

Date of Hearing: April 7, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Ash Kalra, Chair
AB 1807 (Gabriel) – As Amended March 16, 2026

As Proposed to be Amended

SUBJECT: IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT: USE OF STATE-OWNED PROPERTY

KEY ISSUE: SHOULD THE LEGISLATURE PROHIBIT STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES FROM PERMITTING STATE-OWNED PROPERTY TO BE USED FOR IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES?

SYNOPSIS

Since his inauguration in January of 2025, President Trump has made clear his intent to carry out a mass-deportation campaign across the country. Since June 2025, President Trump has ordered California's National Guard into Los Angeles triggering mass protests; engaged in widespread Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids throughout the state and particularly in Southern California; and carried out or planned targeted enforcement campaigns in cities like Chicago, Minneapolis, and Portland. It seems that throughout California, federal immigration enforcement agents have been using state-owned property to stage and carry out these raids. Continuing California's efforts to limit resource-sharing with federal immigration enforcement efforts, this bill proposes to prohibit state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes. The author is proposing two clarifying amendments, which are incorporated into the SUMMARY and discussed in the COMMENTS sections of this analysis.

This bill is sponsored by the California Immigrant Policy Center (CIPC). It enjoys broad support from immigrant rights advocates, legal aid and civil rights organizations, criminal justice reform advocates, and labor unions. There is no known opposition. Should this bill be approved by this Committee, it will be heard next by the Assembly Committee on Governmental Organization.

SUMMARY: Prohibits the use of state-owned property for purposes of immigration enforcement. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Makes the following findings and declarations on behalf of the Legislature:
 - a) During the summer 2025, the federal government engaged in large-scale civil immigration enforcement throughout the state. The use of state property for federal immigration enforcement purposes undermines public trust and confidence in state government;
 - b) The unauthorized use of state resources, property, or personnel to facilitate immigration enforcement actions interfered with the state's authority over, and its use of, its own resources, property, and personnel.
- 2) Defines the following for purposes of the bill:
 - a) "Immigration enforcement" means any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal civil immigration law, 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 person's presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in, the United States;

- b) "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 immigration enforcement operations;
 - c) "State-owned property" includes real property, buildings, structures, or grounds owned by the state or a state agency, including, but not limited to, a garage, parking lot, state park, and vacant lot.
- 3) Prohibits state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes. Prohibited uses include, but are not limited to, the following:
- a) Staging assembling, mobilizing, parking, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel for immigration enforcement purposes;
 - b) Processing, interviewing, temporarily detaining, monitoring and collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes.
- 4) Excludes property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party from the bill's provisions.
- 5) Requires the Department of General Services, in coordination with state agencies, to identify all state-owned property that has been used, or is likely to be used for immigration enforcement purposes, including, but not limited to, as a staging area, processing location, or operations base.
- 6) Requires state agencies to post clear signage stating the following: "This property is owned by the State of California. It may not be used for immigration enforcement purposes," for all properties identified as a state-owned property that has been or is likely to be used for immigration enforcement purposes.
- 7) Requires state agencies to ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers, including locked gates, are used to limit access to state-owned property for purposes of immigration enforcement as required by this bill.
- 8) Requires state agencies, on or before January 1, 2027, to develop procedures to require a state employee who becomes aware of an attempted or actual use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes to document the incident in writing, include any photographic or video evidence, and immediately report the incident to their supervisor. Requires the supervisor to immediately notify the Attorney General's office or the Attorney General's designee.
- 9) Requires the Attorney General's office to design standardized signage for use by an individual seeking to lawfully restrict activities related to immigration enforcement. Requires the Attorney General's office to make this signage available to download free of charge on its public internet website.

