

Date of Hearing: June 23, 2026

Counsel: Ilan Zur

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

SB 1257 (Arreguín) – As Amended April 16, 2026

SUMMARY: Requires the Attorney General (AG) to annually submit to the Legislature, and post on its website, a report summarizing all immigration enforcement incidents and activities conducted by a person at a designated safe location that have been reported to the AG, as specified. Specifically, **this bill**:

- 1) Requires, on or before October 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, the AG to submit to the Legislature, and post on its internet website, a report that includes all of the following:
 - a) A summary of all immigration enforcement incidents and activities conducted by a person at a designated safe location that have been reported by the designated safe location or a person who witnessed the activity to the AG, including, but not limited to, reports submitted onsite or through the AG’s federal agent misconduct online portal.
 - b) Information of each immigration enforcement incident and activity described above, 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 follow-up or resolution status.
 - c) The number of immigration enforcement incidents and activities described above that resulted in legal action regarding the incident or activity’s legality and the county or court in which the legal action was filed. Legal action does not include a legal action or administrative proceeding against an individual for the enforcement of federal immigration law or a prosecution of an individual under federal criminal law.
- 2) Authorizes the AG to request representatives of a designated safe location to furnish reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities as part of compiling its annual report.
- 3) Authorizes the AG to issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this bill
- 4) Authorizes, as part of compiling this report, the AG to consider whether a designated safe location is in compliance with other state laws related to immigration enforcement and authorizes the AG to take enforcement action to enforce those laws, as needed.
- 5) Prohibits a report required by this bill and any information therein from including personally identifiable information regarding an individual stopped, detained, or arrested by an individual conducting an immigration enforcement incident or activity.
- 6) Defines the following terms:

- a) A “designated safe location” means educational institutions, health care provider entities, as defined, shelters, polling places, courthouses, public transportation property, and state and local government property.
- b) “Immigration enforcement” means any effort to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of a federal civil immigration law or a federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person’s presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in the United States.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the California Values Act, which prohibits law enforcement agencies (LEAs) from using agency or department money or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, subject to specified exemptions. (Gov. Code, §§ 7282.5, 7284.6.)
- 2) Requires an LEA that participates in a joint law enforcement task force to annually report to the Department of Justice (DOJ) the purpose of the task force, the agencies involved, the number of arrests made during the reporting period, and the number of people arrested for immigration enforcement purposes. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (c)(1).)
- 3) Requires LEAs to annually report to the DOJ the number of transfers of an individual to immigration authorities and the offense that allowed for the transfer, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (c)(2).)
- 4) Requires the AG to annually report on the total number of arrests made by joint law enforcement task forces, and the total number of arrests made for immigration enforcement by all task force participants, including federal law enforcement agencies, and to post the report on the AG’s website. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (d).)
- 5) Requires 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, 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).)
- 6) Requires the AG to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at licensed child daycare facilities to the fullest extent possible, as specified, and consider, when developing the policy, procedures for employees to notify the licensee or administrator of the facility if an individual requests or gains access to facility grounds for immigration enforcement. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1597.640, subd. (f)(1).)
- 7) Requires the licensee or administrator of a licensed child daycare facility to report to the AG any requests for information or access to the facility by an officer of a law enforcement agency for immigration enforcement, and permits a license-exempt California state preschool program to do the same. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1597.640, subd. (b)(1).)

