

Date of Hearing: April 6, 2021
Counsel: David Billingsley

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Chair

AB 937 (Carrillo) – As Amended March 22, 2021

SUMMARY: Eliminates the existing ability under the Values Act for law enforcement agencies to cooperate with federal immigration authorities by giving them notification of release for inmates or facilitating inmate transfers. Prohibits all state and local agencies from assisting, in any manner, the detention, deportation, interrogation, of an individual by immigration enforcement. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Specifies that a state or local agency shall not arrest or assist with the arrest, confinement, detention, transfer, interrogation, or deportation of an individual for an immigration enforcement purpose in any manner including, but not limited to, by notifying another agency or subcontractor thereof regarding the release date and time of an individual, releasing or transferring an individual into the custody of another agency or subcontractor thereof, or disclosing personal information, as specified, about an individual, including, but not limited to, an individual's date of birth, work address, home address, or parole or probation check in date and time to another agency or subcontractor thereof.
- 2) States that the prohibition described above shall apply notwithstanding any contrary provisions in the California Values Act, as specified, which allowed law enforcement to cooperate with immigration authorities in limited circumstances.
- 3) Specifies that this bill does not prohibit compliance with a criminal judicial warrant.
- 4) Prohibits a state or local agency or court from using immigration status as a factor to deny or to recommend denial of probation or participation in any diversion, rehabilitation, mental health program, or placement in a credit-earning program or class, or to determine custodial classification level, to deny mandatory supervision, or to lengthen the portion of supervision served in custody.
- 5) Clarifies the following terms for purposes of this bill:
 - a) "Immigration enforcement" includes "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."
 - b) "State or local agency" includes, but is not limited to, "local and state law enforcement agencies, parole or probation agencies, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation."

- 6) “Transfer” includes “custodial transfers, informal transfers in which a person’s arrest is facilitated through the physical hand-off of that person in a nonpublic area of the state or local agency, or any coordination between the state or local agency and the receiving agency about an individual’s release to effectuate an arrest for immigration enforcement purposes upon or following their release from the state or local agency’s custody.”
- 7) States that in addition to any other sanctions, penalties, or remedies provided by law, a person may bring an action for equitable or declaratory relief in a court of competent jurisdiction against a state or local agency or state or local official that violates the provisions of this bill.
- 8) Specifies that a state or local agency or official that violates the provisions of this bill is also liable for actual and general damages and reasonable attorney’s fees.
- 9) Repeals statutory provisions directing California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to implement and maintain procedures to identify inmates serving terms in state prison who are undocumented aliens subject to deportation.
- 10) Repeals statutory provisions directing CDCR and California Youth Authority to implement and maintain procedures to identify, within 90 days of assuming custody, inmates who are undocumented felons subject to deportation and refer them to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.
- 11) Repeals statutory provisions directing CDCR to cooperate with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service by providing the use of prison facilities, transportation, and general support, as needed, for the purposes of conducting and expediting deportation hearings and subsequent placement of deportation holds on undocumented aliens who are incarcerated in state prison.
- 12) Repeals the statutory directive to include place of birth (state or country)—in state or local criminal offender record information systems.
- 13) Makes Legislative findings and declarations.

EXISTING FEDERAL LAW:

- 1) Provides that any authorized immigration officer may at any time issue Immigration Detainer-Notice of Action, to any other federal, state, or local law enforcement agency. A detainer serves to advise another law enforcement agency that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) seeks custody of an alien presently in the custody of that agency, for the purpose of arresting and removing the alien. The detainer is a request that such agency advise the DHS, prior to release of the alien, in order for the DHS to arrange to assume custody, in situations when gaining immediate physical custody is either impracticable or impossible. (8 CFR Section 287.7(a).)
- 2) States that upon a determination by the DHS to issue a detainer for an alien not otherwise detained by a criminal justice agency, such agency shall maintain custody of the alien for a period not to exceed 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays in order to permit

assumption of custody by the DHS. (8 CFR Section 287.7(d).)

- 3) Authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security under the 287(g) program to enter into agreements that delegate immigration powers to local police. The negotiated agreements between ICE and the local police are documented in memorandum of agreements (MOAs). (8 U.S.C. Section 1357(g).)
- 4) States that notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual. (8 U.S.C. 1373, subd. (a).)
- 5) States that notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no State or local government entity may be prohibited, or in any way restricted, from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of an alien in the United States. (8 U.S.C. 1644.)

