

From: [Alexandra FitzGerald](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: Constituent concerns
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 4:34:13 AM


 [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Mayor and Council-

I am ashamed you are our officials, and that I voted for any of you.

I don't care if ICE is normally at events, it is your duty as our officials to protect us and to protect our city from the kind of lawlessness and murder that they are carrying out across the country. Want to know what is happening with the rest of us who actually live here? We are calling our friends and family to warn them to stay inside that weekend, to not go down by the stadium for chores or shopping because who knows if ICE is going to be roaming our streets in SUVs and disappearing citizens who aren't white, or murdering others.

A man dressed in a Batman suit is a better defender for our city than you, I hope you are ashamed.

And just so you know I am your constituent and that without something better from you than this, I will make sure everyone I know who can vote against you, will. I am a homeowner just a mile north of 

Maybe try to be as least as caring, useful, and kind, as a grown man in a Halloween costume.

YOU CAN DO BETTER THAN THIS.

From: [sami waterman](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: Cooperating with ICE
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 8:12:19 AM

You don't often get email from s[REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

You will lose so many votes if you and your counsel decide to cooperate with ICE.

Please consider the fact that this is California, we are a largely mixed region.

As a fifth generation Californian, I stand with Newsom against everything trump orders and so does my family.

Not only will you lose votes, you will lose respect in the eyes of your entire community, your family, everyone you know.

Yes, this is a warning from the general public.

We are a safe, haven state. We always have been. California was never segregated.

-Samantha Waterman
Fifth generation californian
And very proud of it

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Condemn ICE Actions in Minnesota
Date: Sunday, January 25, 2026 1:24:57 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Anna Nguyen [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2026 3:14 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Condemn ICE Actions in Minnesota

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City of Santa Clara Council,

I am a constituent in Santa Clara, California, writing to condemn the recent actions of ICE in Minnesota and to urge you to take action.

Reports of aggressive enforcement tactics and the use of force raise serious concerns about civil liberties, accountability, and due process. Regardless of immigration policy, no federal agency should operate without meaningful oversight or respect for human rights.

I ask that you publicly condemn these actions, support independent investigations where appropriate, and use your office to demand transparency and accountability from ICE.

I would appreciate a response explaining what steps you are taking to address this issue.

Sincerely,
Anna Nguyen
Santa Clara, CA

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Condemn ICE Actions in Minnesota
Date: Sunday, January 25, 2026 1:24:30 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Anna Nguyen [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2026 3:14 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Condemn ICE Actions in Minnesota

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gillmor,

I am a constituent in Santa Clara, California, writing to condemn the recent actions of ICE in Minnesota and to urge you to take action.

Reports of aggressive enforcement tactics and the use of force raise serious concerns about civil liberties, accountability, and due process. Regardless of immigration policy, no federal agency should operate without meaningful oversight or respect for human rights.

I ask that you publicly condemn these actions, support independent investigations where appropriate, and use your office to demand transparency and accountability from ICE.

I would appreciate a response explaining what steps you are taking to address this issue.

Sincerely,
Anna Nguyen
Santa Clara, CA

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Condemn ICE Actions in Minnesota
Date: Sunday, January 25, 2026 1:24:57 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Anna Nguyen [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2026 3:14 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Condemn ICE Actions in Minnesota

[REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City of Santa Clara Council,

I am a constituent in Santa Clara, California, writing to condemn the recent actions of ICE in Minnesota and to urge you to take action.

Reports of aggressive enforcement tactics and the use of force raise serious concerns about civil liberties, accountability, and due process. Regardless of immigration policy, no federal agency should operate without meaningful oversight or respect for human rights.

I ask that you publicly condemn these actions, support independent investigations where appropriate, and use your office to demand transparency and accountability from ICE.

I would appreciate a response explaining what steps you are taking to address this issue.

Sincerely,
Anna Nguyen
Santa Clara, CA

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Dealing with ICE in Santa Clara
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 2:43:53 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Peter Transburg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2026 9:49 AM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Police <Police@santaclaraca.gov>; Kevin Park <KPark@santaclaraca.gov>
Subject: Dealing with ICE in Santa Clara

[REDACTED]

Hello Santa Clara Mayor's Office, Police Department, and Councilmember Park,

I am a Santa Clara resident since 2016, with two kids in public elementary school.

I'm writing to find out how I can learn more about what the city of Santa Clara is doing with regard to ICE activities in Santa Clara - both about any current ICE activities as well as future ICE activities. Does the city have official statements or policies in place for how ICE is allowed to conduct itself in the city, or how they interact with Santa Clara law enforcement, or how citizens can engage with ICE?

The lawless abductions, violence, and terrorism that ICE is perpetrating in Minnesota (and other places with less visibility) is likely to continue to happen in many other places, including eventually in Santa Clara and San Jose. I want to be sure that the city, led by the Mayor's office and police department, is already formulating how it will act in the face of this potential assault on its residents.

Grateful for any information and sources you can provide in this regard. Please let me

know if there is another office to contact, or if there is a specific meeting or forum where these matters are being discussed.

Best regards,
Peter Transburg

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Peter Transburg.

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: DHS in Santa Clara
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 2:46:33 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Javier Aguirre [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 1:38 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: DHS in Santa Clara

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Mayor Gilmore and City Council,

I am a concerned Santa Clara resident.

<https://www.kron4.com/news/bay-area/renewed-ice-fears-ahead-of-bay-area-super-bowl/amp/>

What are you doing to prepare the residents of the city for potential Federal operations?

Cities in Minnesota have had to shut down schools, close streets, and guard against constant confrontations with DHS agents.

How is the city preparing for the influx of people for the Super Bowl and this Federal operation?

Sincerely,

Javi Aguirre

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Maria Le](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: End any and all local cooperation or contracts with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
Date: Friday, June 13, 2025 9:52:10 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor and Council,

We received the following email which we are forwarding for your reference.

Thank You,

Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant

Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara

(408) 615-2252 | www.santaclaraca.gov



From: Jessica Garcia [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2025 12:35 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: End any and all local cooperation or contracts with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi, my name is Jessica Garcia, and I'm a resident in Santa Clara. I'm writing this email to urge Mayor Lisa M. Gillmor and the City Council to follow the lead of cities like Glendale, California and immediately move to end any and all local cooperation or contracts with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Glendale recently ended its jail contract with ICE as a public stand against targeting immigrant communities. That kind of leadership is urgently needed here in Santa Clara. Local governments have the power—and the responsibility—to protect vulnerable residents from unjust detention and deportation.

Our community should be a place of safety, not fear. I'm asking you to review and cancel any contracts, memorandums of understanding, or law enforcement cooperation with ICE.

Please make this a public agenda item and let residents know where the city stands. I would appreciate a response, and I hope to see this issue addressed in an upcoming City Council meeting.
Thank you for your time and service.

Best regards,
Jessica Garcia

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: ICE at Levi Stadium
Date: Monday, January 26, 2026 3:36:53 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Nicholas Lindberg [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 12:52 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: ICE at Levi Stadium

[REDACTED]
Hello Mayor Gilmore

My name is Nick Lindberg I've been living in Santa Clara my whole life and watch Levi get built in the process. And I just heard about [this](#)
ICE will be at the Super Bowl "conducting" security checks. 9 people have been murdered by ICE and thousands of others have been abducted and probably killed as well. Are you or Santa Clara PD (and maybe other Police Departments) going to offer any kind of actual protection at the game from these thugs? Will another murder take place in that parking lot? I would like to know what is to be done about it if anything.

Regards
Nick Lindberg

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Ice operational during superbowl in your city
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 10:31:31 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence in the general inbox which we are forwarding for your reference.

Maria Le

Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-5517
Mobile: 669-243-8467



From: Tama Adelman [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 5:25 AM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Ice operational during superbowl in your city

[REDACTED]

Dear madam and sir

As Ann 80yo veteran I am terrified about ICE being in Santa Clara during Super Bowl. Please please do any thing and everything to minimize ICE getting near our citizens. I know this must be a challenge for you but please do what you can.
Thank you--Tama Adelman, Napa

May all beings everywhere be free from hatred, be healthy, be safe, be peaceful and at ease, in body and in mind, and may they meet no obstacles in their daily lives.

Slava Ukraini

tama adelman



From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Please adopt a Santa Clara Civil Rights Defense Plan
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 10:27:13 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence in the general inbox which we are forwarding for your reference.

Maria Le

Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-5517
Mobile: 669-243-8467



From: Eric Krock [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 10:44 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Please adopt a Santa Clara Civil Rights Defense Plan

[REDACTED]

Dear Mayor and City Councilmembers - In light of widespread criminal acts by ICE agents in Minneapolis, the reports that ICE agents will attend the Superbowl, and the possibility that ICE may at some point conduct a surge in the Bay Area, please adopt a Civil Rights Defense Plan. I have posted a draft plan

at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Hm_o9lZh_eru9HG1laM5Ead8b83_VXdJfY45-Offm4/edit?usp=drivesdk

Here are the passages of the plan that are directly relevant to the City of Santa Clara. The City Manager is always empowered to take immediate action in defense of the lives of City residents and visitors. Please see what can be done in these areas as a matter of the highest urgency. Thanks as always!

City Council and County

1. City Council and County Board should, as the City of San Jose, California has already done, pass an emergency ordinance prohibiting ICE/CBT from using all city- and county-owned property as assembly, logistics, or support areas or for any other purpose.
2. The City and County should post signs barring ICE/CBT agents from all of their workplaces and prohibit entry into nonpublic areas.
3. The City and County should proactively educate their residents about their First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights, the difference between a judicial and administrative warrant, the right not to open their car door or home's door if they have not been presented with a signed judicial warrant, effective use of the questions "Am I under arrest? Am I free to go?," the importance of not speaking to law enforcement officers when detained without an attorney present, and so on using every educational channel we have, including statements at City Council meetings, prominent posts on the City web site, outbound emails, and posts on social media. An educated citizenry is best able to participate in protecting its civil rights.
4. The City and County should establish official written policies that the police department and

Sheriff's Office will enforce the legal requirement that law enforcement officers have a signed judicial warrant before they can search a person's home or car without consent, and local law enforcement should treat violations of these legal requirements as criminal acts and arrest those responsible.

5. The City and County should pass ordinances prohibiting police officers and Sheriff's deputies (respectively) from moonlighting for ICE and Customs and Border Patrol.

City Attorney should review Automatic License Plate Reader policies and contracts

Given the evidence that ICE is misusing Automatic License Plate Reader data to identify and intimidate legal observers, the City should evaluate how it can reduce the ability of ICE to misuse data from ALPRs in any way. The City Attorney should meet immediately with the vendor the City uses for Automatic License Plate Readers, to assess how contracts, ALPR configurations, and ALPR data retention policies can be revised to provide the maximum possible assurance that federal authorities will not be able to obtain ALPR data without City prior knowledge and consent. Options such as retaining data for a limited time, storing data on servers under City control without contractor or federal access, and encrypting data with encryption keys that only City staff possess should be considered. If acceptable legal and technical measures to protect the civil rights of City residents

cannot be put in place, the City should cancel its ALPR contract as the City of Santa Cruz, California has already done.

City Attorney and Police Department

The hardest, most physically dangerous challenge is that police officers must be ready to intervene as necessary to stop armed, masked federal agents from violating the law just as they would intervene to stop anyone else who is violating the law. Federal agents should not be above the law, but only local and state law enforcement willingness to enforce the laws without special treatment of anyone will make sure that federal agents aren't above the law in practice.

Intervention does not necessarily mean arrest. In the best case, if police officers show up at a scene and inform the federal agents that the federal agents are violating state law and are subject to immediate arrest and prosecution under state law if they do not cease their violations immediately, the federal agents, wanting to avoid state-level prosecution and time in state prison for which federal pardons do not apply, may back down and leave.

Police officers should of course make maximum possible use of their de-escalation training to try to prevent a situation in which federal agents are breaking the law from escalating into an arrest or (worse) use of force.

However, it is clear that at least some ICE/CBT agents

have no regard for the law, insufficient training, poor impulse control, and no reluctance to use unnecessary violence in violation of the law and federal guidelines. Unfortunately, some ICE/CBT agents likely won't cease breaking the law unless they realize that the result may be arrest by local law enforcement and prosecution under state law. Some may not stop until they are in fact arrested.

Historically, local police forces have not normally found themselves in a situation where federal law enforcement agents are violating federal and state laws or the provisions of the federal and/or state constitutions. Therefore, local police forces have generally deferred to federal law enforcement officers on the assumption that the federal law enforcement officers will be acting in good faith in compliance with federal and state law, and that if not, federal law enforcement agency internal disciplinary procedures will be the applicable remedy. All of those assumptions are now invalid. Federal agents are routinely violating the law without consequence, and no federal investigations of violations are being performed.

Local police officers may understandably be reluctant to perform an arrest of an armed federal agent who is violating the law, who feels entitled to compliance with their wishes, and who may use force when challenged. The huge imbalance of forces when the federal government deploys five times as many immigration enforcement agents as a city has police officers (as

has happened in Minneapolis - St. Paul) poses an additional challenge. Unfortunately, events in Minneapolis indicate that such situations may become commonplace nationwide if the Trump Administration doesn't change its policies. Therefore, city and county residents can only be assured of continuing to have their federal and state civil rights if police officers and sheriff's deputies are ready and willing to arrest federal agents who are violating those rights.

Being ready and willing requires that the the police department and county sheriff have established a policy specifying when its officers will and will not arrest federal agents who are violating federal or state law and given the officers training on specific policies and procedures on how to demand compliance with the law, how to de-escalate where possible, how to call for backup, and, when unavoidably necessary, how to use legally allowed force to arrest federal agents who do not comply with instructions and who persist in violating the law.

In situations where the federal agent's illegal actions are not threatening to cause permanent disability (e.g. via blinding) or death, seeking an arrest warrant and arresting the federal agent after the fact may be a course of action providing lower situational risk to arresting officers.

Therefore, the police department should establish specific policies and procedures regarding use of force against federal agents who are violating the law so

that officers are trained and ready to do what is legal, right, and necessary if the situation presents itself with the lowest risk to themselves and federal agents possible.

Sincerely,

Eric Krock

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Super Bowl and ICE
Date: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 10:31:47 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



-----Original Message-----

From: Brenda Rupel [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 8:57 AM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Super Bowl and ICE

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Mayor Gillmor and Council members,

Though the Department of Homeland Security's presence is a necessity at Levi Stadium for games, concerts, and other events, the presence of ICE agents is not.

