

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1807
Author: Gabriel (D) and Carrillo (D), et al.
Amended: 6/24/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 10-3, 6/23/26
AYES: Rubio, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Hurtado, Padilla,
Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NOES: Valladares, Dahle, Ochoa Bogh
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Richardson

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-2, 6/30/26
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern, Wahab,
Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello, Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 58-15, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Immigration enforcement: use of state-owned property

SOURCE: California Immigrant Policy Center

DIGEST: This bill prohibits the use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement, requires the Department of General Services (DGS) to identify and post signage on properties with prior or anticipated enforcement use, and requires state agencies to establish policies to ensure the formal documentation of any attempted or actual immigration enforcement activities on state-owned property.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Limits, pursuant to the Tenth Amendment, the power of Congress to directly compel states to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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 the purposes of civil immigration custody.

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits state-owned properties from being used for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified.
- 2) Provides that this bill does not apply to, or interfere with, property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party.
- 3) Specifies that this bill does not apply to uses of state property by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to implement and maintain procedures in compliance with the Penal Code.
- 4) Requires 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 purposes, including, but not limited to, as a staging area, processing location, or operations base.
- 5) Requires state agencies, for properties identified pursuant to the above provision, 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."

- 6) Requires state agencies to ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers, including locked gates, are used to limit access to state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified.
- 7) Requires state agencies, on or before January 1, 2027, to develop procedures to ensure that an attempted or actual use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes documented in writing that the documentation includes any photographic or video evidence, and that the Attorney General's (AG) office or the AG's designee is notified.
- 8) Requires the AG's office to design standardized signage for use by an individual seeking to lawfully restrict activities related to immigration enforcement.
- 9) Requires the AG'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) Specifies that this bill does not restrict or interfere with the execution of a lawful judicial warrant.
- 12) Includes various relevant definitions, as specified; and includes related legislative findings and declarations.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "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."

A New Kind of Immigration Enforcement. Since his 2024 campaign, President Donald Trump has repeatedly stated his intention to pursue large-scale immigration enforcement actions and deportations. Following his inauguration in

2025, the federal administration expanded immigration enforcement operations throughout the country, including in California. These efforts have included large-scale immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) operations in Southern California and other regions of the state, as well as deployments of federal personnel in major metropolitan areas across the country. Reports indicate that federal immigration authorities have, in some instances, utilized state-owned property as staging areas or operational locations in support of immigration enforcement activities.

Consistent with California's longstanding policy of limiting the use of state resources to support federal immigration enforcement, this bill prohibits the use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes. Specifically, this bill prohibits state-owned property from being used for staging, assembling, mobilizing, parking, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel for immigration enforcement purposes *and* processing, interviewing, temporarily detaining, monitoring and collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes. This bill includes an exception for the execution of a lawful judicial warrant and exempts property that is already subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party.

Additionally, this bill requires DGS, in coordination with state agencies, to identify state-owned properties that have been used, or are likely to be used, for immigration enforcement purposes. State agencies would be required to post signage notifying the public that the property may not be used for immigration enforcement activities, implement physical barriers where appropriate, and establish procedures for reporting attempted or actual uses of state property for immigration enforcement purposes to the AG's office.

Existing Restrictions on State Cooperation with Federal Immigration Enforcement. For more than a decade, California has enacted a series of measures limiting the extent to which state and local resources may be used to assist federal immigration enforcement activities. The most notable of these measures is SB 54 (DeLeón, Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017), commonly known as the California Values Act. SB 54 generally restricts state and local law enforcement agencies from using their resources to investigate, detain, detect, report, or arrest individuals for immigration enforcement purposes and limits the sharing of certain information with federal immigration authorities.