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Defines "immigration hold" as "an immigration detainer issued by an authorized immigration officer, pursuant to specified regulations, that requests that the law enforcement official to maintain custody of the individual for a period not to exceed 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, and to advise the authorized immigration officer prior to the release of that individual." (Gov. Code, § 7282, subd. (c).)
- 2) Defines "Notification request" as an Immigration and Customs Enforcement request that a local law enforcement agency inform ICE of the release date and time in advance of the public of an individual in its custody and includes, but is not limited to, DHS Form I-247N. (Gov. Code, § 7283, subd. (f).)
- 3) Defines "Transfer request" as an Immigration and Customs Enforcement request that a local law enforcement agency facilitate the transfer of an individual in its custody to ICE, and includes, but is not limited to, DHS Form I-247X. (Gov. Code, § 7283, subd. (f).)
- 4) Prohibits law enforcement agencies (including school police and security departments) from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest people for immigration enforcement purposes. These provisions are commonly known as the Values Act. Restrictions include:
 - a) Inquiring into an individual's immigration status;
 - b) Detaining a person based on a hold request from ICE;
 - c) Providing information regarding a person's release date or responding to requests for notification by providing release dates or other information unless that information is available to the public;

- d) Providing personal information, as specified, including, but not limited to, name, social security number, home or work addresses, unless that information is “available to the public;”
 - e) Arresting a person based on a civil immigration warrant;
 - f) Participating in border patrol activities, including warrantless searches;
 - g) Performing the functions of an immigration agent whether through agreements known as 287(g) agreements, or any program that deputizes police as immigration agents;
 - h) Using ICE agents as interpreters;
 - i) Transfer an individual to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant or judicial probable cause determination, or except as otherwise specified;
 - j) Providing office space exclusively for immigration authorities in a city or county law enforcement facility; and,
 - k) Entering into a contract, after June 15, 2017, with the federal government to house or detain adult or minor non-citizens in a locked detention facility for purposes of immigration custody. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (a).)
- 5) Describes the circumstances under which a law enforcement agency has discretion to respond to transfer and notification requests from immigration authorities. These provisions are known as the TRUST Act. Law enforcement agencies cannot honor transfer and notification requests unless one of the following apply:
- a) The individual has been convicted of a serious or violent felony, as specified;
 - b) The individual has been convicted of any felony which is punishable by imprisonment in state prison;
 - c) The individual has been convicted within the last five years of a misdemeanor for a crime that is punishable either as a felony or misdemeanor (a wobbler);
 - d) The individual has been convicted within the past 15 years for any one of a list of specified felonies;
 - e) The individual is a current registrant on the California Sex and Arson Registry;
 - f) The individual has been convicted of a federal crime that meets the definition of an aggravated felony as specified in the federal Immigration and Nationality Act; or,
 - g) The individual is identified by ICE as the subject of an outstanding federal felony arrest warrant for any federal crime; or,
 - h) The individual is arrested on a charge involving a serious or violent felony, as specified, or a felony that is punishable by imprisonment in state prison, and a magistrate makes a finding of probable cause as to that charge. (Gov. Code, § 7282.5.)

- 6) Provides that law enforcement agencies are able to participate in joint taskforces with the federal government only if the primary purpose of the joint task force is not immigration enforcement. Participating agencies must annually report to the California Department of Justice (DOJ) if there were immigration arrests as a result of task force operations. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subds. (b) & (c).)
- 7) Allows law enforcement agencies to respond to a request from immigration authorities for information about a person's criminal history. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(2).)
- 8) Allows law enforcement agencies to make inquiries into information necessary to certify an individual who has been identified as a potential crime or trafficking victim for a T or U Visa. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subds. (b)(4).)
- 9) Allows law enforcement agencies to give immigration authorities access to interview an individual in agency custody if such access complies with the TRUTH Act. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subds. (b)(5).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, "AB 937 helps California realize its promise of protecting immigrant rights and reforming our criminal justice system. Under current law many individuals that have completed their sentence or have been deemed eligible for release from a California jail or prison can face a second punishment in the immigration detention system, solely because of where they were born. AB 937 will stop this arbitrary second punishment where one has no right to legal representation, pretrial release, or a hearing from a jury of their peers. Immigration Detainees can find themselves housed in county jails and even private facilities anywhere in America, facilities beyond the oversight and accountability of the state of California where abuse and neglect is well documented. All Californians, regardless of citizenship status, should get the chance to reintegrate back into their communities and reunite with their families when they have paid their debt to society."
- 2) **California Values Act:** The Values Act, which became effective on January 1, 2018, limits the involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in federal immigration enforcement. It prohibits law enforcement agencies (including school police and security departments) from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest people for immigration enforcement purposes. It also places limitations on the ways in which law enforcement agencies can collaborate with federal task forces that involve elements of immigration enforcement. Under the Values Act, CDCR is not considered a law enforcement agency.