ICE agents have proven beyond a doubt that their activities within communities across our country have created nothing but danger, injury, and death (ask Minneapolis's mayor, Jacob Frey).

ICE killed two innocent people, has kidnapped children, and has created mayhem in cities like Minneapolis. And now they are coming in mass numbers into the city of Santa Clara for Super Bowl activities?

Mayor and council members, are you planning on warning the community that ICE will be in Santa Clara? Will our police be protecting peaceful protesters and press from ICE agents?

As elected public servants, it is your duty to

A) warn the community and visitors

B) ensure our police department prioritizes the safety of all (regardless of immigration status) and NOT assist ICE.

I'm sure I don't have to tell you that the country and world will have all eyes on our town.

Sincerely,

Brenda Rupel

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Maria Le](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Super Bowl and World Cup
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:07:04 AM

Dear Mayor and Council,

We received a follow up email on this topic which we are forwarding for your reference.

Thank You,
Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant
Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara
(408) 615-2252

-----Original Message-----

From: Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:03 AM
To: 'Patricia A Lopez' [REDACTED] >
Subject: RE: Super Bowl and World Cup

Hello Patricia,
I have received the below follow up from the Police Department:

Thank you again for reaching out and for sharing your concerns regarding public safety surrounding upcoming major events in Santa Clara, including Super Bowl LX and the 2026 FIFA World Cup™.

The Santa Clara Police Department's foremost priority is the safety and well-being of every resident, visitor, and participant. The department does not tolerate unlawful activity by any agency or individual. Our officers are dedicated to upholding the rights of all people and maintaining a secure and welcoming environment. We work closely with our local, state, and federal partners under a unified command structure to ensure public safety during major events. This collaboration focuses on community protection, emergency preparedness, and coordination.

With respect to your question about federal immigration enforcement, authority over immigration rests with the federal government under powers enumerated in the U.S. Constitution and reinforced by the Supremacy Clause, which preempts conflicting state or local action. The Santa Clara Police Department does not conduct immigration enforcement. However, like any local police department, if federal agents or others are threatened or assaulted within our jurisdiction, our officers will respond to protect public safety and maintain the peace. These matters are being addressed through the appropriate legal and judicial processes, and we encourage calm and respect for those processes.

You also asked about attending the Public Safety Steering Committee and related subcommittee meetings. These committees handle law enforcement and security planning, and due to the sensitive nature of those discussions, the meetings are not open to the public. However, the City of Santa Clara hosts many public meetings and forums where residents may share feedback and stay informed about upcoming events and city operations. Information about those meetings is available on the City's website at www.santaclaraca.gov.

We appreciate your concern for community safety and your engagement in these important conversations. Your decision about participating in upcoming festivities is, of course, a personal one, and we respect your right to make that decision based on your own sense of comfort and safety.

++++

Can you let me know if you have any follow up questions on this information?

Thank You,
Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant
Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara
(408) 615-2252

-----Original Message-----

From: Patricia A Lopez <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 8:22 AM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Re: Super Bowl and World Cup

Thank you again. My biggest concern is whether or not the random kidnappings of brown individuals will be tolerated and allowed to take place? How are the people going to be protected from ice?

The reason I am asking is because I would like to participate in the festivities and at this time I am unsure of my safety.

Also, is it possible for me to attend the committee meetings? I would love to attend.

Thank you for following up.

Sent on the fly from my iPhone

> On Oct 18, 2025, at 7:23 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

>

> Thank you, I expected this response. I do have some more questions which I
> am thinking about and I will get back to you with them. Thank you again.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>

> Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:00 PM

> To: Patricia A Lopez [REDACTED]

> Subject: RE: Super Bowl and World Cup

>

> Hi Patricia,

> We have received back the below information on Super Bowl and World Cup from
> the Police Department:

>

> The Santa Clara Police Department is the lead public safety agency for Super
> Bowl LX and all 2026 FIFA World Cup(tm) games being held at Levi's Stadium.

> The department's primary goal is to promote the safety and well-being of
> everyone present at and within the surrounding community of events in the
> City of Santa Clara. We have a comprehensive public safety steering
> committee responsible for various planning areas, and all areas address
> contingency planning. The sub-committee's members include representatives
> from local, state, and federal law enforcement organizations, to include
> Santa Clara Police Department officers.

>

> Can you let me know if you will have any follow up questions on this
> information that I can submit?

>

>

> Thank You,

> Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant

> Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara

> (408) 615-2252

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Patricia A Lopez <

> Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 12:40 PM

> To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>

> Subject: Super Bowl and World Cup

>

> earn why this is
> important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

>

> Hello. I would like to know what your plan is to guarantee the safety of the

> athletes, fans, associates and residents? In short, what do you plan to do

> about ice? Is there a contingency plan? I am a natural born us citizen and

> 40 year resident person of color.

> I do not believe in the illegal harassment of persons of color. How do you

> plan to handle the situation?

>

> Sent on the fly from my iPhone

>

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Maria Le](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Super Bowl and World Cup
Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:07:04 AM

Dear Mayor and Council,

We received a follow up email on this topic which we are forwarding for your reference.

Thank You,
Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant
Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara
(408) 615-2252

-----Original Message-----

From: Mayor and Council
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:03 AM
To: 'Patricia A Lopez' [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Super Bowl and World Cup

Hello Patricia,
I have received the below follow up from the Police Department:

Thank you again for reaching out and for sharing your concerns regarding public safety surrounding upcoming major events in Santa Clara, including Super Bowl LX and the 2026 FIFA World Cup™.

The Santa Clara Police Department's foremost priority is the safety and well-being of every resident, visitor, and participant. The department does not tolerate unlawful activity by any agency or individual. Our officers are dedicated to upholding the rights of all people and maintaining a secure and welcoming environment. We work closely with our local, state, and federal partners under a unified command structure to ensure public safety during major events. This collaboration focuses on community protection, emergency preparedness, and coordination.

With respect to your question about federal immigration enforcement, authority over immigration rests with the federal government under powers enumerated in the U.S. Constitution and reinforced by the Supremacy Clause, which preempts conflicting state or local action. The Santa Clara Police Department does not conduct immigration enforcement. However, like any local police department, if federal agents or others are threatened or assaulted within our jurisdiction, our officers will respond to protect public safety and maintain the peace. These matters are being addressed through the appropriate legal and judicial processes, and we encourage calm and respect for those processes.

You also asked about attending the Public Safety Steering Committee and related subcommittee meetings. These committees handle law enforcement and security planning, and due to the sensitive nature of those discussions, the meetings are not open to the public. However, the City of Santa Clara hosts many public meetings and forums where residents may share feedback and stay informed about upcoming events and city operations. Information about those meetings is available on the City's website at www.santaclaraca.gov.

We appreciate your concern for community safety and your engagement in these important conversations. Your decision about participating in upcoming festivities is, of course, a personal one, and we respect your right to make that decision based on your own sense of comfort and safety.

++++

Can you let me know if you have any follow up questions on this information?

Thank You,
Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant
Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara
(408) 615-2252

-----Original Message-----

From: Patricia A Lopez [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 8:22 AM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Re: Super Bowl and World Cup

Thank you again. My biggest concern is whether or not the random kidnappings of brown individuals will be tolerated and allowed to take place? How are the people going to be protected from ice?

The reason I am asking is because I would like to participate in the festivities and at this time I am unsure of my safety.

Also, is it possible for me to attend the committee meetings? I would love to attend.

Thank you for following up.

Sent on the fly from my iPhone

> On Oct 18, 2025, at 7:23 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

>

> Thank you, I expected this response. I do have some more questions which I
> am thinking about and I will get back to you with them. Thank you again.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>

> Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:00 PM

> To: Patricia A Lopez [REDACTED]

> Subject: RE: Super Bowl and World Cup

>

> Hi Patricia,

> We have received back the below information on Super Bowl and World Cup from
> the Police Department:

>

> The Santa Clara Police Department is the lead public safety agency for Super
> Bowl LX and all 2026 FIFA World Cup(tm) games being held at Levi's Stadium.

> The department's primary goal is to promote the safety and well-being of
> everyone present at and within the surrounding community of events in the
> City of Santa Clara. We have a comprehensive public safety steering
> committee responsible for various planning areas, and all areas address
> contingency planning. The sub-committee's members include representatives
> from local, state, and federal law enforcement organizations, to include
> Santa Clara Police Department officers.

>

> Can you let me know if you will have any follow up questions on this
> information that I can submit?

>

>

> Thank You,

> Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant

> Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara

> (408) 615-2252

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Patricia A Lopez [REDACTED]

> Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 12:40 PM

> To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>

> Subject: Super Bowl and World Cup

>

> [You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is
> important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

>

> Hello. I would like to know what your plan is to guarantee the safety of the

> athletes, fans, associates and residents? In short, what do you plan to do

> about ice? Is there a contingency plan? I am a natural born us citizen and

> 40 year resident person of color.

> I do not believe in the illegal harassment of persons of color. How do you

> plan to handle the situation?

>

> Sent on the fly from my iPhone

>

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: What's Going On In Minnesota Today -
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 10:32:29 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence in the general inbox which we are forwarding for your reference.

Maria Le

Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-5517
Mobile: 669-243-8467



From: James Curylo [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 8:06 AM
Subject: What's Going On In Minnesota Today -

Governor Tim Walz faced a widening federal fraud probe in Minnesota Monday amid the anti-ICE protests.

IRS agents uncovered 400 fraudulent Somali autism centers in one building.

The autism centers distribute Tylenol to Somali welfare recipients in hopes of producing the next Elon Musk.

**If you want to upset a Conservative, tell them a lie.
If you want to upset a Liberal, tell them the truth.**

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
Bcc: [Albert Gonzalez](#); [Karen Hardy](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Kevin Park](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Sudhanshu Jain](#)
Subject: FW: Your concerns
Date: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 9:00:22 AM
Attachments: [Image.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

Dear Mayor & Council:

We have received the following correspondence which we are forwarding to you for reference.

Maria Le
Mayor & Council Office
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
Main: 408-615-2250



From: Anna Nguyen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 5:14 PM
To: Karen Hardy <KHardy@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Cc: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Re: Your concerns

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [why this is important](#)

Councilmember Hardy,

Thank you for your response. I'm honestly confused by it and I need clarification.

When you say that discussing "things in place to keep people safe" would put people at risk, what exactly do you mean? My message raised concerns about ICE activity and community safety, not operational details or sensitive tactics. Framing basic transparency and accountability as inherently dangerous is troubling.

Elected officials have an obligation to communicate clearly with the public, especially when residents are expressing fear and uncertainty. "The less said the safer everyone is" reads less like reassurance and more like a refusal to engage with legitimate concerns.

If there are specific legal or policy constraints that limit what you can share, please state

them plainly. Otherwise, I would appreciate a substantive response that addresses the core issue rather than dismissing it.

Respectfully,
Anna Nguyen

On Mon, Jan 26, 2026 at 4:21 PM Karen Hardy <KHardy@santaclaraca.gov> wrote:

Your concerns are noted but many of the things in place to keep people safe should not be discussed because it puts people at risk. Please know we are doing everything possible. The less said the safer everyone is.

Karen

Karen Hardy
Councilmember
City of Santa Clara
KHardy@santaclaraca.gov
408-952-9413



From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: ICE coming to santa clara county for Superbowl 26
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 3:18:39 PM

Good Afternoon,

In light of recent deaths of American citizens at the hands of ICE agents, I would like to understand what plans you have in place to combat the aggressive tactics being used by ICE as they arrive in our County for the Superbowl.

- Has the Santa Clara County Sherriff Department been instructed not to engage in any illegal activity at the behest of ICE? For example, entry and search of homes without a warrant?
- Will crimes by ICE committed in our city be prosecuted by the district attorney?
- Will the Santa Clara County Sherriff Department force enforce the no mask laws we now have in place?
- How is the Santa Clara Stadium Authority going to keep football fans, and the people working at the stadium safe from ICE?
- Will ICE be allowed in the stadium?
- Will ICE be allowed in the parking lots?
- If ICE begins tear gassing fans/workers/players- what security will be in place?
- If ICE begins shooting at fans/workers/players- what security will be in place?

I have watched in horror as our federal government has waged war on its own citizens in Minneapolis and Los Angeles. What is the city and county doing to help protect its residents?

From: [Stone Ohkubo, Kristine](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: ICE is expected to be deployed for the Super Bowl game in Santa Clara on February 8
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 9:12:42 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

[REDACTED]

As a Californian and registered voter, I am deeply outraged by the news that ICE is expected to be deployed for the Super Bowl game in Santa Clara on February 8.

We always knew this wasn't about arresting and deporting criminals who were here illegally, but about using these masked enforcers to intimidate and hold our communities hostage. Two innocent American citizens were murdered in cold blood, and yet our California council members are allowing ICE to be present at a game we all cherish and consider All-American!
The government needs to stand up and start advocating for the citizens who elected them.

Source: <https://www.theguardian.com/.../ice-super-bowl-lx-operations>
<https://youtu.be/lcv1HBMnPf0?si=5wudgApchu7hbr9E>

Regards,

Kristine Stone Ohkubo

[REDACTED]

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, by you is strictly prohibited.

[REDACTED]

From: [chuck murray](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: ICE operations at The Super Bowl
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 10:11:30 AM

[REDACTED] [by this is important](#)

All,

I find news reports of planned ICE operations deeply disturbing.

I would call upon the City of Santa Clara to require ID's and no masks for any ICE Agents within City Limits.

Thank you.

Charles Murray

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

From: [Caitlin Clarke](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: Keep ICE out of Santa Clara
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 2:53:05 PM

Dear Santa Clara City Council,

I am writing to express my disappointment in your lack of action on the issue of speaking out as a body against the terror being inflicted on immigrant communities and their neighbors by ICE/CBP thugs, and for failing to make any kind of motion that this behavior will not be tolerated or supported in our city. The eyes of the country will be on Santa Clara for the next few weeks and it is embarrassing that our elected officials will not stand up for what is clearly right, especially when we see how effectively communities who come together can be when fighting the tide of fascism that is threatening to take over. This is not hyperbole, it is reality, and those of you unwilling to take this matter up are standing on the wrong side of history. Shame on you, we expect better from our so-called leaders.

With disgust,

Caitlin Clarke Bartunek, mom and RN



[REDACTED]

 Edit  Share

10:03 AM



Is the Santa Clara Stadium commission really going to allow ice onto the property during their super bowl?