- 10) Requires state agencies to make available educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.
- 11) Clarifies that the bill does not restrict or interfere with the execution of a lawful judicial warrant.
- 12) Includes a severability clause.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Pursuant to the Tenth Amendment, limits the power of Congress to directly compel states to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program. (*New York v. United States* (1992) 505 U.S. 144, 161.)
- 2) Establishes the Immigration and Nationality Act which provides guidance and procedures relating to federal immigration law. (8 U.S.C. Section 1101 *et. seq.*)
- 3) Prohibits law enforcement agencies from using agency or department moneys or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified, place peace officers under the supervision of federal agencies, use immigration authorities as interpreters for law enforcement matters, transfer an individual to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant, and provide office space exclusively dedicated to immigration authorities, and from contracting with the federal government for the use of law enforcement agency facilities to house individuals as federal detainees for the purposes of civil immigration custody, as specified. (Government Code Section 7284.6.)
- 4) Prohibits a city, county, city and county, or local law enforcement agency that does not, as of June 15, 2017 have a contract with the federal government or any federal agency to detain adult noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration enforcement from entering into a new contract with the federal government or any federal agency, to house or detain in a locked detention facility owned and operated by a local entity, noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody. Prohibits a local government or law enforcement agency that, as of June 15, 2017, has an existing contract to detain adult noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody, from renewing or modifying that contract to expand the maximum number of contract beds that may be utilized to house or detain in a locked detention facility noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody. (Government Code Section 7310.)

FISCAL EFFECT: As currently in print this bill is keyed fiscal.

COMMENTS: Since Donald Trump's 2024 campaign for president, he has made no bones about his and his administrations intentions to effectuate a mass deportation campaign throughout the country. Since his inauguration in 2025, the administration's often-violent immigration enforcement tactics have shocked the country and the world. In June, 2025, the President nationalized the California National Guard amidst increased immigration raids and subsequent protests against the administration throughout the City of Los Angeles. Almost a year into President Trump's second term, millions of people watched video footage of a federal agent shooting and killing Renee Macklin Good during a targeted immigration enforcement campaign in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Days later, a Customs and Border Patrol Officer shot and killed Alex Pretti while Mr. Pretti was participating in an anti-ICE protest in Minneapolis. Immigration

enforcement surges similar to the one in Minnesota have also occurred or been threatened in Chicago, Portland, and Los Angeles. According to one report from National Public Radio, these campaigns have cost cities and localities billions of dollars. The Los Angeles Police Department reportedly spent around \$17 million dollars responding to the protests in June 2025. (Jaclyn Diaz, *ICE deployments created chaos for cities and cost them millions, NPR analysis finds* (NPR) March 24, 2026 available at: <https://www.npr.org/2026/03/24/nx-s1-5739701/ice-surge-trump-finance-cost-cities>.) In response to the administration's targeted immigration enforcement campaigns, a number of these local governments have enacted ordinances restricting the use of local or city government property for purposes of immigration enforcement actions. On October 6, 2025, Chicago enacted its "ICE Free Zone" executive order which banned the use of city property for immigration operations. (Mayor's Exec. Order No. 2025-8 (October 6, 2025) available at: <https://chicityclerk.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public-1/reports/EXECUTIVE%20ORDER%202025-8.pdf?VersionId=4IyaMv4OpR2Vltis6BTY0JVlGOkYqqrW>.) The Chicago ordinance was followed shortly by similar legislation in Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles County, to name just a few. (Mayor's Exec. Order No. 2025-02 (December 3, 2025) available at: <https://www.minneapolismn.gov/government/mayor/executive-orders/executive-order-2025-02/>, San Francisco Ordinance No. 27-26 (February 2, 2026) available at: <https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/o0027-26.pdf>, Los Angeles County Ordinance No. 2026-0007 (March 17, 2026) available at: https://library.municode.com/ca/los_angeles_county/ordinances/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=1414645.)

Carrying the torch of the cities and counties that have already enacted similar restrictions, *this bill* would prohibit state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes. The bill specifies that the prohibited uses of state property can include, but are not limited to, staging, parking, or deploying vehicles or personnel for immigration enforcement purposes; and interviewing, processing, temporarily detaining, monitoring and collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes. Notably, the bill includes an exception for circumstances involving a lawful judicial warrant. Put more succinctly, the bill would prohibit any use of any state-owned property by a federal agency in a way that facilitates the agency in carrying out an immigration enforcement action absent a valid judicial warrant.

