

Date of Hearing: May 13, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

AB 1807 (Gabriel) – As Amended April 9, 2026

Policy Committee:	Judiciary	Vote:	9 - 3
	Governmental Organization		15 - 3

Urgency: No State Mandated Local Program: No Reimbursable: No

SUMMARY:

This bill prohibits the use of state-owned property for federal immigration enforcement purposes, requires the Department of General Services and state agencies to identify and post signage at state-owned properties used or likely used for immigration enforcement, requires state agencies to develop incident-reporting procedures by January 1, 2027, and requires the Attorney General to design standardized signage for use by individuals seeking to lawfully restrict immigration enforcement activities.

Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Prohibits state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes, including staging, mobilizing, parking, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel for immigration enforcement; and processing, interviewing, temporarily detaining, monitoring, collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes.
- 2) Defines “state-owned property” as real property, buildings, structures, or grounds owned by the state or a state agency, including parking lots, garages, state parks, and vacant lots, and excludes property subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party.
- 3) Requires the Department of General Services (DGS), in coordination with state agencies, to identify all state-owned property that has been used, or is likely to be used, for immigration enforcement.
- 4) Requires state agencies to post identifying signage at properties identified by DGS, install physical barriers (such as locked gates) where appropriate, and develop procedures by January 1, 2027 requiring state employees who become aware of attempted or actual use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement to document the incident, report it to a supervisor, and notify the Attorney General.
- 5) Requires the Attorney General to design standardized signage for individuals seeking to lawfully restrict immigration enforcement activities and make the signage available for free download on a public website.
- 6) Requires state agencies to make available educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.

- 7) Provides that the bill does not restrict or interfere with the execution of a lawful judicial warrant, and includes a severability clause.

FISCAL EFFECT:

- 1) The bill requires the Department of General Services (DGS) to identify state-owned property previously or likely to be used for immigration enforcement purposes and to use physical barriers limiting access, as provided. DGS estimates approximately \$5,000 to \$57,000 in one-time costs for signage, plus \$37,500 in one-time costs and up to \$4.5 million in ongoing costs for physical barriers, depending on scope (General Fund). The low end assumes signage and swing-arm-style barrier gates at the state's five unsecured parking lots only; the high end assumes signage (four signs per building to cover multiple entry points) and temporary construction fencing rentals to secure each state building site.
- 2) Workload costs (General Fund, special funds) of an unknown amount to state agencies to develop and implement employee documentation and incident-reporting procedures by January 1, 2027, and develop and distribute educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.
- 3) Costs (General Fund) to the Department of Justice (DOJ) to design standardized signage and to make the signage available to download free of charge on the Attorney General's internet website. DOJ reports no significant impact to implement this bill, but notes that as numerous bills this session may result in no significant impact to the DOJ, should an aggregate of these bills become law, the DOJ would request additional resources to process the increase to the DOJ workload.

The Legislative Analyst's Office recently warned of General Fund structural deficits of around \$35 billion per year beginning in the 2027-28 fiscal year.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Purpose.** 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.

- 2) **Background.** California has progressively limited state and local cooperation with federal immigration enforcement over the past decade. Most prominently, SB 54 (de León), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017 (known as the California Values Act) restricted use of state and local resources for immigration enforcement purposes, and AB 103 (Committee on Public Safety), Chapter 17, Statutes 2017, prohibited local governments from contracting with the federal government for immigration detention services. The California Values Act was challenged on Supremacy Clause grounds shortly after enactment; in *United States v. California* (2019), 921 F.3d 865, the Ninth Circuit upheld the law, holding that "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.” The U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari, leaving the Ninth Circuit's decision as governing precedent.

This bill builds on that framework by prohibiting the use of state-owned property — including parking lots, garages, state parks, and vacant lots — for immigration enforcement purposes, subject to an exception for existing leases (preserving any contracted federal use predating the bill) and an exception for the execution of lawful judicial warrants. The Judiciary committee analysis identifies the bill’s structural similarity to the California Values Act framework and notes that the Ninth Circuit’s reasoning in *United States v. California* — that federal immigration law is silent on the role of state and local governments and that California has the right to refrain from assisting with federal efforts — provides a meaningful indication of how a constitutional challenge to AB 1807 might be analyzed. The Judiciary analysis also notes that similar prohibitions have been enacted in numerous other jurisdictions. To the extent the bill is challenged in court, any defense costs would be borne by the Department of Justice.

Analysis Prepared by: Shiran Zohar / APPR. / (916) 319-2081