The Values Act was an expansion of prior state law, the TRUST Act which prohibited law enforcement from honoring federal immigration holds unless the detainee had a criminal history involving a serious or violent felony.

The Values Act contains some exceptions that allows law enforcement agencies to cooperate with immigration authorities. Under the Values Act law enforcement is allowed to engage

with immigration authorities in the following circumstances:

- a) Provide a person's release date or personal information, as specified, if such information is available to the public;
- b) Respond to notification and transfer requests when the individual had been convicted of specified crimes which reflected a higher public safety danger and are on the serious end of the criminal spectrum. Specifically, those crimes included serious and violent felonies, as well as offenses requiring an individual to register as a sex offender;
- c) Make inquiries into information necessary to certify an individual for a visa for a victim of domestic violence and human trafficking;
- d) Respond to a request from immigration authorities for information about a person's criminal history;
- e) Participate with a joint law enforcement task force, as long as the primary purpose of the task force is not immigration enforcement; or,
- f) Give immigration authorities access to interview an individual in agency custody as long as the interview access complied with the requirements of the TRUTH Act.

This bill would eliminate those exceptions for law enforcement to the extent that such exceptions would constitute assistance in immigration enforcement, in any manner.

The prohibitions in this bill on assisting immigration enforcement in any manner are broader in scope than the prohibitions described in the Values Act. The scope of this bill is also broader than the Values Act because the prohibition on assistance applies to all state and local agencies, as opposed to being directed toward law enforcement agencies.

This bill would prohibit any state or local agency, including law enforcement agencies, from engaging in conduct which assists, in any manner, the arrest, detention, interrogation, or deportation of an individual for immigration purposes. To the extent those broader prohibitions might create a conflict with the Values Act, it is not clear which language would control.

3) **Reenactment Clause of the California Constitution:**

"A section of a statute may not be amended unless the section is re-enacted as amended."
California Const., Art. IV, § 9.

Under this provision of the State Constitution, the Legislature is required to reenact a code section when passing legislation which amends that particular code section. This is intended to ensure that legislators understand the scope and effect of the bill they are voting on. In reviewing the contents of a bill that amends a code section, this rule allows that the bill reader to easily identify amendments to existing law because the bill will set forth the changes within the context of the current statute(s). One purpose of this constitutional provision "is to make sure legislators are not operating in the blind when they amend legislation, and to make sure the public can become apprised of changes in the law." *The*

Gillette Company, et. al., v. Franchise Tax Board (2015) 62 Cal.4th 468,483.

This bill would amend the Values Act by repealing the portions of the Values Act which allow law enforcement to cooperate under certain circumstances. Rather than amend the Values Act, this bill creates a new statute and the repeals the portions of the Values Act by cross reference. By failing to amend the Values Act, it creates confusion about how this bill will change current law. To the extent that the provisions of this bill conflict with the Values Act, it is not clear which statute would control.

One example of a potential conflict involves the directive in the Values Act for the Attorney General to develop model policies. The Values Act required that the Attorney General 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, courthouses, division of Labor Standards Enforcement facilities, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers Compensation, and shelters. Under the Values Act, certain agencies are required to adopt those policies, and the other entities are encouraged to adopt them. Would the provisions of this bill take precedence over compliance with the policies generated by the Attorney General if there was a conflict between the policies developed by the Attorney General and the provisions of this bill?

Expressly amending the Values Act would provide legislators and the public clarity about how the provisions of this bill are intended to interact with current law.