AB 1807 would exempt any property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party. This exemption, while possibly impacting a significant number of properties, also avoids a potential constitutional Contracts Clause concern where a state-owned property is already being used by the federal government pursuant to a contract executed prior to this bill's enactment date.

According to the author:

California's state-owned properties are a public trust and must not be used in ways that harm the communities they are meant to serve. AB 1807 is a measured and necessary exercise of state authority, one that protects immigrant communities, pushes back against federal overreach, and defends the constitutional rights of all Californians. We remain committed to ensuring that state resources are used to support our residents, not to advance policies that undermine their safety and well-being.

In order to aid in implementation of its provisions, this bill would also require the Department of General Services working alongside other state agencies to identify all state-owned property that has been or may be used for immigration enforcement purposes and to post a notice at each such location stating that the property may not be used for immigration enforcement purposes. State agencies would also be required to ensure physical barriers “are used to limit access to state-owned property.” As currently drafted, this provision is potentially overbroad and would limit access to state-owned property by *anyone*. In order to ensure the public continues to have regular access to state property, the author proposes the following amendment:

7284.27 (a) The Department of General Services, in coordination with state agencies, shall identify all state-owned property that has been used, or is likely to be used, for immigration enforcement purposes, including, but not limited to, as a staging area, processing location, or operations base.

[...]

(c) State agencies shall ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers, including locked gates, are used to limit access to state-owned property **for purposes of immigration enforcement as required pursuant to Section 7284.26.**

Finally, the bill would require the Attorney General’s office to develop a standardized sign “for use by an individual seeking to restrict activities related to immigration enforcement.” As currently in print, the direction provided by this provision is potentially problematic. It is possible to interpret the language to require the AG to develop a sign for people seeking to go beyond what would be lawful refusal to cooperate with federal agents. In order to avoid such an interpretation, the author proposes the following amendment:

7284.28. (a) The Attorney General’s office shall design standardized signage for use by an individual seeking to **lawfully** restrict activities related to immigration enforcement. The Attorney General’s office shall make this signage available to download free of charge on its public internet website.

The precedent of SB 54. For at least the past decade, the California Legislature has taken steps to limit collaboration with immigration enforcement activity, most notably through passage of SB 54 (De Leon) Chap. 495, Stats. 2017. SB 54, commonly cited as the California Values Act, limited the use of state and local resources for the purposes of immigration enforcement. Shortly after SB 54 went into effect, the Trump administration challenged the new law. The administration argued that the statute’s prohibition on state and local law enforcement providing a person’s release date in response to a request from immigration authorities, providing personal information including an individual’s home or work address; and transferring an individual in custody to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant or probable cause determination violated the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. (*United States v. California* (2018) 314 F. Supp. 3d 1077, 1085.) The district court found that SB 54 was not preempted by federal law, and the Administration appealed that ruling. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit ruled against the Administration. The circuit court held that because federal immigration law is silent on the role of state or local governments in immigration enforcement, and SB 54 was focused on *state and local* agencies, the law was not preempted. In particular they stated “SB 54 does not directly conflict with any obligations that the INA or other federal statutes impose on state or local governments, because federal law does not actually mandate any state action[.]” (*United States v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865, 887.) The Administration appealed the Ninth Circuit

ruling, but the Supreme Court denied the request, leaving the decision untouched and the provisions of SB 54 valid and enforceable law in California.

In addition to restricting the types of information state and local law enforcement agencies may share with the federal government, the Values Act also prohibits California law enforcement agencies from providing office space to immigration authorities for use within a city or county law enforcement facility or contracting with the federal government to use California law enforcement agency facilities for purposes of immigration detention. (Government Code Section 7284.6 (a)(5) – (6).) Additionally, Government Code Section 7310, enacted via AB 103 (Committee on Public Safety) Chap. 17, Stats 2017, prohibits a local government or local law enforcement agency from contracting with the federal government for immigration detention services. Interestingly, none of these provisions were directly challenged in *United States v. California*, but present the existing statutory restrictions on collaboration with federal immigration agents and enforcement actions that are most analogous to the current measure.