- 8) Requires health care provider entity personnel to notify health care provider entity management, administration, or counsel of a request for access to a provider entity site or patient for immigration enforcement. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24250, subd. (b)(1).)
- 9) Prohibits, unless required by state or federal law, a health care provider entity and its personnel from allowing any person access to the nonpublic areas of the facility for immigration enforcement, except as specified. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24251, subd. (b).)
- 10) Requires health care provider entities to inform staff and relevant volunteers on how to respond to requests relating to immigration enforcement that grant access to health care provider entity sites or to patients. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24251, subd. (d).)
- 11) 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 agency from allowing an officer of an agency conducting immigration enforcement to enter a nonpublic area of a school, except as specified. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (a)(2).)
- 12) Prohibits a local educational agency and its personnel, to the extent practicable, from disclosing 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 of an agency conducting immigration enforcement absent a judicial warrant or subpoena, or court order directing the agency or its personnel to do so. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (b).)
- 13) Requires the superintendent of a school district or county office of education, and the principal of a charter school, to report to the governing board or body of the local educational agency any requests for information or access to a school site by an officer of a law enforcement agency for immigration enforcement. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (c).)
- 14) Requires the AG to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, consistent with federal and state law, and ensuring that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (g)(1).)
- 15) States that it is the intent of the Legislature that all California public schools develop a comprehensive school safety plan, and requires, by March 1, 2026, that the plan include procedures to notify parents and guardians of pupils, teachers, administrators, and school personnel when the school confirms the presence of immigration enforcement on the school site. (Ed. Code, §§ 32280; 32282, subd. (a)(2)(N)(i).)
- 16) Requires (or requests in the case of the University of California) specified higher education institutions to take certain actions related to immigration enforcement on their campuses, including: 1) advising students, faculty, and staff to notify the office of the chancellor or president if they are advised that an immigration officer has entered campus to execute a federal immigration order; 2) complying with a request from an immigration officer for access to nonpublic areas of the campus only upon presentation of a judicial warrant; 3) adopting the model policy developed by the AG limiting assistance with immigration enforcement to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal law, among other prohibitions; 4) requiring, in the event an undocumented student is subject to a federal immigration order, that all students, faculty, staff, and campus community members are

notified when the presence of immigration enforcement is confirmed on campus; and 5) requiring each higher education campus to notify all students, faculty, staff, and other campus community members when the presence of immigration enforcement is confirmed on campus, including providing notice of the date and time the immigration enforcement was confirmed, the location of the immigration enforcement, and a hyperlink to additional resources. (Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subs. (a) & (b).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Sponsor:** Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
- 2) **Author's Statement:** 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 are 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.”

- 3) **Rescission of the DHS Sensitive Locations Memo:** The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) previously had standing guidance prohibiting immigration authorities from conducting enforcement actions in certain “sensitive locations,” including schools, hospitals, and churches, unless exigent circumstances existed, prior approval was obtained, or other law enforcement actions had led officers to a sensitive location, as specified.¹ In 2021, the Biden Administration issued a memo expanding these sensitive places to include, as pertains to this bill, social service establishments, such as a crisis center, domestic violence shelter, victims services center, child advocacy center, supervised visitation center, family justice center, community-based organization, facility that serves disabled persons, homeless shelter, drug or alcohol counseling and treatment facility, or food bank or pantry or other establishment distributing food or other essentials of life to people in need.² In justifying the directive, the memo stated the “need to consider the fact that an enforcement action taken near – and not necessarily in—the protected area can have the same restraining impact on an individual’s access to the protected area itself.”³

¹ U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Memorandum: Enforcement Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations (Oct. 24, 2011) <<https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ero-outreach/pdf/10029.2-policy.pdf>> [as of June 10, 2026].

² *Id.* at p. 45.

³ *Ibid.*

On January 21, 2025, acting DHS Secretary Benjamin Huffman rescinded the Biden directive, stating that it “thwart[ed] law enforcement in or near so-called ‘sensitive’ areas.”⁴ On January 31, 2025, DHS issued a new directive stating they were “not issuing rules regarding where immigration laws are permitted to be enforced. Instead... the ICE Director charges Assistant Field Office Directors and Assistant Special Agents in Charge with responsibility for making case-by-case determinations regarding whether, where, and when to conduct an immigration enforcement action in or near a protected area.”⁵ In March, ICE reverted to the 2021 policy, but only in relation to places of worship. (*Ibid.*)

- 4) **Protections for Sensitive Locations under California Law:** Certain locations in California are subject to heightened protections against immigration enforcement activity. In 2017, the California Values Act required the AG to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law at certain locations, including public schools, public libraries, health facilities, courthouses, and shelters, among other locations, and ensuring that they remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. (Gov. Code, § 7284.8, subd. (a).) Numerous laws have been enacted since then that restrict the degree to which employees of certain sensitive locations can cooperate with immigration enforcement operations and require such locations to monitor and disclose when such immigration enforcement incidents occur.