- 4) **The Language in This Bill Prohibiting a State or Local Agency From Assisting Immigration Enforcement is Quite Broad:** This bill specifies that a “state or local agency shall not arrest or assist with the arrest, confinement, detention, transfer, interrogation, or deportation of an individual for an immigration enforcement purpose in any manner, . . .”

To “assist an immigration enforcement purpose in any manner” covers a wide range of behavior, including making information available. That language is broad enough that a state and local agency will need to evaluate whether any action it engages in might assist in immigration enforcement, regardless of whether the action might have a policy purpose unconnected to immigration enforcement. Any information that a state or local agency shares with a federal entity makes it likely that such information would be accessible by federal immigration authorities. It could be difficult for a state or local agency determine if any information shared with federal agency might “assist” an immigration enforcement purpose leading to an interrogation, detention, or ultimately deportation. State and local agencies would face a similar problem with information that is available to the public either via a website or through a public records request. If such information could assist with immigration enforcement, should the state or local agency release such information? This bill would expose any state or local agency to civil liability if the agency assists immigration enforcement in any manner.

- 5) **Lawsuit Challenging the Values ACT (U.S. v. California):** The federal government filed suit in federal court to challenge the Values Act asserting that the Values Act was preempted and violated the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution because the Values Act constituted an “obstacle” to federal immigration enforcement.

A 2019 decision by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeal upheld the legitimacy of the Values act. (*US v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865.) The U.S. Supreme Court subsequently declined the opportunity to review the case. The case was first heard in federal district court. The District Court held that the Values Act was not preempted by federal law:

“California's decision not to assist federal immigration enforcement in its endeavors is not an ‘obstacle’ to that enforcement effort. [The United States'] argument that SB 54 makes immigration enforcement far more burdensome begs the question: more burdensome than what? The laws make enforcement more burdensome than it would be if state and local law enforcement provided immigration officers with their assistance. But refusing to help is not the same as impeding. If such were the rule, obstacle preemption could be used to commandeer state resources and subvert Tenth Amendment principles.” (*California I*, 314 F. Supp. 3d at 1104.)

The case was appealed to the 9th District Court of Appeal which upheld the decision of the district court regarding the Values Act. The 9th District Court of Appeal stated, “Even if SB 54 obstructs federal immigration enforcement, the United States' position that such obstruction is unlawful runs directly afoul of the Tenth Amendment and the anticommandeering rule.” (*U.S. v. California*, at 888.)

The United States' primary argument against SB 54 was that it forces federal authorities to expend greater resources to enforce immigration laws. However, the 9th District Court of Appeal found that would be the case regardless of SB 54, since California would still retain the ability to decline to administer the federal program under the anticommandeering rule. Under the anticommandeering rule Congress cannot issue direct orders to state legislatures and permits a state to refuse to adopt federal policies. The court held that even in the absence of SB 54, Congress could not “impress into its service—and at no cost to itself—the police officers of the 50 States.” (*Id.* at 889.)

The 9th District Court of Appeal noted that:

“Federal schemes are inevitably frustrated when states opt not to participate in federal programs or enforcement efforts. But the choice of a state to refrain from participation cannot be invalid under the doctrine of obstacle preemption where, as here, it retains the right of refusal. Extending conflict or obstacle preemption to SB 54 would, in effect, ‘dictate[] what a state legislature may and may not do,’ *Murphy*, 138 S. Ct. at 1478, because it would imply that a state's otherwise lawful decision *not* to assist federal authorities is made unlawful when it is codified as state law.” (*Id.* at 890.)

This bill would expand on the scope of the Values Act by extending the prohibition on cooperation with immigration authorities to all state and local agencies. The reasoning behind the 9th District's holding in *U.S. v. California* would likely continue to apply to the expansion in scope. However, this bill potentially conflicts with existing federal statutes require specific types of communication on immigration status to be exchanged between immigration authorities and state and local entities.

The Values Act specifically allowed law enforcement to comply with two federal statutes related to immigration enforcement. (8 U.S.C. 1373, subd. (a), and 8 U.S.C. 1644.) These statutes prohibit a state and local government from in any way restricting, any government

entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any individual.

