Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to prohibit the use of City funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law, except for individuals who have been convicted of a violent or serious felony and held to answer for a violent or serious felony and modifying reporting requirements.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising Section 12H.2 and deleting Section 12H.2-1 in Chapter 12H, and revising Sections 121.1, 121.2, 121.3, 121.4, and 121.5 in Chapter 12I, to read as follows:

SEC. 12H.2. USE OF CITY FUNDS PROHIBITED.

No department, agency, commission, officer, or employee of the City and County of San Francisco shall use any City funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law or to gather or disseminate information regarding the immigration or release status of individuals or any other such personal information as defined in Chapter 12I in the City and County of San Francisco unless such assistance is required by Federal or State statute, regulation, or court decision. The prohibition set forth in this Chapter 12H shall include, but shall not be limited to:

(a) Assisting or cooperating, in one's official capacity, with any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, conducted by the Federal agency
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charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law and relating to alleged violations of
the civil provisions of the Federal immigration law, except as permitted under Administrative Code
Section 1213.

(b) Assisting or cooperating, in one's official capacity, with any investigation,
    surveillance, or gathering of information conducted by foreign governments, except for
    cooperation related to an alleged violation of City and County, State, or Federal criminal laws.

(c) Requesting information about, or disseminating information, in one's official
capacity, regarding, the immigration or release status of any individual or any other such
personal information as defined in Chapter 121, except as permitted under Administrative Code
Section 1213, or conditioning the provision of services or benefits by the City and County of
San Francisco upon immigration status, except as required by Federal or State statute or
regulation, City and County public assistance criteria, or court decision.

(d) Including on any application, questionnaire, or interview form used in relation to
    benefits, services, or opportunities provided by the City and County of San Francisco any
    question regarding immigration status other than those required by Federal or State statute,
    regulation, or court decision. Any such questions existing or being used by the City and
    County at the time this Chapter is adopted shall be deleted within sixty days of the adoption of
    this Chapter.

SEC. 12H.2 1. CHAPTER PROVISIONS INAPPLICABLE TO PERSONS CONVICTED
OF CERTAIN CRIMES.

Nothing in this Chapter shall prohibit, or be construed as prohibiting, a Law Enforcement
Officer from identifying and reporting any adult pursuant to State or Federal law or regulation who is
in custody after being booked for the alleged commission of a felony and is suspected of violating the
civil provisions of the immigration laws. In addition, nothing in this Chapter shall prohibit, or be
construed as prohibiting, a Law Enforcement Officer from identifying and reporting any juvenile who is
suspected of violating the civil provisions of the immigration laws if: (1) the San Francisco District Attorney files a petition in the juvenile court alleging that the minor is a person within the description of Section 602(a) of the California Welfare and Institutions Code and the juvenile court sustains a felony charge based upon the petition; (2) the San Francisco Superior Court makes a finding of probable cause after the District Attorney directly files felony criminal charges against the minor in adult criminal court; or (3) the San Francisco Superior Court determines that the minor is unfit to be tried in juvenile court, the minor is certified to adult criminal court, and the Superior Court makes a finding of probable cause in adult criminal court.

Nothing in this Chapter shall preclude any City and County department, agency, commission, officer or employee from (a) reporting information to the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law regarding an individual who has been booked at any county jail facility, and who has previously been convicted of a felony committed in violation of the laws of the State of California, which is still considered a felony under State law; (b) cooperating with a request from the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law for information regarding an individual who has been convicted of a felony committed in violation of the laws of the State of California, which is still considered a felony under State law; or (c) reporting information as required by Federal or State statute, regulation or court decision, regarding an individual who has been convicted of a felony committed in violation of the laws of the State of California, which is still considered a felony under State law. For purposes of this Section, an individual has been "convicted" of a felony when: (a) there has been a conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction; and (b) all direct appeal rights have been exhausted or waived; or (c) the appeal period has lapsed.

However, no officer, employee or law enforcement agency of the City and County of San Francisco shall stop, question, arrest or detain any individual solely because of the individual’s national origin or immigration status. In addition, in deciding whether to report an individual to the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law under the circumstances
described in this Section, an officer, employee or law enforcement agency of the City and County of San Francisco shall not discriminate among individuals on the basis of their ability to speak English or perceived or actual national origin.

This Section shall not apply in cases where an individual is arrested and/or convicted for failing to obey a lawful order of a Police Officer during a public assembly or for failing to disperse after a Police Officer has declared an assembly to be unlawful and has ordered dispersal.