Thank you for contacting the City of Santa Clara. Your message has been received. Social media accounts are not monitored 24/7. Email communications@santaclaraca.gov to share a message with City staff.
To report issues on MySantaClara, visit SantaClaraCA.gov/mysantaclara to submit a request or on the free mobile app.
If you have a question or request, City staff will respond as soon as they are able. .



Sent by Automated Response

From: [sami waterman](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: On the cooperation with ICE
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 8:12:54 AM

 You will lose so many votes if you and your counsel decide to cooperate with ICE.

Please consider the fact that this is California, we are a largely mixed region.

As a fifth generation Californian, I stand with Newsom against everything trump orders and so does my family.

Not only will you lose votes, you will lose respect in the eyes of your entire community, your family, everyone you know.

Yes, this is a warning from the general public.

We are a safe, haven state. We always have been. California was never segregated.

-Samantha Waterman
Fifth generation californian
And very proud of it

From: [David Brucia](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: Pathetic
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 1:27:18 PM

[REDACTED]

I used to live in Santa Clara and am glad I left. You're cooperating with ICE? Really? The same nazi storm troopers who are now shooting Americans? The same ICE whose soldiers wear masks and threaten bystanders?

Go to hell.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
To: [Jessica Garcia](#)
Subject: RE: End any and all local cooperation or contracts with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
Date: Friday, June 13, 2025 9:49:06 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello,

Our office confirms receipt of your email which has been forwarded to the full City Council for their review.

Thank You,

Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant
Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara
(408) 615-2252 | www.santaclaraca.gov



**City of
Santa Clara**
The Center of What's Possible

From: Jessica Garcia <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2025 12:35 PM
To: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: End any and all local cooperation or contracts with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)

[REDACTED] [important](#)

Hi, my name is Jessica Garcia, and I'm a resident in Santa Clara. I'm writing this email to urge Mayor Lisa M. Gillmor and the City Council to follow the lead of cities like Glendale, California and immediately move to end any and all local cooperation or contracts with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Glendale recently ended its jail contract with ICE as a public stand against targeting immigrant communities. That kind of leadership is urgently needed here in Santa Clara. Local governments have the power—and the responsibility—to protect vulnerable residents from unjust detention and deportation.

Our community should be a place of safety, not fear. I'm asking you to review and cancel any contracts, memorandums of understanding, or law enforcement cooperation with ICE.

Please make this a public agenda item and let residents know where the city stands. I would appreciate a response, and I hope to see this issue addressed in an upcoming City Council meeting.
Thank you for your time and service.

Best regards,
Jessica Garcia

From: [Mayor and Council](#)
To: [Andrew Duong](#); [Lisa Gillmor](#)
Subject: RE: Thoughts and Concerns about the Upcoming Super Bowl
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 4:11:26 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Andrew,

Our office confirms receipt of your email, and we are working to address your questions on the upcoming Super Bowl.

Thank You,

Melissa Lee | Executive Assistant

Mayor & Council Offices | City of Santa Clara

(408) 615-2252 | www.santaclaraca.gov



**City of
Santa Clara**
The Center of What's Possible

From: Andrew Duong <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 4:37 PM
To: Lisa Gillmor <LGillmor@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Cc: Mayor and Council <MAYORANDCOUNCIL@SantaClaraCA.gov>
Subject: Thoughts and Concerns about the Upcoming Super Bowl

[REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Mayor Gillmor,

Thank you for taking the time to read my email. I am writing to express concerns and share some thoughts about the upcoming Super Bowl.

I was born in San Jose and am still a resident of the city, but my childhood and much of my life still takes place in Santa Clara. I went to St. Justin Elementary School and my evenings after school would often be spent at Central Park Library, or at Central Park in the pavilion with my brother and his classmate, sharing a rotisserie chicken we had picked up from Safeway across the street. My summers and my Halloweens were spent with my friends at Great America and one of my top theaters of choice when I want to watch a movie is still AMC Mercado. People in my life that I hold dear still live in or work in Santa Clara. I could go on, but suffice to say, I consider Santa Clara just as much of my home as my birth city. This is why I write to you to say that I have concerns about

potential ensuing events that could result from the response to ICE's presence at the Super Bowl in the coming year.

In this concern, I don't wish to express any political opinion. My main concern rather is public safety. When first hearing about this news, the first thing that came to mind was that for this event, I know there will be thousands of people congregated in that area to watch the Super Bowl and therefore, escalated conflicts could then endanger those thousands of people, again in a location that shares a parking lot with the amusement park where I grew up. As a person who considers this place home, this could be quite traumatic for me and others who consider Santa Clara their home.

Following these initial thoughts, I also considered the other implications about our greater home of California and our country. Santa Clara is a cornerstone of the Silicon Valley and therefore is a driving force of not just California's economy, but the US' as a whole. I understand that the property in the surrounding area holds leading corporations in tech and other industries, and within their buildings are millions of dollars of assets. I also know that much of tech's workforce are staff who are here on work visas. I imagine that escalated protests that take place in response to ICE presence could therefore lead to significant property damage and ICE presence in itself could intimidate the workforce. I would therefore assume that leadership of these companies may consider moving out of state, and possibly out of the country in order to forego any complications that arise and save their staff the uneasiness of this presence in the area. It then scares me to think of the economic implications of this for one of the largest economies in the globe and the loss of these leaders of technological advancement. As a side note to this thought, my friend works at a tech company just down the street of the stadium and he had brought up the point that these companies intricately plan their project timelines, projects in which millions of dollars are invested, so should a company in this area feel that they need to halt their operations at all for safety of their staff, property, and projects, I'm certain that they would also be considering the impact to their revenue and performance.

From a visual standpoint, I would think that residents of the city would be saddened by the sight of these pristine buildings boarded up as they brace for that potential property damage as I myself would find that ugly and discomfoting. It also occurred to me that the optics of these military-like officers in the area would cause great discomfort as I believe that the sight of these officers does not give people a sense of safety, rather it brings the implication that the area is unsafe. On top of this, the weapons that these people would be carrying on them would exponentially increase safety risks and danger at the stadium and Santa Clara.

I know we have had past events at this stadium and in the greater area, and I know that our local authorities are more than capable of maintaining safety in these events for our residents and the property in the area. Our officers are also primarily from the area and I believe residents would feel more safe and comfortable trusting our local police and fire with the safety of the event and their hometown.

This past Tuesday, I had met with the congress member of my district, Representative Panetta, in order to express these concerns as well. In our conversation, I had brought up the idea that a potential compromise could be made where ICE could come to the area and set up a perimeter that's about a quarter to a half mile away from the event where they could still control the entry and exit ways to and from the stadium with checkpoints. I believe by doing this, they could still conduct the activities they came here to do, but any potential escalations would be kept away from the stadium and not endanger the thousands of people at the event. By being away from the event, any conflicts could be contained and managed much more safely. In collaboration with our local authorities, I believe ample control of the flow of people coming to and from the event could be achieved at Montague, Bowers, SJC, 101 and any other areas that the local authorities could identify as access points to the event.

I also plan on reaching out to Representative Khanna to express my concerns as well, as Santa Clara falls within his district. Again, my main concern is for the safety of my fellow residents that share my home with me, and I believe we can all work together to achieve this and also find a solution where all parties can attain what they set out to do.

Again, thank you for taking the time to read this and allow me to express my thoughts and concerns to you and your office. I hope you have a wonderful weekend, and here's to a safe, fun, and enjoyable Super Bowl!

Best regards,

Andrew Duong

From: [Jean Cohen](#)
To: [Maria Noel Fernandez](#)
Subject: Request for Action in Santa Clara on February 3
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 7:57:33 PM

Dear City Manager, Mayor, and Members of the Santa Clara City Council:

We write as a coalition of labor and community organizations to thank you for scheduling a special City Council meeting on February 3 in response to community concerns regarding preparedness, coordination, and safety as Santa Clara prepares to host major international sporting events, including the Super Bowl and the 2026 FIFA World Cup. We appreciate the Council's responsiveness to the absence of clear plans and the importance of addressing these issues early and transparently.

As these global events approach, Santa Clara and the broader Bay Area have a unique opportunity to demonstrate what responsible hosting looks like - events grounded in fairness, dignity, and respect for human rights. Their success will depend on the workers who make them possible, including stadium employees, hospitality and food service workers, janitors, stagehands, construction tradespeople, transportation workers, and public safety and healthcare professionals. Many are immigrant and low-wage workers who deserve strong protections and safe working conditions.

We respectfully encourage the City Council to use the February 3 meeting to consider affirming a shared, values-based approach to these events. For your consideration, we are including draft resolution language that reflects widely held Bay Area standards for immigrant and worker protections, public safety, coordination, and accountability. We offer this draft as a starting point and are happy to provide feedback, answer questions, or work collaboratively with Councilmembers and staff as planning continues.

Establishing clear expectations early would provide helpful direction to City staff, event organizers, contractors, and partners, while signaling to workers and community members that their concerns are being taken seriously and addressed proactively. This is a moment to respond decisively to the Super Bowl while building a lasting framework for deeper community engagement and thoughtful preparation for FIFA and future large-scale events.

Thank you for your leadership and engagement. We look forward to continued collaboration to ensure that upcoming sporting events reflect the best of Santa Clara and the South Bay. Please let us know if we can help with next steps.

Respectfully,

Jean Cohen
Executive Officer, South Bay Labor Council

Maria Noel Fernandez
Executive Director, Working Partnerships USA

Draft Resolution Language

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA
AFFIRMING SHARED VALUES AND A COORDINATED APPROACH TO MAJOR
SPORTING EVENTS IN 2026**

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Clara and the Bay Area have a long-standing commitment to fairness, worker dignity, public safety, and human rights; and

WHEREAS, Santa Clara will host or be directly impacted by major professional and international sporting events in 2026, including the Super Bowl and FIFA World Cup matches, which will involve significant public resources, regional coordination, and community impact; and

WHEREAS, the success of these events depends on the workers who make them possible, including city, stadium, hospitality, food service, janitorial, construction, transportation, and public safety workers, many of whom are immigrant and low-wage workers; and

WHEREAS, major sporting events require clear planning and coordination among public agencies, event organizers, employers, workers, labor organizations, immigrant rights organizations, and community partners to ensure public safety, worker protections, and accountability; and

WHEREAS, public investments related to major sporting events should provide community benefit, including support for local workers, local businesses, and workforce development opportunities;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA THAT:

1.

The City of Santa Clara affirms its commitment to planning and hosting major sporting events in a manner that prioritizes public safety, worker protections, and respect for human dignity.

2.
The City supports coordinated planning and communication among City departments, regional and state agencies, event organizers, employers, labor organizations, immigrant rights organizations, and community partners.
3.
The City affirms that public resources related to major sporting events should support fair labor standards, responsible contracting practices, and local economic benefit.
4.
The City affirms that no public resources related to major sporting events will be used towards, facilitate, or support immigration enforcement.
5.
The City supports the availability of safe and confidential mechanisms for workers to report labor violations or unsafe conditions without fear of retaliation.
6.
City staff are encouraged to engage stakeholders and report back to the City Council, as appropriate, on preparedness, coordination, and identified gaps related to major sporting events.
7.
The City supports safe site practices and other policies to protect workers from immigration enforcement, affirming the City's commitment to being a welcoming community for all people, including immigrants.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Resolution affirms shared values and policy direction and does not alter existing laws, regulations, or collective bargaining agreements.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Santa Clara on _____, 2026.

cc: Susan Ellenberg, Aisha Wahab, Patrick Ahrens, Huy Tran, Lorena Gonzalez

From: [Huy Tran](#)
To: [Jovan Grogan](#); [Manager](#)
Cc: [Lucila Ortiz](#); [Jean Cohen](#); [Akemi Flynn](#); [Jeremy Barousse](#); [Kelly Cox](#); [Raj Chahal](#); [Kevin Park](#)
Subject: Sanctuary Policy for Santa Clara
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 12:06:17 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-kvs3un4f.png](#)
[San Jose - 2007 Policy.pdf](#)
[San Jose - 2025 Policy.pdf](#)
[San Jose - 2026 ICE-Free Zones Policy.pdf](#)
[San Mateo County - 2023 Ordinance.pdf](#)
[San Mateo County - 2025 Amended Ordinance.pdf](#)
[Santa Clara County - 2019 Ordinance.pdf](#)
[Los Angeles City - 2024 Ordinance.pdf](#)
[Los Angeles County - 2026 ICE-Free Zones Ordinance.pdf](#)
[San Francisco County - 2016 Amended Ordinance.pdf](#)
[Draft City of Santa Clara sanctuary policy.docx](#)

Good afternoon Jovan,

My name is Huy Tran and I am Executive Director at SIREN. I was at last night's meeting along with the dozens of community members who attended to support Santa Clara adopting a sanctuary policy ahead of the Super Bowl. CCed on this email are Jean Cohen from the South Bay Labor Council, Lucila Ortiz from Working Partnerships, and Akemi Flynn and Jeremy Barousse from the Immigrant Protection and Empowerment Network and Amigos de Guadalupe. I have also CCed Councilmembers Park, Cox, and Chahal as an FYI. There have been no communications between us and any of the councilmembers about this policy since last night's meeting.

Attached to this email is a template policy that incorporates various elements to ensure that no city resources can be leveraged to support immigration enforcement. I'm also including copies of the policies that have been formalized in San Jose, Santa Clara County, San Mateo County, Los Angeles (City and County), and San Francisco. The template we created is based on those policies.

We are ready to work with you to answer questions and prepare a policy for Santa Clara to adopt. Please let us know if you have any availability to meet.