As part of its challenge to the Values Act, the United States contended that 8 U.S.C. 1373 directly prohibits the information-sharing restrictions of the Values Act. The 9th Circuit Court of appeal disagreed and noted that the Values Act expressly *permits* the sharing of such information, and so does not appear to conflict with [Section 1373](#).

This bill does not specifically reference those federal statutes or the sections of the Values Act concerning those statutes. Therefore, to the extent the Values Act continues to have effect beyond the enactment of this bill, perhaps law enforcement agencies would still be allowed to comply with those federal statutes. This bill does not provide an exception allowing state and local agencies (including law enforcement) to comply with those federal statutes if such compliance would otherwise be prohibited by this bill.

The prohibitions in this bill on state and local agencies actions that assist in immigration enforcement would seem to include a prohibition on sending any information to immigration authorities if it would assist in immigration enforcement. Without express provisions allowing state and local agencies to comply with those federal statutes, it does seem more likely that a court could find that this bill is in conflict with, and preempted by, federal law.

- 6) **Argument in Support:** According to the *Initiate Justice*, "When California's jails and prisons voluntarily and unnecessarily transfer immigrant and refugee community members eligible for release from state or local custody to ICE for immigration detention and deportation purposes, they subject these community members to double punishment and perpetual trauma. Community members can be incarcerated by ICE, often for prolonged periods and with no right to bail, and deported--permanently banishing them from the country, from their families, their homes, their livelihoods.

"As the state with the largest immigrant community in the country, California has an ethical and moral obligation to step up our leadership and take action to protect the rights of all refugees and immigrants who call California home, including those eligible for release from our local jails and state prisons. If we fail to end the cruel practice of ICE transfers, California will continue to actively participate in the separation of immigrant and refugee families, and inflict irreparable harm to those who came here fleeing war and genocide or to simply build a better life for themselves and their children.

"Moreover, state and local participation in federal immigration enforcement programs has raised constitutional concerns, including arrests and detentions that violate the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and that target immigrants on the basis of race or ethnicity in violation of the Equal Protection Clause.

"Transferring California residents to ICE custody is costly. By ending voluntary ICE transfers, California stands to save state resources that can be invested in mental health, housing, youth development, and access to living wages-- all of which have been proven to reduce crime and stabilize communities.

"In conclusion, California should not subject community members to double punishment, and disregard their record of rehabilitation, stable reentry plans, and community support,

purely because they are refugees or immigrants. Ending ICE transfers in California is a necessary step in fulfilling the state's commitment to ending racial injustice and mass incarceration."

- 7) **Argument in Opposition:** According to the *Peace Officers Research Association of California*, "AB 937 would prohibit any state or local agency from arresting or assisting with the arrest, confinement, detention, transfer, interrogation, or deportation of an individual for an immigration enforcement purposes. The bill would additionally prohibit state or local agencies or courts from using immigration status as a factor to deny or to recommend denial of probation or participation in any diversion, rehabilitation, mental health program, or placement in a credit-earning program or class, or to determine custodial classification level, to deny mandatory supervision, or to lengthen the portion of supervision served in custody.

"Congress defined our nation's immigration laws in the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), which contains both criminal and civil enforcement measures. PORAC cannot support a State bill that forces our States public safety officers to stand by while our federal counterparts are injured or killed in the performance of their duties. In addition, if the federal government requires our involvement, such as temporarily housing an undocumented arrestee, then it is our responsibility to adhere to the needs of the federal government. This proposed legislation puts local law enforcement in a no-win situation, having to choose between state and federal laws."

- 8) **Related Legislation:** AB 263 (Bonta), would specify that private detention centers are subject to state and local health orders. AB 263 is on the Assembly Floor.
- 9) **Prior Legislation:**
- a) AB 2596 (Bonta), of the 2019-2020 Legislative Session, would have eliminated the existing ability for law enforcement agencies to cooperate with federal immigration authorities by giving them notification of release for inmates or facilitating inmate transfers. AB 2596 was never heard in Assembly Public Safety.
 - b) AB 2948 (Allen), of the 2017-2018 Legislative Session, would have repealed the California Values Act SB 54, which defines the circumstances under which law enforcement agencies may assist in the enforcement of federal immigration laws and participate in joint law enforcement task forces. AB 2948 failed passage in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.
 - c) AB 2931 (Patterson), of the 2017-2018 Legislative Session, would have expanded the list of qualifying criminal convictions which permit law enforcement to cooperate with federal immigration authorities. AB 2931 failed passage in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.
 - d) AB 298 (Gallagher), of the 2017-2018 Legislative Session, would have repealed the TRUST Act and required law enforcement to cooperate with federal immigration by detaining an individual convicted of a felony for up to 48 hours on an immigration hold, as specified, after the person became eligible for release from custody. AB 298 failed passage in this committee.