Nothing herein shall be construed or implemented so as to discourage any person, regardless of immigration status, from reporting criminal activity to law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 121.1. FINDINGS.

The City and County of San Francisco (the "City") is home to persons of diverse racial, ethnic, and national backgrounds, including a large immigrant population. The City respects, upholds, and values equal protection and equal treatment for all of our residents, regardless of immigration status. Fostering a relationship of trust, respect, and open communication between City employees and City residents is essential to the City's core mission of ensuring public health, safety, and welfare, and serving the needs of everyone in the community, including immigrants. The purpose of this Chapter 121, as well as of Administrative Code Chapter 12H, is to foster respect and trust between law enforcement and residents, to protect limited local resources, to encourage cooperation between residents and City officials, including especially law enforcement and public health officers and employees, and to ensure family unity, community security, and due process for all.

Our federal immigration system is in dire need of comprehensive reform. The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") is responsible for enforcing the civil immigration laws. ICE's programs, including Secure Communities and its replacement, the Priority Enforcement Program ("PEP"), seek to enlist local law enforcement's voluntary cooperation and assistance in its enforcement efforts. In its description of PEP, ICE explains that all requests under PEP are for
voluntary action and that any request is not an authorization to detain persons at the expense of the federal government. The federal government should not shift the financial burden of federal civil immigration enforcement, including personnel time and costs related to notification and detention, onto local law enforcement by requesting that local law enforcement agencies continue detaining persons based on non-mandatory civil immigration detainers or cooperating and assisting with requests to notify ICE that a person will be released from local custody. It is not a wise and effective use of valuable City resources at a time when vital services are being cut.

The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s “ICE’s” controversial Secure Communities program (also known as "S-Comm") shifted the burden of federal civil immigration enforcement onto local law enforcement. S-Comm came into operation after the state sent fingerprints that state and local law enforcement agencies had transmitted to the California Department of Justice ("Cal DOJ") to positively identify the arrestees and to check their criminal history. The FBI would forward the fingerprints to the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") to be checked against immigration and other databases. To give itself time to take a detainee into immigration custody, ICE would send an Immigration Detainer – Notice of Action (DHS Form I-247) to the local law enforcement official requesting that the local law enforcement official hold the individual for up to 48 hours after that individual would otherwise be released ("civil immigration detainers"). Civil Immigration detainers may be issued without evidentiary support or probable cause by border patrol agents, aircraft pilots, special agents, deportation officers, immigration inspectors, and immigration adjudication officers.

Given that civil immigration detainers are issued by immigration officers without judicial oversight, and the regulation authorizing civil immigration detainers provides no minimum standard of proof for their issuance, there are serious questions as to their constitutionality. Unlike criminal warrants, which must be supported by probable cause and issued by a neutral
1 magistrate, there is no such requirement for the issuance of a civil immigration detainer. At least one Several federal courts in Indiana have ruled that because civil immigration detainers and other ICE "Notice of Action" documents are issued without probable cause of criminal conduct, they do not meet the Fourth Amendment requirements for state or local law enforcement officials to arrest and hold an individual in custody. (Miranda-Olivares v. Clackamas Co., No. 3:12-cv-02317-ST *17 (D.Or. April 11, 2014) (finding that detention pursuant to an immigration detainer is a seizure that must comport with the Fourth Amendment). See also Morales v. Chadbourne, 996 F. Supp. 2d 19, 29 (D.R.I. 2014); Villars v. Kubiatowski, No. 12-cv-4586 *10-12 (N.D. Ill. filed May 5, 2014).)

On December 4, 2012, the Attorney General of California, Kamala Harris, clarified the responsibilities of local law enforcement agencies under S-Comm. The Attorney General clarified that S-Comm does not require state or local law enforcement officials to determine an individual's immigration status or to enforce federal immigration laws. The Attorney General also clarified that civil immigration detainers are voluntary requests to local law enforcement agencies that do not mandate compliance. California local law enforcement agencies may determine on their own whether to comply with non-mandatory civil immigration detainers. In a June 25, 2014, bulletin, the Attorney General warned that a federal court outside of California had held a county liable for damages where it voluntarily complied with an ICE request to detain an individual, and the individual was otherwise eligible for release and that local law enforcement agencies may also be held liable for such conduct. Over 350 jurisdictions, including Berkeley, California; Richmond, California; Santa Clara County, California; Washington, D.C., and Cook County, Illinois, and many of California’s 58 counties have already acknowledged the discretionary nature of civil immigration detainers and are declining to hold people in their jails for the additional forty-eight (48) hours as requested by ICE. Local law enforcement agencies' responsibilities, duties, and powers are regulated by state law.
However, complying with non-mandatory civil immigration detainers falls outside the scope of those responsibilities and frequently raises due process concerns.