HUY TRAN
Executive Director



Follow us on social media!
linktr.ee/sirenimmigrantrights

RESOLUTION NO. 73677

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE SUPPORTING PUBLIC SAFETY AND IMMIGRANT RIGHTS

WHEREAS, since June of 2006, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency (ICE) has conducted repeated immigration sweeps under "Operation Return to Sender," which has targeted criminal aliens for deportation; and

WHEREAS, raids in recent months in Watsonville, Santa Cruz, Redwood City, Contra Costa County, and other locations--conducted for the purpose of arresting undocumented immigrants with serious criminal records--have also netted scores of immigrants with no criminal ties; and

WHEREAS, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, ICE reported that of the 119 arrested in a set of January sweeps in Contra Costa County, 18 were criminals, while 94 never appeared on ICE's original "wanted" list; and

WHEREAS, as a result of those raids, waves of fear have swept through immigrant communities in California, and within the City of San José; and


WHEREAS, the City of San José has a strong interest in assuring that legal and undocumented immigrants do not fear interacting with their local governmental authorities. In past years, the City has seen how the reluctance of immigrants to interact with local authorities can critically undermine the health and safety of our community. For example, the failure of victims to report crimes, the reluctance of witnesses to cooperate with the police, or the unwillingness of parents to take children to school or to a health clinic, can have grave impacts on the well-being of all of San José's residents, including U.S. citizens;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE THAT:

The City of San José reaffirms the San José Police Department's longstanding policy that its officers will not arrest persons merely for their unlawful presence in the United States; that no otherwise law-abiding undocumented immigrants should fear arrest or deportation for coming forward to report a crime as a victim or a witness; and that no otherwise law-abiding undocumented immigrants should fear arrest or deportation by contacting any employee of the City of San José to express concerns or to ask questions. Moreover, the City of San José, maintains that ICE raids—while laudable where they target violent or predatory criminals for deportation—can have harsh unintended consequences. Those sweeps that have cast the net widely to arrest otherwise law-abiding undocumented immigrants have raised the Council's concern, insofar as they undermine the ability of our police, fire department, and other city agencies to interact with fearful immigrants, leaving all of San José's residents less safe.

ADOPTED this 6th day of March, 2007, by the following vote:

AYES:	CAMPOS, CHIRCO, CONSTANT, CORTESE, LICCARDO, NGUYEN, PYLE, WILLIAMS; REED
NOES:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE
DISQUALIFIED:	NONE
VACANT:	DISTRICT 4, DISTRICT 6


CHUCK REED
Mayor

ATTEST:


LEE PRICE, MMC
City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. RES2025-19

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE REAFFIRMING THE CITY'S COMMITMENT TO PROTECTING THE RIGHTS AND SAFETY OF IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES

WHEREAS, the City of San José's many immigrant communities play a central role in the cultural, social, and economic fabric of the City; and

WHEREAS, the City of San José has a history of supporting our diverse population including adoption of Resolution No. 71759 on September 23, 2003 in response to the provisions of the USA Patriot Act to affirm our support for the constitutional rights of immigrant communities in San Jose; and

WHEREAS, on June 8, 2010, in response to the Arizona Immigrant Enforcement Law, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 75401 to, in part, announce to the public that the City will not detain persons solely for suspicion of having unlawful resident status in the United States, and the City will serve all residents without reporting any otherwise law-abiding persons to federal immigration officials unless otherwise required by federal law, court decision or other legal requirement; and

WHEREAS, on September 18, 2018, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 78788 to denounce the U.S. Department of Justice's Zero Tolerance Policy that resulted in the inhumane separation of families, and called for the immediate reunification of existing separated families; and

WHEREAS, on March 19, 2019, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 79013 denouncing the attempted deportation of Vietnamese refugees and immigrants who arrived in the United States prior to 1995, and acknowledging the rights of refugees and asylum seekers to pursue sanctuary and avoid the endangerment that may accompany a forced return to their country of origin; and

WHEREAS, on April 14, 2020, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 79473 to monitor, protect, and defend the confidentiality of resident information provided to the Federal Government through the 2020 Census from breach and misuse, and to support outreach activities to ensure a complete count and broad participation in the Census as a way to guarantee that marginalized and hard-to-count communities participate in the Census without fear; and

WHEREAS, proposals from the incoming presidential administration, including a promised mass deportation program, pose an existential threat to many residents of the City; and

WHEREAS, waves of fear have already swept through immigrant communities across the country, and within the City of San José; and

WHEREAS, widespread fear of indiscriminate deportation decreases cooperation with law enforcement, withdrawal from public spaces such as schools, and worsening public health outcomes; and

WHEREAS, the City of San José has played a central role in community initiatives such as the Rapid Response Network to keep immigrant communities secure;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE THAT:

The City of San José:

1. Reaffirms the longstanding San José Police Department's policy that its officers will not arrest persons merely for their unlawful presence in the United States; that no undocumented immigrants should fear arrest or deportation for coming

forward to report a crime as a victim or a witness; and that no undocumented immigrants should fear arrest or deportation by contacting any employee of the City of San José to express concerns or to ask questions.

2. Affirms that no City employee will voluntarily support immigration enforcement actions that target San José residents solely based on their immigration status.
3. Affirms its commitment to preserving the safety and integrity of all its residents, regardless of national origin or legal status.

ADOPTED this 4th day of February, 2025, by the following vote:

AYES: CAMPOS, CANDELAS, CASEY, COHEN, DOAN,
KAMEI, MULCAHY, ORTIZ, SALAS, FOLEY, MAHAN.

NOES: NONE.

ABSENT: NONE.

DISQUALIFIED: NONE.

ATTEST:



TONI J. TABER, MMC
City Clerk



MATT MAHAN
Mayor

RESOLUTION NO. RES2026-5

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE APPROVING COUNCIL POLICY 7-15, PROHIBITING THE USE OF CITY PARKING LOTS, OPEN SPACES, AND GARAGES FOR CIVIL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT STAGING AREAS, PROCESSING LOCATIONS, OR OPERATION BASES

WHEREAS, the City of San José (“City”) is home to one of the largest immigrant communities in the nation, which play a central role in the cultural, social, and economic fabric of the City; and

WHEREAS, in recent weeks and months, City has observed across the country the commandeering of city-owned facilities for immigration enforcement, an activity that is solely the responsibility of the federal government; and

WHEREAS, the use of City property for the federal government’s immigration enforcement activities ignores the intended purposes of such assets and undermines City’s authority over its own property; and

WHEREAS, City recognizes the need for a policy to identify City-owned or City-controlled properties such as parking lots, garages, and open spaces that could be commandeered by the federal government for civil immigration enforcement including staging, processing, or establishing an operational base; and

WHEREAS, on October 22, 2025, the Rules and Open Government Committee directed the City Manager to identify City-owned and controlled properties, and to develop a policy to ensure City properties and facilities are only used for City purposes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to establish a new Council Policy No. 7-15, entitled “Prohibiting the Use of City Parking Lots, Open Spaces, and Garages for Civil Immigration Enforcement Staging Areas, Processing Locations, or Operation Bases”,

that includes guidelines, including standardized signage, property access controls where appropriate, and reporting requirements for City employees;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE THAT:

Council Policy 7-15, "Prohibiting the Use of City Parking Lots, Open Spaces, and Garages for Civil Immigration Enforcement Staging Areas, Processing Locations, or Operation Bases", which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by this reference as though fully set forth herein, which will help preserve community trust and ensure consistent management of City public property, is hereby approved.

ADOPTED this 13th day of January, 2026, by the following vote:

AYES: CAMPOS, CANDELAS, CASEY, COHEN, DOAN, KAMEI,
MULCAHY, ORTIZ, TORDILLOS, FOLEY, MAHAN.

NOES: NONE.

ABSENT: NONE.

DISQUALIFIED: NONE.

ATTEST:



TONI J. TABER, MMC
City Clerk



MATT MAHAN
Mayor

EXHIBIT A

City of San José, California

COUNCIL POLICY

TITLE PROHIBITING THE USE OF CITY PARKING LOTS, OPEN SPACES, AND GARAGES FOR CIVIL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT STAGING AREAS, PROCESSING LOCATIONS, OR OPERATION BASES	PAGE 1 of 3	POLICY NUMBER 7-15
EFFECTIVE DATE January 13, 2026	REVISED DATE	
APPROVED BY COUNCIL ACTION 1/13/2026, Item 3.7(a), RES. NO. RES2026-5		

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The City of San José's many immigrant communities play a central role in the cultural, social, and economic fabric of the City. San José has a history of commitment to preserving the safety and integrity of all its residents, regardless of national origin or legal status. San Jose recognizes that public safety is best achieved through trust and collaboration between residents and local government.

On February 4, 2025, the City Council adopted RES2025-19 reaffirming its commitment to protecting the rights and safety of immigrant communities. Specifically, the City continues the longstanding San José Police Department's policy that its officers will not arrest persons merely for their unlawful presence in the United States; that no undocumented immigrants should fear arrest or deportation for coming forward to report a crime as a victim or a witness; and that no undocumented immigrants should fear arrest or deportation by contacting any employee of the City of San José to express concerns or to ask questions. No City employee will voluntarily support immigration enforcement actions that target San José residents solely based on their immigration status.

On October 28, 2025, the City Council approved a motion to prioritize identification of City-owned properties such as parking lots, garages, and open spaces that could be commandeered for civil immigration enforcement activities including staging, processing, or establishing an operational base; and to return with a policy that would restrict such activity. The City Council direction stemmed from events in other parts of the country where publicly owned or controlled facilities have been commandeered for civil immigration enforcement, an activity that is solely the responsibility of the federal government. The unauthorized use of City resources, property, or personnel to facilitate

TITLE PROHIBITING THE USE OF CITY PARKING LOTS, OPEN SPACES, AND GARAGES FOR CIVIL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT STAGING AREAS, PROCESSING LOCATIONS, OR OPERATION BASES	PAGE 2 of 3	POLICY NUMBER 7-15
---	---------------------------	----------------------------------

civil immigration enforcement actions interferes with the City's authority over, and its use of, its own resources, property, and personnel.

II. POLICY

A. Prohibition on Use of City Parking Lots, Garages, and Open Spaces

No City-owned or City-controlled parking lot, garage, or open space shall be used as a staging area, processing location, or operations base for civil immigration enforcement.

B. Implementation and Enforcement

The Administration shall identify City-owned or City-controlled parking lots, garages, or open spaces that are likely to be used as a staging area, processing location, or operations base for the purpose of civil immigration enforcement. These properties shall have clear signage stating:

This property is owned or controlled by the City of San José.
It may only be used for City purposes, and may not be used for civil immigration enforcement Staging Areas, Processing Locations, or Operations Bases.

The Administration shall ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers such as locked gates are used to limit access to City-owned or City-controlled parking lots, garages, or open space consistent with this policy.

The Administration shall develop procedures necessary to implement the policy. The procedures must provide that any City employee who becomes aware of the attempted or actual use of a City-owned or City-controlled parking lot, garage, or open space as a staging area, processing location, or operation base for civil immigration enforcement shall immediately report to their supervisor, who will communicate with the offices of the City Manager and City Attorney.

C. Private Property Signage

The Administration shall provide electronic copy of standardized signage that private landowners and leaseholders could print and display to delineate the non-public areas of the property in which they wish to restrict activities related to civil immigration enforcement. The signage shall be made available free of charge to private landowners and leaseholders, including but not limited to businesses, medical providers, nonprofit organizations, and faith institutions, who voluntarily decide to designate their property consistent with their authority over the property and who voluntarily request such

TITLE PROHIBITING THE USE OF CITY PARKING LOTS, OPEN SPACES, AND GARAGES FOR CIVIL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT STAGING AREAS, PROCESSING LOCATIONS, OR OPERATION BASES	PAGE 3 of 3	POLICY NUMBER 7-15
---	---------------------------	----------------------------------

signage from the City. Landowners and leaseholders that post this signage do so at their own discretion and assume all legal risk.

The Administration shall make available to the public know your rights materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants and security staff regarding entry by federal officials consistent with California law and California Attorney General guidance.

D. Scope

This policy does not apply to property that is subject to an existing lease, license, operator agreement, or other contractual restriction to which the City is a party. This policy is not intended to, and shall not be interpreted to, impair or interfere with such existing agreement.

Nothing in this policy shall be construed as restricting or interfering with the execution of lawful judicial warrants or the enforcement of criminal law, nor as limiting the rights of any person or entity under state or federal law.

This policy does not prohibit the lawful use of City-owned and controlled property for purposes other than a staging area, processing location, or operation base for civil immigration enforcement, nor does it restrict any person or entity from carrying out functions unrelated to those purposes on such property.

III. DEFINITIONS

“Staging Area” means an area that is used to assemble, mobilize, and deploy vehicles, equipment, or materials, and related personnel, for the purpose of carrying out civil immigration enforcement operations.

“Processing Location” means an area that is used for activities such as the identification, intake, processing of documentation, detention, arrest, or temporary holding of individuals.

“Operation Base” means an area that is used to plan, coordinate and execute activities.

ORDINANCE NO. .

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

ORDINANCE ADOPTING CHAPTER 2.48 OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY ORDINANCE CODE RESTRICTING THE USE OF COUNTY RESOURCES TO ASSIST OR COOPERATE WITH IMMIGRATION AUTHORITIES

SECTION 1. FINDINGS. The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo (“County”) hereby finds and declares as follows:

WHEREAS, San Mateo County is home to persons of diverse racial, ethnic, and national backgrounds, including a large immigrant population; and

WHEREAS, all San Mateo County immigrant residents, whether they are U.S. citizens, permanent residents, undocumented residents, refugees, or residents with any other immigration status, are valued and integral members of our social, cultural, and economic fabric; and

WHEREAS, many immigrants have created deep ties in San Mateo County, which they have cultivated for themselves, their families, and their communities; and

WHEREAS, the County seeks to protect public health and safety, which is founded on trust and cooperation of and between community residents and local law enforcement, and the County has enacted numerous laws and policies to strengthen communities and to build and bolster trust between communities and local law enforcement; and

WHEREAS, the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), which is responsible for enforcing federal civil immigration laws, often seeks to enlist local law enforcement’s voluntary cooperation and assistance in enforcing immigration

laws, which may include, for instance, continuing to detain persons based on non-mandatory civil immigration detainers or cooperating and assisting with requests to notify ICE that/when a person will be released from local custody, and such actions often shift the financial burden of civil immigration enforcement onto local agencies; and

WHEREAS, unlike judicial warrants, which must be supported by probable cause and issued by a neutral judicial officer, civil immigration detainers are issued by immigration officers without judicial oversight; and

WHEREAS, when local law enforcement agencies voluntarily assist ICE and other immigration authorities, such assistance can contribute to the separation of families, community distrust of local government, fear of accessing necessary government services by immigrant communities, and reluctance to share vital information and cooperate with local authorities; and

WHEREAS, a significant number of detained immigrants are working people and the primary breadwinners of their families, and many immigrants have lost employment and the ability to provide for their families while detained or deported; and

WHEREAS, in September 2018, the Board unanimously approved funding to support a rapid response network, as well as to fund local non-profit legal service organizations to assist in representing San Mateo County residents in removal defense; and

WHEREAS, in November 2021, in response to requests from residents, faith communities, and civic organizations, the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office adopted a policy of not assisting with ICE detainer, transfer, and notification requests unless presented with a valid judicial warrant (as defined in Cal. Gov. Code § 7284.4(i)), joining

other California counties, including, but not limited to, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Marin, Santa Clara, and San Francisco with similar policies; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to end the County's cooperation with ICE and other immigration authorities to the greatest extent legally practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo ordains as follows:

SECTION 2. A new Chapter 2.48 of Title 2 of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code is hereby adopted to be numbered and entitled to read as follows:

Chapter 2.48 NON-COOPERATION WITH IMMIGRATION AUTHORITIES

Section 2.48.010 – Restrictions.