For licensed child daycare facilities, the AG is required to adopt policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at such facilities. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1597.640, subd. (f)(1).) Licensees or administrators of such facilities are required to report to the AG any requests for information or access to the facility by a law enforcement agency for immigration enforcement purposes. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1597.640, subd. (b)(1).) Similar provisions exist for health care provider entities. Health care provider entities are prohibited from allowing access to a nonpublic area of the facility, except as specified, and health care provider personnel are required to notify the provider entity management, administration, or counsel of any request for access to a site or patient for immigration enforcement. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24250, subd. (b)(1); 24251, subd. (b).) Comparable requirements exist for schools and higher education institutions. (See, e.g., Ed. Code, §§ 234.7, subds. (a)(2) & (g)(1); 234.7, subd. (c); 32280.)

Immigration activity can also be directly reported to the AG. The AG operates a federal agent misconduct portal that permits members of the public to report potentially unlawful activity by federal agents in California.⁶ A person submitting a report must identify the nature of the incident, whether the reporting person was physically present, a description of what happened, whether injury occurred, the location, whether legal action was filed, whether law enforcement was present, and whether a police report was filed, and the portal provides an option for photos or videos to be submitted.⁷

⁴ U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, Statement from a DHS Spokesperson on Directives Expanding Law Enforcement and Ending the Abuse of Humanitarian Parol (Jan. 21, 2025) <available at: <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2025/01/21/statement-dhs-spokesperson-directives-expanding-law-enforcement-and-ending-abuse>> [as of June 10, 2026].

⁵ U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, ICE Directive Common Sense Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Area (January 31, 2025) <<https://www.ice.gov/about-ice/ero/protected-areas>> [as of June 10, 2026].

⁶ Cal. Dept. of Justice, Report Misconduct by Federal Agents to the California Attorney General <<https://oag.ca.gov/reportmisconduct>> [as of June 11, 2026].

⁷ *Ibid.*

- 5) **Effect of this Bill:** This bill requires the AG, by October 30, 2027, to submit to the Legislature, and post on its website, a specified report about immigration enforcement incidents and activities that occurred at “designated safe locations” in California. A designated safe location is broadly defined to include specific entities, such as an educational institution, health care provider entity, shelter, polling place, or courthouse, but also public property more generally, such as public transportation property, and state and local government property.

The AG report must contain three categories of information. First, it must summarize all immigration enforcement incidents and activities that were conducted by a person at a designated safe location that have been reported to the AG either by the designated safe location or a person who witnessed the activity. This can include a report submitted onsite or through the AG’s federal agent misconduct online portal. Second, it must include specific information relating to each immigration enforcement incident and activity, including the date of occurrence, the county of occurrence, the type of facility or location impacted, the government agency involved, and follow-up or resolution status. Third, it must include the number of immigration enforcement incidents and activities that resulted in legal action regarding the incident or activity’s legality and the county or court in which the legal action was filed. This does not include legal action or administrative proceeding against an individual for the enforcement of federal immigration law or a prosecution of an individual under federal criminal law. Personally identifiable information of an individual stopped, detained, or arrested during an immigration enforcement incident or activity may not be included in the report.

In order to collect the information required for the report, the bill authorizes the AG to request that representatives of a designated safe location provide reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities to the AG. To enforce the provisions of the bill, it authorizes the AG to issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this bill. The AG may also, in compiling this report, consider if a designated safe location is in compliance with other state laws related to immigration enforcement, and take enforcement action to enforce those laws. The bill defines immigration enforcement” as an effort to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of a federal civil immigration law or a federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person’s presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in the United States. This definition is largely consistent with the definition of immigration enforcement established in the California Values Act. (Gov. Code, § 7284.4, subd. (f).)

- 6) **Practical Considerations:** The author may wish to consider clarifying how immigration enforcement incident information will be collected at designated safe locations and how this information will be reported to the AG.

The annual AG report required by this bill must include “[a] summary of all immigration enforcement incidents and activities conducted by a person at a designated safe location that have been reported by the designated safe location or a person who witnessed the activity to the Attorney General.” As currently drafted, the contents of the AG report appear somewhat dependent on discretionary reporting to the DOJ. There is no requirement that the designated safe locations track the detailed information that must be included in this AG report or that they report this information to the AG. While some of the entities covered by this bill, such

as health care providers, schools, and higher education institutions, are independently required to monitor immigration enforcement actions to a certain degree, they may not collect the type of information this bill requires. (Health & Saf. Code, § 24250, subd. (b)(1); Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (c); Ed. Code, § 66093.3, subds. (a)-(b).) Other entities encompassed by this bill, such as shelters, polling places, courthouses, or certain types of property such as public transportation property, state governmental property, and local governmental property, may even have more limited access to this information. It may be difficult for AG to include all of this information in its annual reporting if a report submitted to the AG on the front end contains little to none of the necessary information.

