

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Jesse Arreguín, Chair  
2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** SB 1257                      **Hearing Date:** March 24, 2026  
**Author:** Arreguín  
**Version:** February 19, 2026  
**Urgency:** No                                      **Fiscal:** Yes  
**Consultant:** ML

**Subject:** *Federal immigration enforcement: report*

## HISTORY

**Source:** Latino Coalition for a Healthy California

**Prior Legislation:** SB 81 (Arreguín), Ch. 123, Stats. of 2025  
AB 49 (Muratsuchi), Ch. 122, Stats. of 2025  
SB 98 (Pérez), Ch. 124, Stats. of 2025  
SB 54 (De León), Ch. 495, Stats. of 2017

**Support:** ACLU California Action; Asian Americans for Community Involvement; Asociacion de Migrantes Guatemaltecos Los Angeles; California Consortium for Urban Indian Health; California Coverage Health Initiatives; California Immigrant Policy Center; California Pan-Ethnic Health Network; California Physicians Alliance; California Public Defenders Association; Central American Resource Center of California; Coalition of Orange County Community Health Centers; Courage California; Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities; Farm2People; Friends Committee on Legislation of California; Healthy Contra Costa; Immigrant Defenders Law Center; JWCH Institute Inc.; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; The Black Alliance for Just Immigration; The Children's Partnership; TODEC Legal Center; Transitions Clinic Network; UnidosUS; Vision y Compromiso; Western Center on Law & Poverty

**Opposition:** None known

## PURPOSE

***The purpose of this bill is to require the Attorney General (AG) to publish a report annually summarizing all immigration incidents and activities conducted by any persons at designated safe locations and to permit the AG to engage in enforcement actions to enforce state law, including the provisions of this bill, at these designated safe locations.***

*Existing law*, the California Values Act, requires the AG, in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law at public schools, public libraries, health facilities operated by the state or a political subdivision of the state, courthouses, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement facilities, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers' Compensation, and shelters, and ensuring that they remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. (Gov. Code, § 7284.8, subd. (a).)

*Existing law* defines “immigration enforcement” to mean 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. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24253; Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (1)(i); Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (c)(1).)

*Existing law* prohibits a health care provider entity and its personnel, unless required by state and federal law, from allowing any person access to the nonpublic areas of the facility for immigration enforcement purposes, unless that person has a valid judicial warrant or court order specifically grants access to the nonpublic areas of the facility. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24251, subd. (b).)

*Existing law* provides an exception to the above prohibitions for agents accompanying people in lawful custody to access health care services and for their transportation and arrangement to health care provider entities. Does not prohibit any person from entering nonpublic areas of a hospital to receive care for themselves or someone in their care or custody. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24254.)

*Existing law* requires health care provider entities to inform staff and relevant volunteers on how to respond to requests relating to immigration enforcement that grants access to its sites or to patients. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24251, subd. (d).)

*Existing law* requires a health care provider entity, to the extent possible, to establish or amend procedures for monitoring, documenting, and receiving visitors to be consistent with the provisions of this bill. Encourages health care provider entities to post a “notice to authorities” at facility entrances. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24250)

*Existing law* requires health care provider entity personnel to immediately notify their management, administration, or legal counsel of any request for access to a health care provider site or patient for immigration enforcement. Requires provider personnel to immediately provide any requests for review of their documents, including through a lawfully issued subpoena, warrant, or court order, to health care provider entity management, administration, or legal counsel. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24250, subd. (b)(1).)

*Existing law* requires health care provider entity personnel, if a request is made to access its site or patient, including to obtain information about a patient or their family for immigration enforcement, to direct such request to the designated management, administrator, or legal counsel. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24250, subd. (b)(2).)

*Existing law* applies the above provisions to all health care provider entities that receive public funding. Encourages healthcare facilities that are not covered by this requirement to adopt the provisions of this bill. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24255.)

*Existing law* defines “health care provider entity” to include:

1. Public hospitals, defined as a hospital that is licensed to a county, a city, the State of California, the University of California, a local health care district, a local health authority, or any other political subdivision of the state;

2. Nonpublic hospital, defined as a hospital that does not meet the definition of a public hospital, and is licensed as a general acute care hospitals;
3. Clinics, as defined, including clinics exempt from licensure, as specified;
4. A physician organization, as defined;
5. Providers, as defined in the California Health Care Quality and Affordability Act, which includes physician organizations and various health care settings;
6. Integrated health care delivery systems; and,
7. Other providers that deliver or furnish services related to physical or mental health and wellness, education, or access to justice. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24252.).