- (a) All County of San Mateo ("**County**") departments, agencies, commissions, officers, agents, representatives, and employees are prohibited from using County resources, property, personnel, time, labor, or funds to:
1. Assist or cooperate with requests by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement or other immigration authorities or persons, or entities contracted for immigration enforcement purposes ("**Immigration Authorities**"), to hold, detain, house, transfer, or otherwise facilitate the arrest of any person in the custody of the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office, Probation Department, or any other County Department, unless pursuant to a judicial warrant (as defined in California Government Code § 7284.4(i)) or otherwise required by federal or state statute, regulation, or court decision; or
 2. Communicate with Immigration Authorities regarding an individual's release time, date, or place, home or work address, or contact information, or to otherwise assist or cooperate in any immigration enforcement activities, including information gathering, unless pursuant to a judicial warrant (as defined in California Government Code § 7284.4(i)) or otherwise required by federal or state statute, regulation, or court decision; or
 3. Provide access to or use of non-public County property, including but not limited to, County jails, stations, courthouse holding cells, conference rooms, and databases to Immigration Authorities, unless pursuant to a judicial warrant (as defined in California Government Code § 7284.4(i)) or otherwise required by federal or state statute, regulation, or court decision.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of Section 2.48.010(a), County departments, agencies, commissions, officers, agents, representatives, and employees may use County resources, property, personnel, time, labor, or funds to assist or cooperate with Immigration Authorities solely for the purpose of providing assistance with the investigation or enforcement activities of any local, state, or federal law enforcement agency relating to suspected violations of any federal or state criminal statute, regulation, or court decision, provided, however, that such activities do not involve immigration enforcement as defined in California Government Code § 7284.4(f).

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, it shall not affect the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall be effective 30 days from the date of adoption.

* * * * *

ORDINANCE NO. .

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

*** * * * ***

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2.48 OF TITLE 2 OF THE SAN MATEO
COUNTY ORDINANCE CODE TO AMEND SECTION 2.48.010 TO RESTRICT
ACCESS TO COUNTY OWNED OR CONTROLLED PROPERTY AND ADD
SECTIONS 2.48.020, 2.48.030 AND 2.48.040 TO CHAPTER 2.48 TO REQUIRE
REPORTING ON IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES AND REGULATE
LAW ENFORCEMENT IDENTIFICATION AND USE OF FACE MASKS**

The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California,
ORDAINS as follows:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Board of Supervisors finds and determines that:

- (a) Section 2.48.010 of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code prohibits County employees from using County resources to assist or cooperate with Immigration Authorities. Additions to Chapter 2.48 of the County Ordinance Code will clarify that providing access to firearms training ranges owned or controlled by the County would violate Chapter 2.48.
- (b) Currently, there is no requirement for County Departments to report to the Board of Supervisors or the public regarding communications received from United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement or other federal immigration enforcement authorities or persons, or entities contracted for immigration enforcement purposes ("Immigration Authorities"), actions taken with respect to those communications or for reporting on any immigration enforcement actions in San Mateo County.
- (c) Other than the TRUTH Act, which imposes reporting obligations on law enforcement, there is no requirement that departments report interactions with Immigration Authorities whether such interactions are in response to a subpoena, judicial warrant or otherwise.
- (d) Increased immigration enforcement in San Mateo County, the State of California, and the country is negatively impacting our community by causing fear, displacement, loss of work, and loss of class time, among other significant impacts.
- (e) The Board of Supervisors and the public will benefit from receiving periodic reports on immigration enforcement communications and activity taking place in San Mateo County.

- (f) The federal government has launched broad immigration enforcement efforts in California, deploying personnel from various federal agencies
- (g) The increasing use of face coverings, the absence of visible names, officer identification number, or other individually identifying information, the failure to be clearly and conspicuously identifiable as federal law enforcement, or the use of unmarked vehicles during enforcement activities has raised concerns for public safety.
- (h) Both the individuals involved and onlookers have reported confusion and fear that they were experiencing or witnessing a crime.
- (i) While the federal government has publicly condemned impersonations, the use of face coverings and lack of consistent, visible personal and agency identification are making it difficult for individuals and state and local law enforcement to distinguish between authorized personnel and bad actors.
- (j) The County has both the authority and responsibility, under its police powers, to maintain order and protect the safety and well-being of all people within its jurisdiction.
- (k) In order to carry out this duty effectively, the County has the authority to establish identification requirements for law enforcement operating within the County so that the public and its agents can distinguish between individuals who are exercising law enforcement authority and those who are not, particularly in situations where a person is engaging in potentially unlawful behavior.
- (l) Therefore, the County has a compelling interest in identifying and verifying who is and who is not validly claiming or operating under law enforcement authority within the state.
- (m) Additions to Chapter 2.48 will clarify and enhance the County's commitment to the safety and wellbeing of its residents.

SECTION 2. Section 2.48.010 is hereby amended to add subsections (c) and (d) to be numbered and entitled and to read as follows:

- (c) The prohibition on using County resources expressly prohibits County departments, agencies, commissions, officers, agents, representatives, employees, and volunteers from allowing Immigration Authorities access to the County-owned range at Coyote Point Park without a judicial warrant.
- (d) The prohibition on using County resources expressly prohibits County departments, agencies, commissions, officers, agents, representatives, employees, and volunteers from using funds or personnel to assist in traffic enforcement for the purpose of aiding immigration enforcement or allowing Immigration Authorities access to County property for purposes of staging or establishing an operational base for a federal immigration enforcement action.

SECTION 3. COUNTY DEPARTMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS: A new Section 2.48.020 is hereby added to Chapter 2.48 to be numbered and entitled and to read in its entirety as follows:

- (a) No later than January 1, 2026, the Sheriff and Chief Probation Officer shall each place on a Board of Supervisors meeting agenda and post on the Sheriff's Office website a written report stating the number of immigration detainer requests from Immigration Authorities received from January 1, 2025, to the reporting deadline. Thereafter, the Sheriff and Chief Probation Officer shall each submit a written report to the Board of Supervisors by March 1st, June 1st, September 1st, and December 1st of each year, addressing the following issues for the time period covered by the report:
 - 1. A description of all communications received from any Immigration Authorities, including but not limited to, the number of civil immigration detainees, notification requests, or other types of communications related to immigration enforcement including the failure to notify any inmates of a detention request as required by the TRUTH Act (Cal Gov Code sec. 72831.1(b).)
 - 2. A description of any communications the Department made to the Immigration Authorities, including but not limited to any Department's responses to inquiries as described herein.
- (b) The Sheriff and Chief Probation Officer shall additionally include in their periodic reports a description of any immigration enforcement actions that the Department is aware of that were undertaken by the Immigration Authorities within the County, including but not limited to deportations, detentions, workplace raids or other surveillance observed by the Sheriff or Chief Probation Officer.
- (c) All County Departments shall report any interactions with Immigration Authorities, including, but not limited to, any service of subpoenas, warrants or surveillance of County facilities to the County Executive within 24 hours of their occurrence. The County Executive shall keep a log of such Departmental reports and provide a summary of Departmental interactions with Immigration Authorities to the Board according to the schedule provided in subsection (a).
- (d) County Parks Department shall provide a report to the County Executive of any identifiable Immigration Authorities accessing County Parks within 24 hours of the occurrence.

SECTION 4. LAW ENFORCEMENT IDENTIFICATION: A new Section 2.48.030 is

hereby added to Chapter 2.48 to be numbered and entitled and to read in its entirety as follows:

(a) Beginning on January 1, 2026 the Sheriff shall maintain and publicly post a written policy on the visible identification of law enforcement agency personnel as defined in Government Code Section 7288(c)(2). The policy shall include, at minimum, the following:

1. A purpose statement affirming the agency's commitment to both of the following:

A. Transparency, accountability, and public trust.

B. Restricting situations in which sworn personnel do not visibly display identification to specific, clearly defined, and limited circumstances.

2. A requirement that all sworn personnel visibly display identification that includes their agency and either a name or badge number, or both name and badge number, when performing enforcement duties.

3. A list of narrowly tailored exemptions for the following:

A. Officers engaged in active undercover operations or investigative activities.

B. Officers wearing personal protective equipment that prevents display.

C. Exigent circumstances, involving an imminent danger to persons or property, or the escape of a perpetrator, or the destruction of evidence, including if the officer is responding to those circumstances while off-duty.

D. When there is a specific, articulable, and particularized reason to believe identification would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of the peace officer.

(b) The Sheriff shall develop, maintain and publicly post a written policy regarding the use of facial coverings. The policy shall include, but not be limited to, each of the following:

1. A purpose statement affirming the Sheriff's commitment to the following:

A. Transparency, accountability and public trust.

B. Restricting the use of facial coverings to specific, clearly defined, and limited circumstances.

- C. The principle that generalized and undifferentiated fear and apprehension about officer safety shall not be sufficient to justify the use of facial coverings.
- 2. A requirement that all sworn personnel not use a facial covering when performing their duties.
- 3. A list of narrowly tailored exemptions for the following:
 - A. Active undercover operations or assignments authorized by supervising personnel or court order.
 - B. Tactical operations where protective gear is required for physical safety.
 - C. Applicable law governing occupational health and safety.
 - D. Protection of identity during prosecution.
 - E. Applicable law governing reasonable accommodations.
- 4. Opaque facial coverings shall only be used when no other reasonable alternative exists and the necessity is documented.
- 5. Pursuant to the policy, a supervisor shall not knowingly allow a peace officer under their supervision to violate state law or agency policy limiting the use of a facial covering.

SECTION 5. MISCELLANEOUS: A new Section 2.48.040 is hereby added to Chapter 2.48 to be numbered and entitled and to read in its entirety as follows:

(a) Construction with Other Laws

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to violate any State or Federal laws with regard to immigration or other law enforcement. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as contrary to or in defiance of any Federal or State Law.

(b) Severability

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this chapter or its application is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this chapter. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this chapter and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this chapter would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional. To this end, the provisions of this chapter, and each of them, are severable.

* * * * *

In addition, Board members may, but shall not be obligated to, ensure that each separate AAB panel has at least one real property appraiser with the designation of MAI from the Appraisal Institute, or similar designation evidencing experience with complex income property valuation, as well as one experienced Assessment Appeals Board member.

3.53.2 Assessment Appeals Board IV

Assessment Appeals Board IV may be dedicated to the resolution of appeals contesting a “change in ownership” or new construction determination by the Assessor, as well as appeals regarding the Assessor's valuation of real property. If so, then notwithstanding the guidelines above, Seat 1 of Assessment Appeals Board IV shall be filled by one member with experience as a real property appraiser with the designation of MAI from the Appraisal Institute or a similar designation evidencing experience with complex income property valuation. Seats 2 and 3 shall each be filled by a member who has a minimum of five years' professional experience in this State as an attorney, preferably related to real estate and property transfers, and who the nominating member of the Board of Supervisors has reason to believe is possessed of competent knowledge of property taxation. However, a panel that does not meet these requirements is not precluded from hearing any type of appeal.

3.53.3 Appointment of Value Hearing Officers

It is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that when considering prospective value hearing officers, Board members may, but shall not be obligated to, give preference to candidates possessing the following background:

- (A) Residential real property appraisers with an SRA designation from the Appraisal Institute;
- (B) Residential real property appraisers licensed at the Certified Residential or Certified General level by the State of California Office of Real Estate Appraisers; or
- (C) Individuals having experience which is comparable to that set forth in subsections (A) and (B) above.

In addition, Board members may, but shall not be obligated to, give preference to candidates with prior experience as either a hearing officer or arbitrator.

3.54 COOPERATION WITH U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT (Adopted 10-18-11; Amended 6-4-19)

It is the policy of the County of Santa Clara that County officials and employees may cooperate with United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) only as follows:

- (A) Consistent with longstanding County policy, the California Values Act (Gov. Code, §§ 7284-7284.12), and the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the County does not, under any circumstances, honor civil detainer requests from ICE by holding inmates on ICE's behalf for additional time after they would otherwise be released from County custody.
- (B) It is the policy of the County that the Sheriff may exercise discretion to facilitate the transfer of an adult inmate to ICE custody if an ICE agent presents a valid arrest warrant signed by a federal or state judicial officer, or other signed writ or order from a federal or state judicial officer authorizing ICE's arrest of the inmate. An administrative warrant signed by an agent or official of ICE or of the Department of Homeland Security (such as a Form I-200) is not a judicial warrant and will not be honored. The Sheriff and Chief of Correction shall jointly develop transfer procedures to implement this paragraph.
- (C) Except as permitted by this Policy, the County shall not provide assistance or cooperation to ICE in its civil immigration enforcement efforts, including by giving ICE agents access to individuals or allowing them to use County facilities for investigative interviews or other purposes, expending County time or resources responding to ICE inquiries or communicating with ICE regarding individuals' incarceration status or release dates, or otherwise participating in any civil immigration enforcement activities. This Policy does not limit or prohibit giving assistance with the investigative activities of any local, state, or federal law enforcement agency relating to suspected violations of criminal laws.

3.55 DEFENDING PROFESSIONALLY LICENSED EMPLOYEES IN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS (Adopted 10-25-11)

The County values its employees and desires to support them when they perform their duties within the scope of their employment in a good-faith manner and to the best of their abilities. The County acknowledges that its professionally-licensed employees often face difficult judgment calls that need to be made promptly and sometimes result in good-faith mistakes. The County considered these factors in adopting this policy.

Further, this policy may be applied retroactively to underlying actions or failures to act that form the subject matter of a professional-licensing entity proceeding, but is prospective in nature in that it applies only to matters that were initiated by a professional-licensing entity after the enactment of this policy.