According to Section 287.7 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the City is not reimbursed by the federal government for the costs associated with civil immigration detainers alone. The full cost of responding to a civil immigration detainer can include, but is not limited to, extended detention time, the administrative costs of tracking and responding to detainers, and the legal liability for erroneously holding an individual who is not subject to a civil immigration detainer. Compliance with civil immigration detainers and involvement in civil immigration enforcement diverts limited local resources from programs that are beneficial to the City.

The City seeks to protect public safety, which is founded on trust and cooperation of community residents and local law enforcement. However, civil immigration detainers and notifications regarding release undermine community trust of law enforcement by instilling fear in immigrant communities of coming forward to report crimes and cooperate with local law enforcement agencies. A 2013 study by the University of Illinois, entitled "Insecure Communities: Latino Perceptions of Police Involvement in Immigration Enforcement," found that at least 40% percent of Latinos surveyed are less likely to provide information to police because they fear exposing themselves, family, or friends to a risk of deportation. Indeed, civil immigration detainers have resulted in the transfer of victims of crime, including domestic violence victims, to ICE. According to a national 2011 study by the Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy at UC Berkeley, entitled "Secure Communities by the Numbers: An Analysis of Demographics and Due Process" ("2011 Warren Institute Study"), ICE has falsely detained approximately 3,600 U.S. citizens as a result of S-Comm. Thus, S-Comm leaves even those with legal status vulnerable to civil immigration detainers issued without judicial review or without proof of
criminal activity, in complete disregard for the due process rights of those subject to the civil immigration detainers.

The City has enacted numerous laws and policies to strengthen communities and to build trust between communities and local law enforcement. Local cooperation and assistance with civil immigration enforcement keep families united. In contrast, ICE civil immigration detainers have resulted in the separation of families. According to the 2011 Warren Institute Study, it is estimated that more than one-third of those targeted by S-Comm have a U.S. citizen spouse or child. Complying with civil immigration detainers thus resulted in the deportation of potential aspiring U.S. citizens.

According to the 2011 Warren Institute Study, Latinos made up 93% of those detained through S-Comm, although they only account for 77% of the undocumented population in the U.S. As a result, S-Comm has a disproportionate impact on Latinos.

The City has enacted numerous laws and policies to prevent its residents from becoming entangled in the immigration system. But, the enforcement of immigration laws is a responsibility of the federal government. A December 2012 ICE news release stated that deportations have hit record figures each year. According to the Migration Policy Institute's 2013 report, entitled "Immigration Enforcement in the United States: The Rise of a Formidable Machinery," the federal government presently spends more on civil immigration enforcement than all federal criminal law enforcement combined. Local funds should not be expended on such efforts, especially because such entanglement undermines community policing strategies.

In 2014, DHS ended the Secure Communities program and replaced it with PEP. PEP and S-Comm share many similarities. Just as with S-Comm, PEP uses state and federal databases to check an individual's fingerprints against immigration and other databases. PEP employs a number of tactics to facilitate transfers of individuals from local jails to immigration custody.

First, PEP uses a new form (known as DHS Form I-247N), which requests notification from local jails about an individual's release date prior to his or her release from local custody. As with
civil immigration detainers, these notification requests are issued by immigration officers without judicial oversight, thus raising questions about local law enforcement's liability for constitutional violations if any person is overdetained when immigration agents are unable to be present at the time of the person's release from local custody.

Second, under PEP, ICE will continue to issue civil immigration detainer requests where local law enforcement officials are willing to respond to the requests, and in instances of "special circumstances," a term that has yet to be defined by DHS. Despite federal courts finding civil immigration detainers do not meet Fourth Amendment requirements, local jurisdictions are often unable to confirm whether or not a detention request is supported by probable cause or has been reviewed by a neutral magistrate.

The increase in information-sharing between local law enforcement and immigration officials raises serious concerns about privacy rights. Across the country, including in the California Central Valley, there has been an increase of ICE agents stationed in jails, who often have unrestricted access to jail databases, booking logs, and other documents that contain personal information of all jail inmates.