*Existing law* prohibits, except as required by state or federal law, or as required to administer a state or federally supported educational program, school officials and employees of a local educational agency from allowing an officer or employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement to enter a nonpublic area of a schoolsite for any purpose without being presented with a valid judicial warrant or judicial subpoena, or a court order. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (a)(2).)

*Existing law* prohibits a local educational agency and its personnel, to the extent practicable, from disclosing or providing in writing, verbally, or in any other manner, the education records of or any information about a pupil or a pupil's family and household without the pupil's parents' or guardians' written consent, a school employee, or a teacher, to an officer or employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement absent a valid judicial warrant or judicial subpoena, or court order directing the local educational agency or its personnel to do so. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (a)(2).)

*Existing law* requires the superintendent of a school district, the superintendent of a county office of education, and the principal of a charter school, as applicable, to report to the respective governing board or body of the local educational agency in a timely manner any requests for information or access to a schoolsite by an officer or employee of a law enforcement agency for the purpose of enforcing the immigration laws. Requires such reporting be done in a manner that ensures the confidentiality and privacy of any potentially identifying information. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (c).)

*Existing law* requires that the AG, in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law, and ensuring that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. Requires the AG to, at a minimum, consider all of the following issues when developing the model policies:

1. Procedures related to requests for access to school grounds for purposes related to immigration enforcement.
2. Procedures for local educational agency employees to notify the superintendent of the school district or their designee, the superintendent of the county office of education or their designee, or the principal of the charter school or their designee, as applicable, if an individual requests or gains access to school grounds for purposes related to immigration enforcement.
3. Procedures for responding to requests for personal information about pupils or their family members for purposes of immigration enforcement. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (g)(1).)

*Existing law* requires that the AG, no later than December 1, 2025, update the model policies described above to ensure that these policies align with the prohibitions applicable to school officials and employees of local educational agencies related to immigration enforcement, and the requirements for local educational agencies related to immigration enforcement. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (g)(1).)

*Existing law* requires that local educational agencies adopt the model policies described above by July 1, 2018, and shall update those policies to reflect current law by March 1, 2026. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (h).)

*Existing law* provides that local educational agencies may be subject to monitoring and auditing by the Education Department to ensure compliance with these requirements. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (k).)

*Existing law* provides that it does not prohibit or restrict any governmental entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, federal immigration authorities, information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of an individual, or from requesting from federal immigration authorities immigration status information, lawful or unlawful, of any individual, or maintaining or exchanging that information with any other federal, state, or local governmental entity, if required by certain federal laws. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (i).)

*Existing law* requires that all California K-12 public schools develop a comprehensive school safety plan. Sets forth requirements for that plan. (Ed. Code, §§ 32280, 32282.)

*Existing law* requires that when a comprehensive school safety plan is next reviewed on or before March 1, 2026 through January 1, 2031, it includes procedures to notify parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel when the school confirms the presence of immigration enforcement on the schoolsite. (Ed. Code, § 32282, subd. (2)(N)(i).)

*Existing law* sets forth actions the Trustees of the California State University, the governing board of each community college district in the state, and independent institutions of higher education that are qualifying institutions, as specified, must perform in relation to immigration enforcement on their campuses. Requests, but does not require, that the Regents of the University of California perform those same actions. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a).)

*Existing law* prohibits these institutions from disclosing personal information about students, faculty, and staff except: (A) with the consent of the person identified, or if the person is under 18 years of age, with the consent of the parent or guardian of the person identified; (B) as may legally be disclosed under state and federal privacy laws; (C) for the programmatic purpose for which the information was obtained; (D) as part of a directory that does not include residence addresses or individual persons' course schedules and that the person has not elected to opt out of; or (E) in response to a judicial warrant, court order, or subpoena. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(1).)

*Existing law* requires that these institutions comply with a request from an immigration officer for access to nonpublic areas of the campus only upon presentation of a judicial warrant, but specifies that this requirement does not apply to an immigration officer's request for access or information related to the operation of international student, staff, or faculty programs, employment verification efforts, or other nonenforcement activities. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(4).)

*Existing law* requires these institutions to advise all students, faculty, and staff to notify the office of the chancellor or president, or their designee, as soon as possible, if they are advised that an immigration officer is expected to enter, will enter, or has entered the campus to execute a federal immigration order. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(2).)

*Existing law* requires that these institutions must advise all students, faculty, and staff responding to or having contact with an immigration officer executing a federal immigration order, to refer the entity or individual to the office of the chancellor or president, or their designee, for purposes of verifying the legality of any warrant, court order, or subpoena. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(5).)