3.55.1 Policy

Pursuant to Government Code section 995.6, the County does not have a legal duty to defend employees licensed pursuant to the provisions of the California Business and Professions Code ("professionally-licensed employees") in administrative proceedings initi-

ORDINANCE NO. 188441

An ordinance adding Chapter 19 to Division 19 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code to prohibit City resources, including property and personnel, from being utilized for immigration enforcement or for cooperation with federal immigration agents.

**THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. Chapter 19 is added to Division 19 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code to read as follows:

CHAPTER 19

**PROHIBITION OF THE USE OF CITY RESOURCES FOR
FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT**

Sec. 19.190. Definitions.

For purposes of this chapter, the following words and phrases are defined as follows:

“Citizenship or Immigration Status” shall mean all information or classification regarding citizenship of the United States or any other country, place of birth, the authority to reside in or otherwise be present in the United States, including visa status, and the time or manner of a person’s entry into the United States.

“Immigration Agent” means an individual engaged in Immigration Enforcement against natural persons, including agents employed by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and all other individuals authorized to conduct Immigration Enforcement against natural persons under 8 U.S.C. §1357(g) or any other federal law.

“Immigration Enforcement” means any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal civil immigration law against natural persons, and also includes any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a natural person’s presence in, entry, or reentry to, or employment in, the United States.

Sec. 19.191. Prohibition on the Use of City Resources.

Unless required by federal or state law, no City resources, including, but not limited to, City personnel and City property, shall be utilized to:

(a) Inquire into or collect information about an individual's Citizenship or Immigration Status, unless such information is necessary to provide a City service, including the provision of immigration and naturalization assistance, for election-related purposes or appointment to a City office or commission, or as required for purposes of City employment or the disbursement of City funds.

(b) Investigate, cite, arrest, hold, transfer, or detain any person for the purpose of Immigration Enforcement, except as authorized under California Government Code Section 7284.6(b)(1). Prior to conducting any probable cause arrest for a violation of 8 U.S.C. Section 1326(a) that may be subject to the enhancement specified in 8 U.S.C. Section 1326(b)(2), or prior to transferring a suspect to an Immigration Agent based on a probable cause arrest for a violation of 8 U.S.C. Section 1326(a) that may be subject to the enhancement specified in 8 U.S.C. Section 1326(b)(2), City personnel shall obtain approval from their respective department's designated immigrant affairs liaison.

(c) Respond to any administrative warrant or other request to detain, transfer, or notify any Immigration Agent about the status or release of any individual for the purpose of Immigration Enforcement.

(d) Provide any Immigration Agent access to any non-public areas of property owned or controlled by the City, including City jails, for the purpose of Immigration Enforcement.

(e) Make any person in City custody available to any Immigration Agent for an interview for the purpose of Immigration Enforcement.

(f) Participate in Immigration Enforcement in any operation, joint operation, or joint task force involving any Immigration Agent.

Sec. 19.192. Confidentiality and Protection of City Data.

Except as required by 8 U.S.C. § 1373 or other applicable federal or state law, no City personnel shall provide access to any City data or information that can be used to determine or trace a person's Citizenship or Immigration Status to any Immigration Agent. In furtherance of this restriction, as of the effective date of this ordinance, City personnel shall not provide City data or information that can be used to determine or trace a person's Citizenship or Immigration Status to any City contractor unless the contractor first agrees in writing to prohibit the contractor's employees and subcontractors from providing that data or information to any Immigration Agent, to the extent permitted by law. All City employees shall treat information that can be used to distinguish or trace a person's Citizenship or Immigration Status, either on its own or when combined with other information, as confidential information, to the extent permitted by law, and shall handle, maintain, and secure such information according to the standards for confidential information set forth in City policy.

Sec. 19.193. Judicial Warrants.

Nothing in this chapter shall prohibit or otherwise restrict the City from complying with a valid warrant for a criminal offense issued by a federal or state judge, or other order evidencing a judicial determination of probable cause.

Sec. 19.194. Adoption of Policy.

To the extent that some City departments are, by terms of the charter, exempt from the prohibitions in this chapter, they are strongly encouraged to adopt policies consonant with the provisions contained herein.

Sec. 19.195. Severability.

If any subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this chapter is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this chapter. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this chapter, and each and every subsection, sentence, clause, and phrase thereof not declared invalid or unconstitutional, without regard to whether any portion of the chapter would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

Sec. 2. **URGENCY CLAUSE.** News organizations are reporting that the incoming federal administration, on January 20, 2025, intends to begin an immediate roll back of longstanding policies that currently focus the federal government's limited immigration enforcement resources on deportations of people deemed threats to public safety or national security. The same news reports indicate that the incoming administration will quickly reverse numerous humanitarian parole programs, which grant City residents lawful status and work authorization. These policy changes, and others, including the possible use of military assets, are being proposed, in part, to allow for a program of mass deportation, which will directly affect the public peace, health, and safety of all residents across the City. Therefore, the City Council finds and declares that this ordinance is required for the immediate protection of the public peace, health and safety. The policies set forth in this ordinance are rooted in a commitment to the principle that all of Los Angeles is safer when our City personnel maintain a relationship of trust, respect, and cooperation with City residents. The cooperation of immigrant communities to report crimes and assist in the investigation and prosecution of criminals is critical to the fair and effective enforcement of the law and the safety of all members of the community. When residents feel confident that they can come forward as a victim of or a witness to a crime, irrespective of immigration status, the City's ability to protect and serve all residents is enhanced. In the 45 years since adopting its initial immigration-related policies, Los Angeles has benefited greatly from the cooperation of witnesses and victims of crime in the City's immigrant communities. These positive outcomes will not continue if immigrant communities see City personnel as agents of federal immigration authorities because such fear reduces cooperation with the City and erodes the relationship between the City and its communities. While the City's policies

limit the City's cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, neither existing LAPD policies nor the current executive directives are codified into local municipal law. In addition, existing policies allow immigration agents access to City property to interview people in City custody and lack comprehensive restrictions on limiting direct and indirect data sharing with immigration agents. This allows for significant exposure of City residents and their data to immigration agencies, undermining the City's commitment to protecting all residents from City resources being utilized for immigration enforcement. The City Council adopts this ordinance to become effective upon publication pursuant to Los Angeles City Charter Section 253.

Sec. 3. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

Approved as to Form and Legality

HYDEE FELDSTEIN SOTO, City Attorney

By _____
MICHAEL J. DUNDAS
Senior Assistant City Attorney

Date November 26, 2024


File No. 23-0243

M:\GENERAL COUNSEL DIVISION\ORDINANCES AND REPORTS\ORDINANCES - FINAL YELLOW\Revised - LAAC Chap 19, Div 19 - Prohibition of City Resources for Immigration Enforcement.docx

The Clerk of the City of Los Angeles hereby certifies that the foregoing ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, **by a vote of not less than three-fourths** of all its members.

CITY CLERK

MAYOR

_____
Holly Lynn Wolcott

_____
Karen Bass

Ordinance Passed December 4, 2024

Approved 12/09/2024

Ordinance Published: 12/19/2024
Ordinance Effective Date: 12/19/2024

REVISED

AGN. NO.

MOTION BY SUPERVISORS LINDSEY P. HORVATH

January 13, 2026

AND HILDA L. SOLIS

Creating ICE-Free Zones in Los Angeles County

As federal civil immigration enforcement ramps up throughout the nation, jurisdictions have taken decisive action to protect their citizens and public spaces. States, counties, and cities have sought protection and remedies through the judicial system and have enacted policies such as requiring identification from federal agents, increasing penalties for impersonating a federal agent, and prohibiting non-federal government staff from cooperating with federal immigration enforcement actions unless required by law.

On October 6, 2025, Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson signed the “ICE Free Zone” executive order, which creates clear mechanisms to prohibit federal immigration agents from using any City-owned property in their ongoing operations in Chicago. The executive order comes following documented use of Chicago Public Schools’ parking lots and a City-owned parking lot as staging sites for federal immigration enforcement operations.¹

¹ City of Chicago Office of the Mayor. “Mayor Brandon Johnson Signs “ICE Free Zone” Executive Order, Prohibiting Use of City Property for Federal Immigration Operations.” Chicago.gov, 6 Oct. 2025, www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/mayor/press_room/press_releases/2025/october/city-property-executive-order.html. Accessed 23 Oct. 2025.

MOTION

MITCHELL

HORVATH

HAHN

BARGER

SOLIS

. On October 8, 2025, federal agents conducted a raid in San Pedro at Deane Dana Friendship Park and Nature Center, a County park in Supervisorial District 4. The agents arrested three people and threatened to arrest staff from the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation who responded to the scene.² Because of this raid, County residents avoided the park, were unable to access it and use it for recreation as intended, and County staff were diverted from their regular duties.

As federal immigration actions are increasingly taking place in public spaces, it is imperative the County of Los Angeles take action to protect our spaces so that they can be accessed by the public and used for their intended County purposes, and to prohibit County property from being used as staging areas for these raids, or other operations, which may result in unlawful actions such as detaining U.S. citizens and denying due process to County residents of all immigration statuses.

I WE, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct County Counsel to prepare and place on the Board's agenda, within 30 days, an ordinance for introduction and consideration by the Board that does the following:

1. Prevents real and personal property belonging to, or subject to the control of the County, from being used for other than County purposes, including for any civil enforcement staging, processing, or operations in the following manner:
 - a. No real and personal property belonging to, or subject to the control of the County shall be used as a staging area, processing location, or

² Hutchings, Kristy. "ICE Conducts Operations in San Pedro, Threatens to Arrest LA County Staff, Supervisor Hahn Says." Daily Breeze, 8 Oct. 2025, www.dailybreeze.com/2025/10/08/ice-conducts-operations-in-san-pedro-threatens-to-arrest-la-county-staff-supervisor-hahn-says/. Accessed 24 Oct. 2025.

operations base for unauthorized civil law enforcement actions, including civil immigration enforcement.

- b. Defines "staging area" as an area that is used to assemble, mobilize, and deploy vehicles, equipment, or materials, and related personnel, in a manner that is outside of regular business purposes or hours, or that disrupts or impedes its use for County purposes.
- c. Requires real and personal property, belonging to, or subject to the control of the County, have clear signage stating:

**This property is owned and controlled by the County of
Los Angeles. It may not be used for unauthorized civil
law enforcement, including civil immigration
enforcement, as a Staging Area, Processing Location, or
Operations Base.**

- d. Requires County departments to further ensure that, wherever appropriate, signage and physical barriers such as locked gates are used to limit access to real and personal property belonging to, or subject to the control of the County.
- e. Does not restrict or interfere with the execution of lawful judicial warrants or the enforcement of criminal law, nor does it limit the rights of any person or entity under state or federal law.
- f. Does not prohibit the lawful use of real and personal property belonging to, or subject to the control of the County for County uses other than a staging area, processing location, or operations base for unauthorized

civil law enforcement, nor does it restrict any authorized person or entity from carrying out authorized functions on such property.

2. Requires any civil law enforcement entity to seek a permit from the appropriate County Department to conduct any civil law enforcement staging, processing, or operations in advance of such operations, with an exception for exigent circumstances or a judicial warrant.

‡ **WE, FURTHER MOVE** that the Board of Supervisors direct:

1. Internal Services Department, in collaboration with the Chief Executive Office Asset Management Branch, County Counsel, and all relevant departments to identify real and personal property belonging to, or subject to the control of the County that either have been used, or are likely to be used in the future, as a staging area, processing location, or operations base for the purpose of unauthorized civil law enforcement, including immigration enforcement.
2. County Counsel in collaboration with the Department of Human Resources and the Chief Executive Office shall develop the procedures necessary to implement this ordinance. These implementing procedures shall provide that any County employee who becomes aware of the attempted or actual use of real and personal property belonging to, or subject to the control of the County as a staging area, processing location, or operations base for unauthorized civil law enforcement, including civil immigration enforcement, shall immediately report to their supervisor, who will communicate with County Counsel.

#

CHAPTER 12H:

IMMIGRATION STATUS

Sec. 12H.1.	City and County of Refuge.
Sec. 12H.2.	Use of City Funds Prohibited.
Sec. 12H.3.	Clerk of Board to Transmit Copies of this Chapter; Informing City Employees.
Sec. 12H.4.	Enforcement.
Sec. 12H.5.	City Undertaking Limited to Promotion of General Welfare.
Sec. 12H.6.	Severability.

SEC. 12H.1. CITY AND COUNTY OF REFUGE.

It is hereby affirmed that the City and County of San Francisco is a City and County of Refuge.

■ (Added by O d 375-89, App 10/24/89)

SEC. 12H.2. USE OF CITY FUNDS PROHIBITED.

No department, agency, commission, officer, or employee of the City and County of San Francisco shall use any City funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law or to gather or disseminate information regarding release status of individuals or any other such personal information as defined in Chapter 12I in the City and County of San Francisco unless such assistance is required by Federal or State statute, regulation, or court decision. The prohibition set forth in this Chapter 12H shall include, but shall not be limited to:

(a) Assisting or cooperating, in one's official capacity, with any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, conducted by the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law and relating to alleged violations of the civil provisions of the Federal immigration law, except as permitted under Administrative Code Section 12I.3.

(b) Assisting or cooperating, in one's official capacity, with any investigation, surveillance, or gathering of information conducted by foreign governments, except for cooperation related to an alleged violation of City and County, State, or Federal criminal laws.

(c) Requesting information about, or disseminating information, in one's official capacity, regarding the release status of any individual or any other such personal information as defined in Chapter 12I, except as permitted under Administrative Code Section 12I.3, or conditioning the provision of services or benefits by the City and County of San Francisco upon immigration status, except as required by Federal or State statute or regulation, City and County public assistance criteria, or court decision.

(d) Including on any application, questionnaire, or interview form used in relation to benefits, services, or opportunities provided by the City and County of San Francisco any question regarding immigration status other than those required by Federal or State statute, regulation, or court decision. Any such questions existing or being used by the City and County at the time this Chapter is adopted shall be deleted within sixty days of the adoption of this Chapter.

■ (Added by O d 375-89, App 10/24/89 amended by O d 228-09, F e No 091032, App 10-28-2009 O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

SEC. 12H.2-1. [REPEALED.]

■ (Added by O d 282-92, App 9/4/92 amended by O d 238-93, App 8/4/93 O d 228-09, F e No 091032, App 10-28-2009 repea ed by O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

SEC. 12H.3. CLERK OF BOARD TO TRANSMIT COPIES OF THIS CHAPTER; INFORMING CITY EMPLOYEES.