The bill includes an enforcement mechanism by authorizing the AG to request representatives of a designated safe location to furnish any reported immigration enforcement incidents while compiling its report, and to issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this bill. While this may assist in securing additional information about immigration enforcement incidents, it may be difficult to get this information if designated safe locations are not required to collect, and do not have access to, the type of detailed incident information that the AG is requesting.

Further, while the AG is authorized to request such information, the bill does not require that the entities respond or comply with such requests. Civil penalties or other enforcement activity may not be prudent if a designated safe location does not have the applicable immigration enforcement incident information and is not required to provide such information. The author may wish to clarify the responsibilities of a designated safe location upon receiving such a request.

Finally, for immigration incidents occurring on property, such as public transportation, state, or local governmental property, rather than at a particular entity, it is unclear which “representative” or person” would be responsible for receiving and responding to such a request. To improve the feasibility of the bill it may be prudent to remove “public transportation property, and state and local government property” from the definition of a “designated safe location.”

- 7) **The California Values Act:** In 2017, California enacted the California Values Act, which limits the involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in federal immigration enforcement. The Values Act prohibits law enforcement agencies from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest people for immigration enforcement purposes; however, it permits LEAs to cooperate with immigration authorities to the extent such cooperation would not violate federal, state, or local law. (Gov. Code, § 7282.5.) Additionally, law enforcement agencies have discretion to transfer an individual to immigration authorities or provide ICE with information about an in-custody individual’s release date for individuals arrested or convicted for certain crimes. (Gov. Code, § 7282.5, subds. (a) (1) & (2), (b).)

The Values Act was challenged by the federal government as obstructing the enforcement of federal immigration law and violating the doctrine of intergovernmental immunity. (*United States v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865, 886, 891.) Ultimately, in *United States v. California*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the provisions of the California Values Act relating to law enforcement cooperation with ICE. The court of appeals had “no doubt that SB 54 makes the jobs of federal immigration authorities more difficult.” (*Id.* at p. 886.)

But the court concluded that this does not constitute obstacle preemption, because federal law “does not require any particular action on the part of California or its political subdivisions.” (*Id.* at p. 889.) “Even if SB 54 obstructs federal immigration enforcement,” the court stated, “the United States’ position that such obstruction is unlawful runs directly afoul of the Tenth Amendment and the anticommandeering rule.” (*Id.* at p. 888.) “California has the right, pursuant to the anticommandeering rule, to refrain from assisting with federal efforts.” (*Id.* at p. 891.) The court concluded that SB 54 does not violate the United States’ intergovernmental immunity for similar reasons. (*Ibid.*)

This bill establishes a new statutory section, proposed Government Code section 7284.9, that falls squarely within the chapter of law known as the “California Values Act.” The Legislature has not added a new section to the California Values Act since its enactment, in part due to the legal sensitivity associated with the critical legislation. To avoid errantly involving the Values Act in possible litigation, the author may wish to move the provisions of this bill into a different chapter of law.

8) **Application to Immigration Enforcement Activities Involving California Law**

Enforcement Officers: The information required to be included in the AG report pursuant to this bill may encompass certain immigration enforcement activity conducted by California law enforcement agencies. This is because California state and local law enforcement agencies are permitted to assist with immigration enforcement efforts in certain ways. As previously noted, the Values Act permits LEAs to cooperate with immigration authorities to the extent such cooperation would not violate federal, state, or local law. (Gov. Code, § 7282.5.) Most notably, LEAs have discretion to transfer an individual to immigration authorities or provide ICE with information about an in-custody individual’s release date for individuals arrested or convicted of certain crimes. (Gov. Code, § 7282.5, subds. (a) (1) & (2), (b).) Further, the definition of an LEA under the Values Act does not include the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (Gov. Code, § 7284.4, subd. (a).)

The California Values Act already requires law enforcement agencies to annually report to the DOJ the number of transfers of an individual to immigration authorities and the offense that allowed for the transfer, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (c)(2).) These records are subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act (CPRA), and, as permitted under the CPRA, personal identifying information may be redacted prior to public disclosure. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (c)(3).)