*Existing law* requires these institutions to designate a staff person to serve as a point of contact for any student, faculty, or staff person who may or could be subject to an immigration order or inquiry on campus. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(6).)

*Existing law* requires these institutions to adopt and implement the model policy developed by the AG or an equivalent policy pursuant to the California Values Act, limiting assistance with immigration enforcement to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(8).)

*Existing law* requires each of these institutions to post on its internet website in a conspicuous location, and provide via email quarterly or each semester to all students, faculty, and staff: (i) a copy of the policy adopted and (ii) guidance informing them of their rights under state and federal immigration laws and how to respond to a federal immigration action or order. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(9).)

*Existing law* requires these institutions to notify all students, faculty, staff, and other campus community members who work on campus when the presence of immigration enforcement is confirmed on campus, to the fullest extent consistent with state and federal law. Requires that notice must provide: the date and time the immigration enforcement was confirmed, the location of the confirmed immigration enforcement, and a hyperlink to additional resources. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (b)(1).)

*This bill* requires that on or before October 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, the AG shall submit to the Legislature, and post on its internet website, a report that includes all of the following:

1. A summary of all immigration incidents and activities conducted by any person at designated safe locations that have reported immigration incidents and activities either onsite or to the AG, including, but not limited to, reports submitted through the AG's federal agent misconduct online portal.
2. Information of each immigration incident and activity, including, but not limited to, the date of occurrence, the county of occurrence, the type of facility or location impacted, the government agency involved, and followup or resolution status.
3. The number of immigration incidents and activities that resulted in legal action and the counties involved in the legal action. (Gov. Code, § 7284.9, subd. (a).)

*This bill* defines “designated safe locations” to mean educational institutions, health care providers, shelters, polling places, courthouses, public transportation property, state and local government property, and areas where the public may be exercising their rights protected under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

*This bill* provides that the AG may request representatives of the designated safe locations to furnish any reported immigration incidents and activities as part of compiling its annual report. Authorizes the AG to issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this section.

*This bill* provides that as part of compiling this report, the AG may consider whether the designated safe location is in compliance with other state law, and may take enforcement action, as needed.

*This bill* requires that the report comply with Section 9795 of the Government Code, governing the delivery and format of government reports.

## COMMENTS

### 1. Need For This Bill

According to the author:

California is recognized for its commitment to human rights and is home to nearly 11 million immigrants. However, the state has seen a marked rise in unjust immigration enforcement. Between January and October 2025, ICE made over 18,000 arrests in California.

Recently, ICE actions have impacted communities nationwide, regardless of legal status, and in some cases, resulted in the loss of U.S. citizens' lives. Many California immigrant communities now fear for their safety when leaving their homes.

This increase in fear leads to skipped medical appointments, school absences, and avoiding public areas, resulting in a low quality of life. This is why accountability and transparency is needed regarding ICE activity in and across our state. This bill ensures that designated health locations entities are reporting ICE activity, and that Californians are aware of actions taken to hold entities accountable.

### 2. Immigration Enforcement at Safe Locations in California

During his second term, President Trump has implemented an array of immigration policy changes focused on restricting immigration and increasing immigration enforcement. These policy changes include restrictions on both lawful and unlawful immigration into the U.S., increased interior enforcement activities to support mass deportation, attempts to end birthright citizenship for the children of noncitizen immigrants, and rescinding protections against enforcement action in previously protected areas such as schools, churches, and health care

facilities.<sup>1</sup> U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement deported at least 8,250 people from California during the first nine months of 2025, with removals surging as the year went on.<sup>2</sup>

Restrictive and harsh immigration policies have been shown to produce a chilling effect throughout immigrant communities, wherein immigrant families avoid interacting with public services and institutions for fear of being exposed to deportation threats.<sup>3</sup> Since President Trump's reelection, federal immigration agents have been documented in California camping out in the lobby of a Southern California hospital, at community clinics, and at mobile clinics.<sup>4</sup> According to the University of California, San Francisco, visits to mobile clinics designed to serve hard-to-reach undocumented immigrant communities dropped by around 36% as enforcement activity increased in California.<sup>5</sup> In 2024, the mobile clinics saw on average 34 patients per outing; in late 2025, the number of patients dropped to around 22 patients per outing.<sup>6</sup> A 2024 Urban Institute survey found that 16 percent of California immigrants were worried about attending a doctor's office or clinic because they did not want to draw attention to their immigration status.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, one in six adults in immigrant families with children were worried about taking their children to school or daycare.<sup>8</sup>