The City has an interest in ensuring that confidential information collected in the course of carrying out its municipal functions, including but not limited to public health programs and criminal investigations, is not used for unintended purposes that could hamper collection of information vital to those functions. To carry out public health programs, the City must be able to reliably collect confidential information from all residents. To solve crimes and protect the public, local law enforcement depends on the cooperation of all City residents. Information gathering and cooperation may be jeopardized if release of personal information results in a person being taken into immigration custody.

In late 2015, Pedro Figueroa, an immigrant father of an 8-year-old U.S. citizen, sought the San Francisco Police Department’s help in locating his stolen vehicle. When Mr. Figueroa went to the
police station to retrieve his car, which police had located, he was detained for some time by police
officers before being released, and an ICE agent was waiting to take him into immigration custody
immediately as he left the police station. It was later reported that both the Police Department and the
San Francisco Sheriff's Department had contact with ICE officials while Mr. Figueroa was at the
police station. He spent over two months in an immigration detention facility and remains in
deportation proceedings. Mr. Figueroa's case has raised major concerns about local law
enforcement's relationship with immigration authorities, and has weakened the immigrant community's
confidence in policing practices. Community cooperation with local law enforcement is critical to
investigating and prosecuting crimes. Without the cooperation of crime victims – like Mr. Figueroa –
and witnesses, local law enforcement's ability to investigate and prosecute crime, particularly in
communities with large immigrant populations, will be seriously compromised.

SEC. 121.2. DEFINITIONS.

"Administrative warrant" means a document issued by the federal agency charged with the
enforcement of the Federal immigration law that is used as a non-criminal, civil warrant for
immigration purposes.

"Eligible for release from custody" means that the individual may be released from
custody because one of the following conditions has occurred:

(4a) All criminal charges against the individual have been dropped or dismissed.
(2b) The individual has been acquitted of all criminal charges filed against him or her.
(3c) The individual has served all the time required for his or her sentence.
(4d) The individual has posted a bond, or has been released on his or her own
recognizance.
(5e) The individual has been referred to pre-trial diversion services.
(6f) The individual is otherwise eligible for release under state or local law.
"Civil immigration detainer" means a non-mandatory request issued by an authorized federal immigration officer under Section 287.7 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, to a local law enforcement official to maintain custody of an individual for a period not to exceed forty-eight (48) hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, and advise the authorized federal immigration officer prior to the release of that individual.

"Convicted" means the state of having been proved guilty in a judicial proceeding, unless the convictions have been expunged or vacated pursuant to applicable law. The date that an individual is Convicted starts from the date of release.

"Firearm" means a device, designed to be used as a weapon, from which is expelled through a barrel, a projectile by the force of an explosion or other form of combustion as defined in Penal Code Section 16520.

"Law enforcement official" means any City Department or officer or employee of a City Department, authorized to enforce criminal statutes, regulations, or local ordinances; operate jails or maintain custody of individuals in jails; and operate juvenile detention facilities or maintain custody of individuals in juvenile detention facilities.

"Notification request" means a non-mandatory request issued by an authorized federal immigration officer to a local law enforcement official asking for notification to the authorized immigration officer of an individual’s release from local custody prior to the release of an individual from local custody. Notification requests may also include informal requests for release information by the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law.

"Personal information" means any confidential, identifying information about an individual, including, but not limited to, home or work contact information, and family or emergency contact information.

"Serious Felony" means all serious felonies listed under Penal Code Section 1192.7(c) that also are defined as violent felonies under Penal Code Section 667.5(c); rape as defined
in Penal Code Sections 261, and 262: exploding a destructive device with intent to injure as
defined in Penal Code Section 18740; assault on a person with caustic chemicals or
flammable substances as defined in Penal Code Section 244; shooting from a vehicle at a
person outside the vehicle or with great bodily injury as defined in Penal Code Sections
26100(c) and (d).

"Violent Felony" means any crime listed in Penal Code Section 667.5(c); human
trafficking as defined in Penal Code Section 236.1; felony assault with a deadly weapon as
defined in Penal Code Section 245; any crime involving use of a firearm, assault weapon,
machine gun, or .50 BMG rifle, while committing or attempting to commit a felony that is
charged as a sentencing enhancement as listed in Penal Code Sections 12022.4 and
12022.5.

12I.3. RESTRICTIONS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), a law enforcement official shall not detain an
individual on the basis of a civil immigration detainer after that individual becomes eligible for
release from custody or respond to a federal immigration officer’s notification request.