The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall send copies of this Chapter, including any future amendments thereto that may be made, to every department, agency and commission of the City and County of San Francisco, to California's United States Senators, and to the California Congressional delegation, the Commissioner of the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law, the United States Attorney General, and the Secretary of State and the President of the United States. Each appointing officer of the City and County of San Francisco shall inform all employees under her or his jurisdiction of the prohibitions in this ordinance, the duty of all of her or his employees to comply with the prohibitions in this ordinance, and that employees who fail to comply with the prohibitions of the ordinance shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action. Each City and County employee shall be given a written directive with instructions for implementing the provisions of this Chapter.

(Added by O d 375-89, App 10/24/89 O d 228-09, F e No 091032, App 10-28-2009)

SEC. 12H.4. ENFORCEMENT.

The Human Rights Commission shall review the compliance of the City and County departments, agencies, commissions and employees with the mandates of this ordinance in particular instances in which there is question of noncompliance or when a complaint alleging noncompliance has been lodged.

■ (Added by O d 375-89, App 10/24/89)

SEC. 12H.5. CITY UNDERTAKING LIMITED TO PROMOTION OF GENERAL WELFARE.

In undertaking the adoption and enforcement of this Chapter, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. This Chapter is not intended to create any new rights for breach of which the City is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused injury. This section shall not be construed to limit or proscribe any other existing rights or remedies possessed by such person.

■ (Added by O d 375-89, App 10/24/89)

SEC. 12H.6. SEVERABILITY.

If any part of this ordinance, or the application thereof, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected thereby, and this ordinance shall otherwise continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this ordinance, and each of them, are severable.

(Added by O d 375-89, App 10/24/89)

CHAPTER 12I:

CIVIL IMMIGRATION DETAINERS

Sec. 12I.1.	Findings.
Sec. 12I.2.	Definitions.
Sec. 12I.3.	Restrictions on Law Enforcement Officials.
Sec. 12I.4.	Purpose of this Chapter.
Sec. 12I.5.	Semiannual Report.
Sec. 12I.6.	Severability.
Sec. 12I.7.	Undertaking for the General Welfare.

■

SEC. 12I.1. FINDINGS.

The City and County of San Francisco (the "City") is home to persons of diverse racial, ethnic, and national backgrounds, including a large immigrant population. The City respects, upholds, and values equal protection and equal treatment for all of our residents, regardless of immigration status. Fostering a relationship of trust, respect, and open communication between City employees and City residents is essential to the City's core mission of ensuring public health, safety, and welfare, and serving the needs of everyone in the community, including immigrants. The purpose of this Chapter 12I, as well as of Administrative Code Chapter 12H, is to foster respect and trust between law enforcement and residents, to protect limited local resources, to encourage cooperation between residents and City officials, including especially law enforcement and public health officers and employees, and to ensure community security, and due process for all.

The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") is responsible for enforcing the civil immigration laws. ICE's programs, including Secure Communities and its replacement, the Priority Enforcement Program ("PEP"), seek to enlist local law enforcement's voluntary cooperation and assistance in its enforcement efforts. In its description of PEP, ICE explains that all requests under PEP are for voluntary action and that any request is not an authorization to detain persons at the expense of the federal government. The federal government should not shift the financial burden of federal civil immigration enforcement, including personnel time and costs relating to notification and detention, onto local law enforcement by requesting that local law enforcement agencies continue detaining persons based on non-mandatory civil immigration detainers or cooperating and assisting with requests to notify ICE that a person will be released from local custody. It is not a wise and effective use of valuable City resources at a time when vital services are being cut.

ICE's Secure Communities program (also known as "S-Comm") shifted the burden of federal civil immigration enforcement onto local

law enforcement. S-Comm came into operation after the state sent fingerprints that state and local law enforcement agencies had transmitted to the California Department of Justice ("Cal DOJ") to positively identify the arrestees and to check their criminal history. The FBI would forward the fingerprints to the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") to be checked against immigration and other databases. To give itself time to take a detainee into immigration custody, ICE would send an Immigration Detainer Notice of Action (DHS Form I-247) to the local law enforcement official requesting that the local law enforcement official hold the individual for up to 48 hours after that individual would otherwise be released ("civil immigration detainees"). Civil Immigration detainees may be issued without evidentiary support or probable cause by border patrol agents, aircraft pilots, special agents, deportation officers, immigration inspectors, and immigration adjudication officers.

Given that civil immigration detainees are issued by immigration officers without judicial oversight, and the regulation authorizing civil immigration detainees provides no minimum standard of proof for their issuance, there are serious questions as to their constitutionality. Unlike criminal warrants, which must be supported by probable cause and issued by a neutral magistrate, there are no such requirements for the issuance of a civil immigration detainer. Several federal courts have ruled that because civil immigration detainees and other ICE "Notice of Action" documents are issued without probable cause of criminal conduct, they do not meet the Fourth Amendment requirements for state or local law enforcement officials to arrest and hold an individual in custody. (*Miranda Olivares v. Clackamas Co.*, No. 3:12-cv-02317-ST *17 (D.Or. April 11, 2014) (finding that detention pursuant to an immigration detainer is a seizure that must comport with the Fourth Amendment). See also *Morales v. Chadbourne*, 996 F. Supp. 2d 19, 29 (D.R.I 2014); *Villars v. Kubiowski*, No. 12-cv-4586 *10-12 (N.D. Ill. filed May 5, 2014).)

On December 4, 2012, the Attorney General of California, Kamala Harris, clarified the responsibilities of local law enforcement agencies under S-Comm. The Attorney General clarified that S-Comm did not require state or local law enforcement officials to determine an individual's immigration status or to enforce federal immigration laws. The Attorney General also clarified that civil immigration detainees are voluntary requests to local law enforcement agencies that do not mandate compliance. California local law enforcement agencies may determine on their own whether to comply with non-mandatory civil immigration detainees. In a June 25, 2014, bulletin, the Attorney General warned that a federal court outside of California had held a county liable for damages where it voluntarily complied with an ICE request to detain an individual, and the individual was otherwise eligible for release and that local law enforcement agencies may also be held liable for such conduct. Over 350 jurisdictions, including Washington, D.C., Cook County, Illinois, and many of California's 58 counties, have already acknowledged the discretionary nature of civil immigration detainees and are declining to hold people in their jails for the additional 48 hours as requested by ICE. Local law enforcement agencies' responsibilities, duties, and powers are regulated by state law. However, complying with non-mandatory civil immigration detainees frequently raises due process concerns.

According to Section 287.7 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the City is not reimbursed by the federal government for the costs associated with civil immigration detainees alone. The full cost of responding to a civil immigration detainer can include, but is not limited to, extended detention time, the administrative costs of tracking and responding to detainees, and the legal liability for erroneously holding an individual who is not subject to a civil immigration detainer. Compliance with civil immigration detainees and involvement in civil immigration enforcement diverts limited local resources from programs that are beneficial to the City.

The City seeks to protect public safety, which is founded on trust and cooperation of community residents and local law enforcement. However, civil immigration detainees and notifications regarding release undermine community trust of law enforcement by instilling fear in immigrant communities of coming forward to report crimes and cooperate with local law enforcement agencies. A 2013 study by the University of Illinois, entitled "Insecure Communities: Latino Perceptions of Police Involvement in Immigration Enforcement," found that at least 40% of Latinos surveyed are less likely to provide information to police because they fear exposing themselves, family, or friends to a risk of deportation. Indeed, civil immigration detainees have resulted in the transfer of victims of crime, including domestic violence victims, to ICE.

The City has enacted numerous laws and policies to strengthen communities and to build trust between communities and local law enforcement. Local cooperation and assistance with civil immigration enforcement undermines community policing strategies.

In 2014, DHS ended the Secure Communities program and replaced it with PEP. PEP and S-Comm share many similarities. Just as with S-Comm, PEP uses state and federal databases to check an individual's fingerprints against immigration and other databases. PEP employs a number of tactics to facilitate transfers of individuals from local jails to immigration custody.

First, PEP uses a new form (known as DHS Form I-247N), which requests notification from local jails about an individual's release date prior to his or her release from local custody. As with civil immigration detainees, these notification requests are issued by immigration officers without judicial oversight, thus raising questions about local law enforcement's liability for constitutional violations if any person is overdetrained when immigration agents are unable to be present at the time of the person's release from local custody.

Second, under PEP, ICE will continue to issue civil immigration detainer requests where local law enforcement officials are willing to respond to the requests, and in instances of "special circumstances," a term that has yet to be defined by DHS. Despite federal courts finding civil immigration detainees do not meet Fourth Amendment requirements, local jurisdictions are often unable to confirm whether or not a detention request is supported by probable cause or has been reviewed by a neutral magistrate.

The increase in information-sharing between local law enforcement and immigration officials raises serious concerns about privacy rights. Across the country, including in the California Central Valley, there has been an increase of ICE agents stationed in jails, who often have unrestricted access to jail databases, booking logs, and other documents that contain personal information of all jail inmates.

The City has an interest in ensuring that confidential information collected in the course of carrying out its municipal functions, including but not limited to public health programs and criminal investigations, is not used for unintended purposes that could hamper collection of information vital to those functions. To carry out public health programs, the City must be able to reliably collect confidential information from all residents. To solve crimes and protect the public, local law enforcement depends on the cooperation of all City residents. Information gathering and cooperation may be jeopardized if release of personal information results in a person being

taken into immigration custody.

In late 2015, Pedro Figueroa, an immigrant father of an 8-year-old U.S. citizen, sought the San Francisco Police Department's help in locating his stolen vehicle. When Mr. Figueroa went to the police station to retrieve his car, which police had located, he was detained for some time by police officers before being released, and an ICE agent was waiting to take him into immigration custody immediately as he left the police station. It was later reported that both the Police Department and the San Francisco Sheriff's Department had contact with ICE officials while Mr. Figueroa was at the police station. He spent over two months in an immigration detention facility and remains in deportation proceedings. Mr. Figueroa's case has raised major concerns about local law enforcement's relationship with immigration authorities, and has weakened the immigrant community's confidence in policing practices. Community cooperation with local law enforcement is critical to investigating and prosecuting crimes. Without the cooperation of crime victims like Mr. Figueroa and witnesses, local law enforcement's ability to investigate and prosecute crime, particularly in communities with large immigrant populations, will be seriously compromised.

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013 amended by O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

(Fo me Sec 121.1 added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 409-97, App 10/31/97 O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 repealed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 121.2. DEFINITIONS.

"Administrative warrant" means a document issued by the federal agency charged with the enforcement of the Federal immigration law that is used as a non-criminal, civil warrant for immigration purposes.

"Eligible for release from custody" means that the individual may be released from custody because one of the following conditions has occurred:

- (a) All criminal charges against the individual have been dropped or dismissed.
- (b) The individual has been acquitted of all criminal charges filed against him or her.
- (c) The individual has served all the time required for his or her sentence.
- (d) The individual has posted a bond, or has been released on his or her own recognizance.
- (e) The individual has been referred to pre-trial diversion services.
- (f) The individual is otherwise eligible for release under state or local law.

"Civil immigration detainer" means a non-mandatory request issued by an authorized federal immigration officer under Section 287.7 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, to a local law enforcement official to maintain custody of an individual for a period not to exceed 48 hours and advise the authorized federal immigration officer prior to the release of that individual.

"Convicted" means the state of having been proved guilty in a judicial proceeding, unless the convictions have been expunged or vacated pursuant to applicable law. The date that an individual is Convicted starts from the date of release.

"Firearm" means a device, designed to be used as a weapon, from which is expelled through a barrel, a projectile by the force of an explosion or other form of combustion as defined in Penal Code Section 16520.

"Law enforcement official" means any City Department or officer or employee of a City Department, authorized to enforce criminal statutes, regulations, or local ordinances; operate jails or maintain custody of individuals in jails; and operate juvenile detention facilities or maintain custody of individuals in juvenile detention facilities.

"Notification request" means a non-mandatory request issued by an authorized federal immigration officer to a local law enforcement official asking for notification to the authorized immigration officer of an individual's release from local custody prior to the release of an individual from local custody. Notification requests may also include informal requests for release information by the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law.

"Personal information" means any confidential, identifying information about an individual, including, but not limited to, home or work contact information, and family or emergency contact information.

"Serious Felony" means all serious felonies listed under Penal Code Section 1192.7(c) that also are defined as violent felonies under Penal Code Section 667.5(c); rape as defined in Penal Code Sections 261, and 262; exploding a destructive device with intent to injure as defined in Penal Code Section 18740; assault on a person with caustic chemicals or flammable substances as defined in Penal Code Section 244; shooting from a vehicle at a person outside the vehicle or with great bodily injury as defined in Penal Code Sections 26100(c) and (d).

"Violent Felony" means any crime listed in Penal Code Section 667.5(c); human trafficking as defined in Penal Code Section 236.1; felony assault with a deadly weapon as defined in Penal Code Section 245; any crime involving use of a firearm, assault weapon, machine gun, or .50 BMG rifle, while committing or attempting to commit a felony that is charged as a sentencing enhancement as listed in Penal Code Sections 12022.4 and 12022.5.

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013 amended by O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

(Fo me Sec 121.2 added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 278-96, App 7/3/96 O d 409-97, App 10/31/97 O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 repealed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 12I.3. RESTRICTIONS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), a law enforcement official shall not detain an individual on the basis of a civil immigration detainer after that individual becomes eligible for release from custody.

(b) Law enforcement officials may continue to detain an individual in response to a civil immigration detainer for up to 48 hours after that individual becomes eligible for release if the continued detention is consistent with state and federal law, and the individual meets both of the following criteria:

(1) The individual has been Convicted of a Violent Felony in the seven years immediately prior to the date of the civil immigration detainer; and

(2) A magistrate has determined that there is probable cause to believe the individual is guilty of a Violent Felony and has ordered the individual to answer to the same pursuant to Penal Code Section 872.

In determining whether to continue to detain an individual based solely on a civil immigration detainer as permitted in this subsection (b), law enforcement officials shall consider evidence of the individual's rehabilitation and evaluate whether the individual poses a public safety risk. Evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors to consider includes, but is not limited to: the individual's ties to the community, whether the individual has been a victim of any crime, the individual's contribution to the community, and the individual's participation in social service or rehabilitation programs.

This subsection (b) shall expire by operation of law on October 1, 2016, or upon a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors that finds for purposes of this Chapter, the federal government has enacted comprehensive immigration reform that diminishes the need for this subsection (b), whichever comes first.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (d), a law enforcement official shall not respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request.