### 3. Prior Legislation

In 2017, the legislature passed the California Values Act, which required the AG to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law at public schools, public libraries, health facilities operated by the state or a political subdivision of the state, courthouses, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement facilities, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers' Compensation, and shelters, and ensuring that they remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status.<sup>9</sup> These model policies are available on the Department of Justice website.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Pillai et al., *Living in an Undocumented Immigrant Family Under the Second Trump Administration: Fear, Uncertainty, and Impacts on Health and Well-Being*, Kaiser Family Foundation (May 8, 2025) <<https://www.kff.org/racial-equity-and-health-policy/living-in-an-undocumented-immigrant-family-under-the-second-trump-administration-fear-uncertainty-and-impacts-on-health-and-well-being/>> [hereafter Kaiser Family Foundation Report].

<sup>2</sup> Mathew Miranda, *ICE Deportation in California surged in the thousands as 2025 went on*, Sacramento Bee (Jan. 12, 2026) <<https://www.sacbee.com/news/california/article314213552.html>>.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*; Kaiser Family Foundation Report, *supra*; Larry Valenzuela, *'They still need care': Why California migrant workers are avoiding medical clinics*, CalMatters (Dec. 1, 2025) <<https://calmatters.org/economy/2025/12/immigrant-farmworker-medical-clinic>> [hereafter CalMatters Article].

<sup>4</sup> Claudia Boyd-Barrett, *Immigration agents are raiding California hospitals and clinics. Can a new state law prevent that?*, Los Angeles Times (Oct. 29, 2025) <Immigration agents are raiding California hospitals and clinics. Can a new state law prevent that? - Los Angeles Times>.

<sup>5</sup> CalMatters Article, *supra*.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Dulce Gonzalez & Hamutal Bernstein, *Escalating Immigration Policies Threaten California Immigrant Families*, Urban Institute, (May 29, 2025) <<https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/escalating-immigration-policies-threaten-california-immigrant-families>>.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Gov. Code, § 7284.8, subd. (a).

<sup>10</sup> Available at <<https://oag.ca.gov/publications#immigration>>.

In 2025, in response to President Trump’s immigration policies, California legislators passed three pieces of legislation to prohibit employees at certain institutions—such as health care providers that receive state funding, state public schools, state community colleges, certain state universities, and other state facilities—from allowing immigration enforcement personnel into nonpublic areas without a lawfully issued judicial warrant or court order. These bills all defined “immigration enforcement” to include 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.<sup>11</sup>

SB 81 (Arreguín) prohibited health care providers receiving state funding from allowing immigration enforcement agents into nonpublic areas.<sup>12</sup> The bill also required providers to develop and publicly post policies for employees to follow in the circumstance a federal immigration enforcement agent requests access to nonpublic facilities or information. Such requests by an immigration enforcement agent for access or information were required to be immediately forwarded to the health care provider’s management, administration, or legal counsel.<sup>13</sup> The bill clarified that it did not prohibit immigration enforcement agents from entering health care facilities to accompany people in their lawful custody receiving care, or from seeking care for themselves.<sup>14</sup>

AB 49 (Muratsuchi) prohibited employees of any local educational agency from allowing any employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement to enter a nonpublic area of a schoolsite without a valid judicial warrant, judicial subpoena, or court order.<sup>15</sup> The bill further required school administrators to report to their respective governing boards any requests for information or access to a schoolsite by a law enforcement employee for the purpose of enforcing immigration laws.<sup>16</sup> Additionally, the bill required the AG to update its model policies to reflect current law and required local educational agencies to adopt the model policies by March 1, 2026.

SB 98 (Pérez) required school safety plans, which were already required by state law, to include procedures to notify parents and guardians, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel when the school confirms the presence of immigration enforcement on the schoolsite.<sup>17</sup>

SB 98 also set forth policies that the Trustees of the California State University, the governing board of each community college district in the state, and independent institutions of higher education that qualify for the Cal Grant Program, must follow related to immigration enforcement.<sup>18</sup> In particular, the bill prohibited these institutions from complying with a request by an immigration enforcement officer to access nonpublic areas, unless they presented a judicial warrant.<sup>19</sup> Additionally, the bill prohibited these institutions from disclosing personal

---

<sup>11</sup> Health & Saf. Code, § 24253; Ed. Code, § 234.7 (l)(i); Ed. Code, § 66093.3 (c)(1).

<sup>12</sup> Health & Saf. Code, § 24251, subd. (b).

<sup>13</sup> Health & Saf. Code, § 24250, subd. (b)(2).