(b) Law enforcement officials may continue to detain an individual in response to a
civil immigration detainer for up to forty-eight (48) hours after that individual becomes eligible
for release and may respond to a federal immigration officer’s notification request if the
continued detention is consistent with state and federal law, and the individual meets both of the
following criteria:

(1) The individual has been convicted of a Violent Felony in the seven years
immediately prior to the date of the civil immigration detainer or notification request; and

(2) A magistrate has determined that there is probable cause to believe the individual
is guilty of a Violent Felony and has ordered the individual to answer to the same pursuant to
Penal Code Section 872.
In determining whether to continue to detain an individual based solely on a civil immigration detainer or respond to a notification request as permitted in this subsection (b), law enforcement officials shall consider evidence of the individual's rehabilitation and evaluate whether the individual poses a public safety risk. Evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors to consider includes, but is not limited to: the individual's ties to the community, whether the individual has been a victim of any crime, the individual's contribution to the community, and the individual's participation in social service or rehabilitation programs.

This subsection (b) shall expire by operation of law on October 1, 2016, or upon a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors that finds for purposes of this Chapter, the federal government has enacted comprehensive immigration reform that diminishes the need for this subsection (b), whichever comes first.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (d), a law enforcement official shall not respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request.

(d) Law Enforcement officials may respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request if the individual meets both of the following criteria:

(1) The individual either:

(A) has been Convicted of a Violent Felony in the seven years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; or

(B) has been Convicted of a Serious Felony in the five years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; or

(C) has been Convicted of three felonies identified in Penal Code sections 1192.7(c) or 667.5(c), or Government Code sections 7282.5(a)(2) or 7282.5(a)(3), other than domestic violence, arising out of three separate incidents in the five years immediately prior to the date of the notification request; and
(2) A magistrate has determined that there is probable cause to believe the individual is guilty of a felony identified in Penal Code sections 1192.7(c) or 667.5(c), or Government Code sections 7282.5(a)(2) or 7282.5(a)(3), other than domestic violence, and has ordered the individual to answer to the same pursuant to Penal Code Section 872.

In determining whether to respond to a notification request as permitted by this subsection (d), law enforcement officials shall consider evidence of the individual’s rehabilitation and evaluate whether the individual poses a public safety risk. Evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors to consider includes, but is not limited to, the individual’s ties to the community, whether the individual has been a victim of any crime, the individual’s contribution to the community, and the individual’s participation in social service or rehabilitation programs.

Law enforcement officials shall not arrest or detain an individual, or provide any individual’s personal information to a federal immigration officer, on the basis of an administrative warrant, prior deportation order, or other civil immigration document based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws.

Law enforcement officials shall make good faith efforts to seek federal reimbursement for all costs incurred in continuing to detain an individual, after that individual becomes eligible for release, in response each civil immigration detainer.

SEC. 121.4. PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER.

The intent of this Chapter 121 is to address requests for non-mandatory civil immigration detainers, voluntary notification of release of individuals, transmission of personal information, and civil immigration documents based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws. Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to apply to matters other than those relating to federal civil immigration detainers, notification of release of individuals, transmission of personal information, or civil immigration documents, based solely on alleged
violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws. In all other respects, local law enforcement agencies may continue to collaborate with federal authorities to protect public safety. This collaboration includes, but is not limited to, participation in joint criminal investigations that are permitted under local policy or applicable city or state law.

SEC. 121.5. ANNUAL SEMIANNUAL REPORT.

By no later than July 1, 2014, the Sheriff and Juvenile Probation Officer shall each provide to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a written report stating the number of detentions that were solely based on civil immigration detainers during the first six months following the effective date of this Chapter, and detailing the rationale behind each of those civil immigration detainers. Thereafter, the Sheriff and Juvenile Probation Officer shall each annually submit a written report to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, by January 1st and July 1st of each year, addressing the same following issues for the time period covered by the report:

(a) a description of all communications received from the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law, including but not limited to the number of civil immigration detainers, notification requests, or other types of communications.

(b) a description of any communications the Department made to the Federal agency charged with enforcement of the Federal immigration law, including but not limited to any Department's responses to inquires as described in subsection 121.5 and the Department's determination of the applicability of subsections 121.3(b), 121.3(d) and 121.3(e).

Section 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.
Section 3. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: JANA CLARK
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