secretary's April 24, 2025 Letter to Recipients (DoTAR_00228);
- d. EO 14148 (DoTAR_00232); and
- e. EO 14222 (DoTAR_00235)