<sup>14</sup> Health & Saf. Code, § 24254.

<sup>15</sup> Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (a)(2).

<sup>16</sup> Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (c).

<sup>17</sup> Ed. Code, § 32282, subd. (N)(i).

<sup>18</sup> Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a).

<sup>19</sup> Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(4).

information about students, faculty, and staff, unless certain exceptions are met, such as in response to a judicial warrant, court order, or subpoena.<sup>20</sup> These institutions were also required to instruct all students, faculty, and staff to refer immigration officers executing a federal immigration order to the office of the chancellor or president, or their designee.<sup>21</sup> Finally, these institutions were required to adopt and post publicly the model policies developed by the AG under the California Values Act or an equivalent policy.<sup>22</sup>

#### 4. Reporting of Immigration Enforcement Incidents at Safe Locations

Presently, there is no law that requires health care providers, schools, colleges, universities, or other public institutions to publicly report data concerning immigration enforcement incidents.

This bill attempts to remedy this issue by requiring the AG to publish a report annually summarizing all immigration incidents and activities conducted by any persons at designated safe locations and to permit the AG to enforce state law, such as those listed above, at these designated locations. Specifically, the bill provides that by October 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, the AG is required to submit to the Legislature, and post on its internet website, a report that includes all of the following:

1. A summary of all immigration incidents and activities conducted by any person at designated safe locations that have reported immigration incidents and activities either onsite or to the AG, including, but not limited to, reports submitted through the AG's federal agent misconduct online portal.
2. Information of each immigration incident and activity, including, but not limited to, the date of occurrence, the county of occurrence, the type of facility or location impacted, the government agency involved, and followup or resolution status.
3. The number of immigration incidents and activities that resulted in legal action and the counties involved in the legal action.

Notably, the term "immigration incident," as written, could be interpreted broadly to mean any incident related to immigration, such as someone applying for a work visa or for asylum. If the legislation is intended to capture only incidents related to federal immigration enforcement, the author may consider using the term "immigration enforcement incident." SB 81 uses the term "immigration enforcement" throughout.

This bill further defines "designated safe locations" to mean educational institutions, health care providers, shelters, polling places, courthouses, public transportation property, state and local government property, and areas where the public may be exercising their rights protected under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. As written, "health care providers" is not defined, and the author may consider using a cross reference to the codified by SB 81. Additionally, "areas where the public may be exercising their rights protected under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution" could include public streets or even private homes. It may not be feasible for the AG to track and report such information.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(1).

<sup>21</sup> Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(5).

<sup>22</sup> Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subd. (a)(8).

The bill further provides that the AG may request representatives of the designated safe locations to furnish any reported immigration incidents and activities as part of compiling its annual report. The AG may issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this section. As part of compiling this report, the AG may consider whether the designated safe location is in compliance with other state law, and may take enforcement action, as needed.

The term “other state law” used in this bill could be broadly interpreted to mean a number of state laws unrelated to immigration enforcement. If the legislation is intended to give the AG power to enforce state laws designed to protect immigrants, such as the California Values Act, SB 81, AB 49, and SB 98, the author may consider using the term “other state law related to immigration enforcement,” or listing the relevant specific code sections, instead.

## 5. Argument in Support

The Western Center on Law and Poverty writes:

In 2025, California passed SB 81 (Arreguin), SB 98 (Renee-Perez), and AB 49 (Muratsuchi), which protected various locations from unlawful entry by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Yet, the state of California is currently experiencing a significant increase in unjust immigration enforcement. From January to October 2025, over 18,000 ICE arrests occurred in the state. This increase in activity requires a constant commitment to maintain accountability for all individuals and entities found in unlawful immigration-related activities. It is a fundamental responsibility of the AG to ensure that those who participate in these activities are held accountable through appropriate legal measures.

The lack of accountability and transparency allows ICE enforcement to continue to commit violations and stoke fear within California. This increase in fear can lead Californians to skip medical appointments, not attend school, and avoid public areas. As a result, this leads to a low quality of life.

Although the state is collecting information on misconduct by a federal agency for The California AG, the data needs to be made public, and violators need to be held accountable. The state currently lacks accountability and transparency regarding the number and locations of violations. This undermines public trust and will lead to a lack of confidence in the community to report future violations.

A public report on ICE activity, including unlawful enforcement, is key to accountability and transparency for the safety of all Californians. SB 1257 will require the AG to publish an annual report on immigration incidents and activities that happen in California. Finally, the AG is authorized to ensure compliance through penalties or other enforcement activities.

-- END --