The AG report required by this bill could be interpreted to encompass lawful immigration enforcement incidents or activities conducted by state and local law enforcement agencies. Certain state or local peace officer immigration enforcement activity, such as a California peace officer-facilitated transfer to ICE, may take place on a “designated safe location,” such as public transportation property, state government property, or local government property. For example, if a local police officer transports an undocumented individual to immigration authorities because they were convicted of a specified crime, as permitted under the Values Act, and this immigration enforcement action takes place on local government property, the details of this incident, if reported to the AG, would be required to be included in the AG’s annual report. Given that local and state LEAs are permitted to assist ICE with immigration enforcement efforts in narrow ways, particularly when it comes to individuals who have committed certain crimes, this bill may expand the AG’s reporting obligations regarding the

degree to which California law enforcement agencies assist in immigration enforcement under the California Values Act.

- 9) **Argument in Support:** According to *The Latino Coalition for a Healthy California*, SB 1257 “will require the California Attorney General to publish an annual public report on all immigration incidents and activities by federal agencies...”

“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 Attorney General to ensure that those who participate in these activities are held accountable through appropriate legal measures.

“The lack of accountability and transparency from the state 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 Attorney General, the data needs to be made public, and violators need to be held accountable. The state's current lack of 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. SB1257 will require the Attorney General to publish an annual report on immigration incidents and activities that happen in California. Finally, the Attorney General is authorized to ensure compliance through penalties or other enforcement activities.”

- 10) **Argument in Opposition:** None received.

11) **Prior Legislation:**

- a) SB 81 (Arreguín), Chapter 123, Statutes of 2025, prohibited a health care provider entity and its personnel, unless required by state and federal law, from granting access to the nonpublic areas of the facility for immigration enforcement without a valid judicial warrant or court order.
- b) AB 49 (Muratsuchi), Chapter 122, Statutes of 2025, prohibited, except as required by state or federal law, school officials and employees of a local educational agency (LEA) from allowing an officer or employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement to enter a school site without providing a valid judicial warrant or court order.
- c) SB 98 (Pérez), Chapter 124, Statutes of 2025, required the governing boards of school districts and county offices of education, and the governing boards of charter schools, to include procedures for notifying parents and school staff when immigration enforcement is confirmed on the school site within the school safety plan.

- d) SB 841 (Rubio), of the 2025-2026 Legislative Session, would have prohibited an employee of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider from allowing immigration enforcement activity in the nonpublic areas of the facility without a valid warrant or court order. SB 841 was ordered to the inactive file at the request of the Assembly Majority Leader.
- e) AB 699 (O'Donnell), Chapter 493, Statutes of 2017, required the AG to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, requires local educational agencies to adopt the model policies or equivalent policies, and provides education and support to immigrant students and their families.
- f) SB 54 (De León), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017, limited the involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in federal immigration enforcement.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Latino Coalition for a Healthy California (Sponsor)
 Access Reproductive Justice
 ACLU California Action
 Alliance for a Better Community (UNREG)
 Asian Americans for Community Involvement
 Asian Resources, INC.
 Asociacion De Migrantes Guatemaltecos Los Angeles
 Berkeley; City of
 Buen Vecino
 California Community Foundation
 California Consortium for Urban Indian Health
 California Coverage Health Initiatives (CCHI)
 California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio
 California Immigrant Policy Center
 California Lgbtq Health and Human Services Network
 California Pan - Ethnic Health Network
 California Physicians Alliance
 California Public Defenders Association
 California Teachers Association
 Campaign for College Opportunity
 Celestria Health
 Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)
 Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)
 Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño
 Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations
 Coalition of Orange County Community Health Centers
 Community Health Partnership
 Courage California
 El Arc De California
 Emeryville; City of

Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC) Fiscally Sponsored by Community Partners
Farm2people
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Health4kern
Healthy Contra Costa
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Jwch Institute
Lideres Campesinas
Multicultural Institute
Oakland; City of
Oasis Legal Services
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Rubicon Programs
San Francisco Aids Foundation
Santa Cruz Community Health
Seiu California
Soledad; City of
South Asian Network
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
Thai Community Development Center
The Black Alliance for Just Immigration
The Children's Partnership
The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health
Todec Legal Center
Transitions Clinic Network
Unidosus
Vision Y Compromiso (UNREG)
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
2 private individuals

Analysis Prepared by: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744