In February 2026, New Jersey Governor Mikie Sherill signed an executive order similarly prohibiting the use of “nonpublic areas of State property for the purpose of facilitating federal enforcement of civil immigration law,” and, absent a valid judicial warrant, prohibiting federal agents and agencies from using New Jersey state property as a “staging area, processing location, or operations base for the purpose of facilitating federal enforcement of civil immigration law.” Governor’s Exec. Order No. 12 (February 11, 2026) available at: <https://nj.gov/infobank/eo/057sherrill/pdf/EO-12.pdf>.) The Trump administration almost immediately challenged the executive order in federal court, and the matter remains pending.

It is impossible for any committee analysis to predict how the courts may land on a question of constitutionality. How different legal challenges that arise from similar legislation across the country conclude may give us some indication of the fate of this new statute should it become law. The Ninth Circuit’s past reasoning on the constitutionality of the Values Act may also provide some indication as to the success of a challenge, particularly insofar as this measure likewise focuses on the actions of the state.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is sponsored by the California Immigrant Policy Center (CIPC). It enjoys broad support from immigrant rights advocates, legal aid organizations, civil rights organizations, criminal justice reform advocates, and labor unions. In support of the bill the sponsors submit:

California is home to the largest immigrant population in the United States: 1 in 4 Californians are immigrants, and nearly half of all children in the State live in immigrant families, making trust in our government at all levels essential to the safety of our diverse communities. However, Californians have witnessed a pattern of aggressive, militarized, and unlawful federal immigration enforcement actions, including indiscriminate arrests and mass raids conducted without judicial warrants and actions that have been challenged in courts.

Families in California are in fear of being arrested by ICE or federal agents as they go about their everyday lives at school, work, and in their communities while they access vital public services. ICE and federal agents have relied on using public property, such as parking lots, vacant land, and other spaces, as staging grounds for mass raids and arrests, **turning public spaces into sites of fear rather than safety.**

manner, community trust in public institutions erodes, and families and residents are deterred from accessing the essential services and resources that they need.

While California has taken significant steps to limit state participation in federal immigration enforcement, there are clear gaps that remain. Assembly Bill 1807 prohibits the use of State-owned properties and facilities from being used to stage, process, detain or otherwise support federal immigration enforcement activities without valid judicial warrants. AB 1807 makes it clear that the State has authority over its own property and a responsibility to protect California's resources from being used to support unlawful federal immigration enforcement.

For example, in June 2025, ICE, FBI, and federal agents used a California Highway Patrol parking lot in Downtown Los Angeles to stage immigration enforcement operations. Similarly, in December 2025, federal immigration agents utilized a parking lot on the campus of Santa Barbara City College to assemble and deploy personnel for immigration enforcement. These are among the many instances where federal immigration enforcement has leveraged California's public properties and resources to conduct indiscriminate raids and arrests without regard for public safety or constitutional rights. When the State allows its property to be used in this

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Immigrant Policy Center (sponsor)
Alameda County Office of Education
Alianza Sacramento
Alliance for a Better Community
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Prisoner Support Committee
Building Skills Partnership
Business for Good San Diego
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School Employees Association
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Canal Alliance
CAUSE
Center for Empowering Refugees and Immigrants
Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)
Change Begins With Me (INDIVISIBLE)
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
Community Works West
Courage California
Diversity in Health

Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
End Child Poverty CA
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glide Foundation
Harbor Institute for Immigrant and Economic Justice
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Immigrants Rising
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice
LA Defensa
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children / All of US or None
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE)
Majdal Arab Community Center of San Diego
New Light Wellness
Oakland Privacy
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Public Counsel
Rubicon Programs
Sacramento Immigration Coalition
Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network (SIREN)
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
South Asian Network
South Bay People Power
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
Thai Community Development Center
The Children's Partnership
The San Diego LGBT Community Center
Valor US
Viet Voices
Vision Y Compromiso
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
Women's Economic Ventures
Working Partnerships USA

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Manuela Boucher-de la Cadena / JUD. / (916) 319-2334