

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 1807 (Gabriel and Carrillo and Carrillo)

As Amended August 19, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Prohibits the use of state-owned property for purposes of immigration enforcement.

Major Provisions

- 1) 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.
- 2) Excludes property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party from the bill's provisions *and exempts the use of state property by the Department of Transportation in compliance with state laws if the property meets specified criteria.*
- 3) 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.
- 4) 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.
- 5) Requires state agencies to make available educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.
- 6) Clarifies that the bill does not restrict or interfere with the execution of a lawful judicial warrant.
- 7) *Exempts the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitations from the bill's restrictions on the use of state property and other requirements.*

Senate Amendments

Exempt specified uses of state property by the Department of Transportation, exempt the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and make various technical and clarifying amendments.

COMMENTS

Since Donald Trump's 2024 campaign for president, he has made no bones about his and his administration's 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- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (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=4IyaMv4OpR2Vltis6BTY0JVIGOkyyqrW>.) 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 prohibits 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.

The bill exempts 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.

In order to aid in implementation of its provisions, this bill also requires 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 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 for the purposes of immigration enforcement as required by the bill's other provisions. Finally, the bill would require the Attorney General's office to develop a standardized sign for use by an individual seeking to lawfully restrict activities related to immigration enforcement.

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.

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: One in four 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 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (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*.

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

Arguments in Opposition

This bill is opposed by the SFV Alliance. They submit:

We 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 that enforcement.

The SFV Alliance is grateful for the enforcement efforts of ICE that have removed criminal aliens that have been convicted of heinous crimes. Making California a safer place. We have concerns with the downloadable signage that could be posted anywhere unlawfully because of it's accessibility. This could lead to intimidation of people that are supportive of the law enforcement actions to protect them from unauthorized aliens in the United States.

FISCAL COMMENTS

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 Department of Justice (DOJ) does not anticipate a significant fiscal impact.

VOTES:

ASM JUDICIARY: 9-3-0

YES: Kalra, Lee, Bryan, Connolly, Harabedian, Pacheco, Papan, Stefani, Zbur

NO: Macedo, Dixon, Sanchez

ASM GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION: 15-3-4

YES: Blanca Rubio, Berman, Bryan, Carrillo, Fong, Gabriel, Gipson, McKinnor, Nguyen, Pacheco, Ramos, Michelle Rodriguez, Solache, Soria, Valencia

NO: Dixon, Macedo, Ta

ABS, ABST OR NV: Davies, Alvarez, Gallagher, Wallis

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 11-3-1

YES: Wicks, Aguiar-Curry, Calderon, Caloza, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache

NO: Dixon, Ta, Tangipa

ABS, ABST OR NV: Hoover

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 58-15-7

YES: 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

NO: Castillo, Chen, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

ABS, ABST OR NV: Alanis, Davies, Flora, Hoover, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo, Wallis

UPDATED

VERSION: June 24, 2026

CONSULTANT: Manuela Boucher / JUD. / (916) 319-2334

FN: 0004077