Shortly after SB 54 took effect, the federal government challenged several of its provisions in *United States v. California* (2018) 314 F. Supp.3d 1077. Among

other arguments, the federal government contended that restrictions on information sharing, transfer of individuals to immigration authorities, and cooperation with immigration enforcement efforts were preempted by federal law under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution. The district court rejected those arguments, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals subsequently affirmed the decision. In upholding the law, the Ninth Circuit concluded that federal immigration law does not require state or local governments to participate in immigration enforcement activities and therefore California's decision to limit the use of its own resources for purposes was not preempted by federal law. The United States Supreme Court later declined to review the case, leaving the Ninth Circuit's decision in place.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 1171 (Caballero, 2026) prohibits the awarding of a grant or loan that uses state funds to a private entity that contracts with ICE, as specified. (Pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee)

SB 54 (DeLeón, Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017) limits the involvement of state and local enforcement agencies in federal immigration services. Specifically, the bill prohibits law enforcement agencies (including school police and security departments) from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest people for immigration enforcement purposes.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: No

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, DGS estimates one-time costs ranging from \$5,000 to \$57,000 for signage, and ongoing costs ranging from \$37,500 to \$4.5 million for physical barriers (General Fund and special funds). The lower-end estimate assumes signage and swing-arm style barrier gates for the state's five unsecured parking lots, while the high-end estimate assumes signage and temporary construction fencing rentals at all state buildings.

Unknown costs for state agencies to develop and implement employee documentation, incident-reporting procedures, and educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff when federal agents enter state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes. Costs per agency will depend on their level of intersection with federal immigration enforcement actions and whether they have existing procedures that meet the bill's mandates.

The DOJ does not anticipate a significant fiscal impact.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/13/26)

California Immigrant Policy Center (source)
AAPOIS for Civic Empowerment
Acacia Center for Justice
Alameda County Office of Education
Alianza Sacramento
Alliance for a Better Community
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Law Alliance
Asian Prisoner Support Committee
Bend the Arc: Jewish Action California
Buen Vecino
Building Skills Partnership
Business for Good San Diego
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Community Foundation
California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Lulac State Organization
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School Employees Association
California United for a Responsible Budget
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Canal Alliance
CAUSE
Center for Empowering Refugees and Immigrants
Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law
Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)
Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy
Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative
Change Begins With Me (INDIVISIBLE)
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Chispa
Coastside United Indivisible
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
Community Works West
Contra Costa Young Democrats

Courage California
Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley
Diversity in Health
East Valley Indivisibles
Education and Leadership Foundation
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Emeryville; City of
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities (EMAC)
End Child Poverty CA
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glide Foundation
Harbor Institute for Immigrant and Economic Justice
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Immigrants Rising
Inclusive Action for the City
Indivisible CA Statestrong
Indivisible Hollister
Indivisible Marin
Indivisible Mid-peninsula
Indivisible Santa Barbara
Indivisible Tri-valley
Indivisible West Marin
Indivisible Westside Los Angeles
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice
Inland Empire Immigrant Youth Collective
Justice2jobs Coalition
Khmer Girls in Action
LA Defensa
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE)
Madera Coalition for Community Justice
Majdal Arab Community Center of San Diego
National Union of Healthcare Workers (NUHW)
New Light Wellness
Nextgen California
Oakland Privacy
Oakland; City of
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Orange County Justice Fund
Orange County Rapid Response Network

Public Counsel
Rubicon Programs
Sacramento County Young Democrats
Sacramento Immigration Coalition
Sacramento Mayor Kevin Mccarty
San Bernardino Community Service Center, INC
Secure Justice
Seiu California
Service Employees International Union, Local 1000
Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network (SIREN)
Siren: Services Immigrant Rights and Education Network
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Soledad; City of
South Asian Network
South Bay People Power
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
Survivor Justice Center
Thai Community Development Center
The Black Alliance for Just Immigration
The Children's Partnership
The San Diego Lgbt Community Center
The Translatin@ Coalition
United Domestic Workers/afscme Local 3930
Valorus
Venice Resistance
Vision Y Compromiso
Western Center on Law & Poverty
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
Women's Economic Ventures
Working Partnerships USA

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/13/26)

SFV Alliance

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: In support of the bill, the California Immigrant Policy Center, in coordination with 50 other organizations, write in part that, “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.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: In opposition to the bill, SFV Alliance writes, “[w]e would like to see the legislators stop trying to hinder the enforcement of federal immigration law in California. We would appreciate cooperation and assistance with the enforcement codes created by our legislators representing us in Washington D.C. This includes the continuous usage of state property to facilitate enforcement.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 58-15, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Castillo, Chen, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Davies, Flora, Hoover, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo, Wallis

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
8/14/26 13:21:39

**** **END** ****