(d) Law Enforcement officials may respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request if the individual meets both of the following criteria:

(1) The individual either:

(A) has been Convicted of a Violent Felony in the seven years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; or

(B) has been Convicted of a Serious Felony in the five years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; or

(C) has been Convicted of three felonies identified in Penal Code sections 1192.7(c) or 667.5(c), or Government Code sections 7282.5(a)(2) or 7282.5(a)(3), other than domestic violence, arising out of three separate incidents in the five years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; and

(2) A magistrate has determined that there is probable cause to believe the individual is guilty of a felony identified in Penal Code sections 1192.7(c) or 667.5(c), or Government Code sections 7282.5(a)(2) or 7282.5(a)(3), other than domestic violence, and has ordered the individual to answer to the same pursuant to Penal Code Section 872.

In determining whether to respond to a notification request as permitted by this subsection (d), law enforcement officials shall consider evidence of the individual's rehabilitation and evaluate whether the individual poses a public safety risk. Evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors to consider includes, but is not limited to, the individual's ties to the community, whether the individual has been a victim of any crime, the individual's contribution to the community, and the individual's participation in social service or rehabilitation programs.

(e) Law enforcement officials shall not arrest or detain an individual, or provide any individual's personal information to a federal immigration officer, on the basis of an administrative warrant, prior deportation order, or other civil immigration document based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws.

(f) Law enforcement officials shall make good faith efforts to seek federal reimbursement for all costs incurred in continuing to detain an individual, after that individual becomes eligible for release, in response each civil immigration detainer.

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013 amended by O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

(Fo me Sec 12I 3 added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 409-97, App 10/31/97 O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 repea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 12I.4. PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER.

The intent of this Chapter 12I is to address requests for non-mandatory civil immigration detainers, voluntary notification of release of individuals, transmission of personal information, and civil immigration documents based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws. Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to apply to matters other than those relating to federal civil immigration detainers, notification of release of individuals, transmission of personal information, or civil immigration documents, based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws. In all other respects, local law enforcement agencies may continue to collaborate with federal authorities to protect public safety. This collaboration includes, but is not limited to, participation in joint criminal investigations that are permitted under local policy or applicable city or state law.

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013 amended by O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

SEC. 12I.5. SEMIANNUAL REPORT.

By no later than July 1, 2014, the Sheriff and Juvenile Probation Officer shall each provide to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a written report stating the number of detentions that were solely based on civil immigration detainers during the first six months following the effective date of this Chapter, and detailing the rationale behind each of those civil immigration detainers. Thereafter, the Sheriff and Juvenile Probation Officer shall each submit a written report to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, by January 1st and July 1st of each year, addressing the following issues for the time period covered by the report:

(a) a description of all communications received from the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law, including but not limited to the number of civil immigration detainers, notification requests, or other types of communications.

(b) a description of any communications the Department made to the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law, including but not limited to any Department's responses to inquiries as described in subsection 12I.5 and the Department's determination of the applicability of subsections 12I.3(b), 12I.3(d) and 12I.3(e).

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013 amended by O d [96-16](#), F e No 160022, App 6/17/2016, Eff 7/17/2016)

(Fo me Sec 12I 5 added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 304-92, App 9/29/92 O d 409-97, App 10/31/97 O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 epea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 12I.6. SEVERABILITY.

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Chapter 12I or it¹ application, is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Chapter 12I. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this Chapter 12I and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this Chapter 12I would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013)

(Fo me Sec 12I 6 added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 409-97, App 10/31/97 O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 epea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

CODIFICATION NOTE

1 So n O d [204-13](#)

SEC. 12I.7. UNDERTAKING FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE.

In enacting and implementing this Chapter 12I the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. It is not assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an obligation for breach of which it is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused injury.

(Added by O d [204-13](#), F e No 130764, App 10/8/2013, Eff 11/7/2013)

(Fo me Sec 12I 7 added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 epea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 12I.8.

(Added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 409-97, App 10/31/97 O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 epea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 12I.10.

(Added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 epea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

SEC. 12I.11.

(Added by O d 391-90, App 12/6/90 amended by O d 38-01, F e No 010010, App 3/16/2001 epea ed by O d 171-03, F e No 030422, App 7/3/2003)

CHAPTER 12J:

[REPEALED]



New Ordinance Notice

Publisher's Note: This Chapter has been **REPEALED** by new legislation (Ord. [192-25](#), approved 10/16/2025, effective 11/16/2025, oper. 1/1/2026). The text of the amendment will be incorporated under the new section number when the amending legislation is operative.

SEC. 12J.1. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; amended by Ord. 251-97, App. 6/27/97; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.2. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; amended by Ord. 251-97, App. 6/27/97; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.3. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; amended by Ord. 251-97, App. 6/27/97; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.4. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; amended by Ord. 251-97, App. 6/27/97; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.5. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.6. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.7. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; amended by Ord. 251-97, App. 6/27/97; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.8. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; amended by Ord. 251-97, App. 6/27/97; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.9. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 159-96, App. 4/24/96; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

SEC. 12J.10. [REPEALED.]

(Added by Ord. 287-00, File No. 001355, App. 12/22/2000; repealed by Ord. [192-25](#), File No. 250192, App. 10/16/2025, Eff. 11/16/2025, Oper. 1/1/2026)

CHAPTER 12K:

[REDESIGNATED]

Editor's Notes:

Chapter 12K ("Salary History") was redesignated as Labor and Employment Code Article 141 by Ord. [221-23](#), File No. 230835, approved November 3, 2023, effective December 4, 2023, and operative January 4, 2024.

Ord. [142-17](#), approved July 19, 2017, effective August 18, 2017, and becoming operative July 1, 2018, added provisions designated as a new Ch. 12K, Salary History, and redesignated former Ch. 12K, Local Implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), as Ch. 33A, which remains so.

SEC. 12K.1. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by Ord. [142-17](#), File No. 170350, App. 7/19/2017, Eff. 8/18/2017, Oper. 7/1/2018; redesignated as Labor and Employment Code Sec. 141.1 by Ord. [221-23](#), File No. 230835, App. 11/3/2023, Eff. 12/4/2023, Oper. 1/4/2024)

(Fo me Sec 12K 1 added by O d 128-98, App 4/13/98 amended by O d 325-00, F e No 001920, App 12/28/2000 edes gna ed as Sec 33A 1 by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018)

SEC. 12K.2. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 2 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

(Fo me Sec 12K 2 added by O d 325-00, F e No 001920, App 12/28/2000 edes gna ed as Sec 33A 2 by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018)

(Fo me Sec 12K 2 added by O d 128-98, App 4/13/98 enumbe ed as Sec 12K 3 by O d 325-00)

SEC. 12K.3. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 3 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

(Fo me Sec 12K 3 added as Sec 12K 2 by O d 128-98, App 4/13/98 enumbe ed and amended by O d 325-00, F e No 001920, App 12/28/2000 edes gna ed as Sec 33A 3 by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018)

SEC. 12K.4. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 4 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

(Fo me Sec 12K 4 added as Sec 12K 3 by O d 128-98, App 4/13/98 enumbe ed and amended by O d 325-00, F e No 001920, App 12/28/2000 edes gna ed as Sec 33A 4 by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018)

SEC. 12K.5. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 5 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

(Fo me Sec 12K 5 added as Sec 12K 4 by O d 128-98, App 4/13/98 enumbe ed and amended by O d 325-00, F e No 001920, App 12/28/2000 O d 16-03, F e No 021853, App 2/7/2003 edes gna ed as Sec 33A 5 by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018)

SEC. 12K.6. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 6 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

(Fo me Sec 12K 6 added as Sec 12K 5 by O d 128-98, App 4/13/98 enumbe ed by O d 325-00, F e No 001920, App 12/28/2000 edes gna ed as Sec 33A 6 by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018)

SEC. 12K.7. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 7 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

SEC. 12K.8. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 8 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

SEC. 12K.9. [REDESIGNATED.]

(Added by O d [142-17](#), F e No 170350, App 7/19/2017, Eff 8/18/2017, Ope 7/1/2018 edes gna ed as Labo and Emp oymen Code Sec 141 9 by O d [221-23](#), F e No 230835, App 11/3/2023, Eff 12/4/2023, Ope 1/4/2024)

CITY OF SANTA CLARA

ORDINANCE NO. ____

**AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA AS A SANCTUARY CITY
AND RESTRICTING THE USE OF CITY RESOURCES FOR FEDERAL CIVIL IMMIGRATION
ENFORCEMENT**

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

(a) The City of Santa Clara is a diverse and inclusive community, home to residents of varied racial, ethnic, cultural, and national backgrounds, including immigrants of all immigration statuses who are valued members of the community.

(b) The City's public safety, economic stability, and public health depend upon trust and cooperation between residents and City departments, including law enforcement and City service providers.

(c) Voluntary cooperation with federal civil immigration enforcement undermines community trust, discourages crime reporting and service access, and may lead to family separation and economic harm.

(d) Civil immigration enforcement is the responsibility of the federal government. The use of City resources for such purposes diverts limited local resources from core municipal functions.

(e) The purpose of this Ordinance is to ensure that City of Santa Clara resources are not used for federal civil immigration enforcement, except where required by law, and to protect the civil rights, safety, and dignity of all residents of the City of Santa Clara.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Chapter:

- "Immigration Authorities" means U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and any federal agency or contractor engaged in the enforcement of federal civil immigration laws.
- "Judicial Warrant" means a warrant issued by a neutral judge or magistrate, supported by probable cause, and meeting the requirements of California Government Code § 7284.4(i).

- “Immigration Enforcement” has the meaning set forth in California Government Code § 7284.4(f).
-

SECTION 3. GENERAL NON-COOPERATION POLICY

No City department, office, board, commission, officer, employee, agent, or contractor shall use City funds, property, facilities, equipment, databases, technology, personnel, or time to assist, cooperate with, or facilitate federal civil immigration enforcement, except as required by state or federal law.

SECTION 4. PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

Unless required by law or pursuant to a valid judicial warrant, City personnel shall not:

(A) Notification and Information Sharing

1. Share personal identifying information, including home or work address, contact information, or immigration status.
2. Grant access to non-public City databases or records.

(B) Access to City Facilities

1. Provide Immigration Authorities access to non-public areas of City property, including police facilities, holding rooms, offices, or interview spaces.
 2. Permit Immigration Authorities to interview individuals in City custody without a judicial warrant and the individual’s informed, written consent.
 3. Permit Immigration Authorities to use any City-owned properties, including parking lots, vacant lots, and garages for civil immigration enforcement staging areas, processing locations, or operation bases. This provision expressly applies to Levi’s Stadium.
-

SECTION 5. JUDICIAL WARRANT STANDARD

Any cooperation with Immigration Authorities that is otherwise prohibited by this Chapter shall occur only upon verification of a valid judicial warrant and only to the minimum extent necessary to comply with the warrant.

SECTION 6. CITY SERVICES AND COMMUNITY PROTECTIONS

(A) City services, benefits, programs, licenses, education, emergency services, housing assistance, and public health services shall be provided without regard to immigration status, except as required by law.

(B) City employees shall not inquire into or collect information regarding immigration status unless explicitly required by law.

SECTION 7. DATA, TECHNOLOGY, AND SURVEILLANCE LIMITATIONS

(A) City-owned or operated surveillance technologies, including automated license plate readers, facial recognition systems, and data analytics platforms, shall not be used for immigration enforcement purposes.

(B) Data collected by City departments shall not be shared with Immigration Authorities for immigration enforcement.

SECTION 8. TRAINING, NOTICE, AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

(A) The City Manager shall ensure annual training for all relevant City personnel on this Ordinance, the California Values Act, and constitutional rights of immigrants.

(B) The City shall publish multilingual public information materials describing residents' rights under this Ordinance.

(C) The City shall establish safe site protocols for all city owned and managed sites - including Levi's stadium - and train all city employees, contractors and vendors immediately and on an ongoing basis. These protocols may be based on the City of San Jose's model protocols and training.

SECTION 9. OVERSIGHT AND REPORTING

(A) Each City department shall designate a compliance officer responsible for ensuring adherence to this Chapter.

(B) The City Manager shall issue an annual public report detailing:

- **Requests received from Immigration Authorities;**
- **The City's response to each request;**

- The legal basis for any cooperation.
-

SECTION 10. ENFORCEMENT AND REMEDIES

(A) Violations of this Chapter may result in administrative discipline, contract termination, or other remedies authorized by law.

(B) Any person harmed by a violation of this Chapter may seek declaratory or injunctive relief and reasonable attorneys' fees.

SECTION 11. SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this Ordinance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining provisions.

SECTION 12. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Ordinance shall take effect ____ days following adoption.

WED 10:01

You must tell us what your plan is to protect the people of Santa Clara, the Superbowl in S the Levi Stadium workers from the murderous traitorous lawless ICE agents! I am 60 years old born and raised in Santa Clara . Graduate of Santa Clara High School class of 1983.

What is the city doing to protect its residents from ICE assault and racial profiling during the Super Bowl?

Stadium surrounded by ICE. Everyone must show papers. ICE at light rail stations. ICE on the bike paths. Papers please! Welcome to Trump's America. Red state conservatives want this in the blue states.

— · 🇺🇸 ·

👍 🔄

From: [Caroline O'Brien](#)
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Subject: Super Bowl 2026
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 2:23:00 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I just watched Batman's testimony at a recent council meeting, where he implored the city NOT to cooperate with ICE during the upcoming Super Bowl game.

So I decided to take a look at the demographics of Santa Clara, posted on your own website.

Seems like a city that has 2/3 non whites as citizens would be particularly reluctant to allow ICE agents into their community, given the level of terror and chaos ICE has inflicted in Minneapolis in recent weeks.

Do the right thing. BAN ICE from the Super Bowl.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
To: Super Bowl and ICE
Subject: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 1:15:37 PM
Date:

I have heard that ICE will be at the Super Bowl. This will endanger the on-site spectators and personnel in the parking areas and the stadium.

If allowed, this will probably impact ticket sales because of people fearing for their safety.

Furthermore incidents will be caught on camera for folks across the nation to see. The reputation of the event will be tarnished and you will be embroiled in debate.

If you can legally prohibit ICE from your property (including parking) please do so.

The Super Bowl is a National treasure emblematic of wholesome family entertainment. It is not an appropriate event for ICE.

I apologize for any typos including artificial intelligence dictation mistakes. Sent from my iPhone