- e) AB 1252 (Allen), of the 2017-2018 Legislative Session, would have repealed the TRUST Act and prohibited state grants to county and local “sanctuary jurisdictions.” AB 1252 failed passage in this committee.
- f) SB 54 (De Leon), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017, limited the involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in federal immigration enforcement.
- g) AB 2792 (Bonta), Chapter 768, Statutes of 2016, requires local law enforcement agencies to provide copies of specified documentation received from ICE to the individual in custody and to notify the individual regarding the intent of the agency to comply with ICE requests.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Alliance for Boys and Men of Color (Co-Sponsor)
 Alliance San Diego (Co-Sponsor)
 Asian Americans Advancing Justice - California (Co-Sponsor)
 Asian Prisoner Support Committee (Co-Sponsor)
 California Coalition for Women Prisoners (Co-Sponsor)
 California Immigrant Policy Center (Co-Sponsor)
 Center for Empowering Refugees and Immigrants (Co-Sponsor)
 Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ) (Co-Sponsor)
 Community United Against Violence (Co-Sponsor)
 Freedom for Immigrants (Co-Sponsor)
 Ice Out of Marin (Co-Sponsor)
 Immigrant Legal Resource Center (Co-Sponsor)
 Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice (Co-Sponsor)
 Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity (Co-Sponsor)
 Legal Services for Prisoners With Children (Co-Sponsor)
 Long Beach Immigrant Rights Coalition (Co-Sponsor)
 Orange County Rapid Response Network (Co-Sponsor)
 Re:store Justice (Co-Sponsor)
 Santa Barbara County Action Network (Co-Sponsor)
 Secure Justice (Co-Sponsor)
 South Bay People Power (Co-Sponsor)
 The Orange County Justice Fund (Co-Sponsor)
 Vietrise (Co-Sponsor)
 Young Women's Freedom Center (Co-Sponsor)
 Youth Justice Coalition (Co-Sponsor)
 Alianza
 Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE) Action
 American Civil Liberties Union/northern California/southern California/san Diego and Imperial Counties
 Asian Solidarity Collective
 Buen Vecino
 Buena Vista United Methodist Church Immigration Committee

California Public Defenders Association (CPDA)
California United for A Responsible Budget (CURB)
Californiahealth+ Advocates
Californians for Safety and Justice
Church World Service
Community Justice Exchange
Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
Contra Costa Immigrant Rights Alliance
Courage California
Critical Resistance
Drug Policy Alliance
East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC)
Equal Rights Advocates
Filipino Migrant Center
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Hope for All: Helping Others Prosper Economically
Human Impact Partners
Human Rights Watch
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Immigrant Defense Advocates
Indivisible Sausalito
Initiate Justice
Irvine United Congregational Church -- Advocates for Peace and Justice
Kehilla Community Synagogue
Khmer Girls in Action
Lakeshore Avenue Baptist Church
Long Beach Southeast Asian Anti-deportation Collective
Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project (MICOP)
Network in Solidarity With the People of Guatemala
New Bridges Presbyterian Church
Nikkei Progressives
No New Sf Jail Coalition
Norcal Resist
Oakland Privacy
Or Shalom Jewish Community
Orange County Equality Coalition
Pangea Legal Services
Pico California
Pillars of The Community
San Diego; County of
San Francisco Peninsula People Power
San Francisco Public Defender
Showing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ) San Diego
Showing Up for Racial Justice North County
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
Surj Contra Costa County
Surj San Mateo

Survived and Punished
Team Justice
Think Dignity
UC Berkeley's Underground Scholars Initiative (USI)
Uncommon Law
Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Redwood City, Social Action Committee
Viet Rainbow of Orange County
We the People - San Diego
Woman INC
Women for American Values and Ethics Action Fund
Women For: Orange County

Oppose

California Police Chiefs Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)

Analysis Prepared by: David Billingsley / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744