

1 [Administrative Code - Restrictions on Use of City Property]

2
3 **Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to prohibit the use of City property**
4 **without the City's authorization, except for uses traditionally available to the public**
5 **without authorization; prohibit any City official or employee from authorizing the use of**
6 **City property if that use would disrupt City operations or discourage access to City**
7 **services, unless the use furthers a City purpose; stating that civil immigration**
8 **enforcement is not a City purpose; and authorizing the City Attorney to bring a cause**
9 **of action against anyone that uses City property for an unlawful or unauthorized**
10 **purpose.**

11 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
12 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
13 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
14 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
15 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
16 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
17 subsections or parts of tables.

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

19 Section 1. Findings.

20 As set forth in the preamble to the City Charter, the City's mission is to improve the
21 quality of urban life; to encourage the participation of all persons and all sectors in the affairs
22 of the City; to enable municipal government to meet the needs of the people effectively and
23 efficiently; to provide for accountability and ethics in public service; to foster social harmony
24 and cohesion; and to assure equality of opportunity for every resident.

25 To further this mission, the City invests in and maintains substantial resources,
including real and personal property, to support and administer duly authorized public
programs such as health care, education, transportation, emergency response, housing,

1 public safety, workforce and business development, and other essential municipal services.
2 City facilities are critical access points relied upon by all residents, and preserving their safety,
3 accessibility, and operational continuity, is a matter of practical necessity and fiscal
4 responsibility.

5 City law has long prohibited City officials from using City resources to assist in the
6 enforcement of federal immigration laws, except in narrowly defined circumstances.
7 Consistent with the City's mission, the purpose of that prohibition is to encourage the
8 participation of all persons in the affairs of the City. To investigate and solve crimes, fight
9 fires, provide emergency assistance, and deliver comprehensive public health programs,
10 among other things, the City needs the cooperation and involvement of all City residents,
11 regardless of citizenship status. If the City were to assist with the enforcement of federal
12 immigration laws, including permitting the use of City property to conduct enforcement, it
13 would unquestionably discourage that critical cooperation and involvement.

14 Substantial evidence from major cities across the country demonstrates that recent
15 surges in immigration enforcement activity discourage participation in the affairs of those
16 cities, which disrupts municipal operations, creates public health and safety risks, and
17 depresses commercial activity. National surveys conducted by the Urban Institute found that
18 roughly one in six adults in immigrant families avoided public programs or facilities because of
19 immigration-related fears. Community-based organizations in cities experiencing recent
20 immigration raids have reported reduced engagement in public life, with many residents
21 unwilling to access essential services such as health care, libraries, and workforce centers, as
22 well as public events.

23 In Southern California, following reports of increased immigration enforcement activity
24 near medical sites, health clinics reported no-show rates climbing from approximately 9% to
25 more than 30 % with residents skipping medical appointments, vaccinations, and pharmacy

1 visits. Los Angeles County's main hospital reported that even threats of enforcement activity
2 near the hospital discouraged access and thereby jeopardized community health. Also in Los
3 Angeles County, St. John's Community Health, a major nonprofit health-care provider,
4 reported that immigration enforcement activity at a mobile clinic site caused immediate service
5 interruptions.

6 Schools and programs serving youth have recently experienced similar disruptions. In
7 Los Angeles, following reports of increased immigration enforcement near campuses, families
8 avoided school events, including graduation ceremonies. In Chicago, federal activity near
9 public school facilities prompted school lockdowns and the suspension of after-school
10 activities, as families reported fear and confusion about the presence of federal agents on or
11 near school campuses. At Chicago's Funston Elementary School, students on the playground
12 were rushed inside after federal agents deployed tear gas across the street, and recess was
13 canceled for the day.

14 The Economic Policy Institute reported that intensified immigration enforcement
15 increases workplace disruptions, employee turnover, and uncertainty for employers, with
16 adverse spillover effects on local economies that depend on a stable workforce and consumer
17 spending. A July 2025 study found that in California, recent surges in immigration
18 enforcement had caused a sharper decline in workforce participation than any event in the
19 past 40 years other than the Great Recession of 2008-09 and the COVID-19 pandemic. In
20 Washington, D.C., officials observed that workers in neighborhoods impacted by increased
21 immigration enforcement stopped reporting to job sites, adversely affecting the hospitality
22 industry, tourism, and construction. These burdens translate into lost productivity for workers
23 and businesses, and fiscal strain for local jurisdictions.

24 Recent increases in enforcement activity also have carried economic and operational
25 consequences for local business owners, and ultimately local governments. News reports

1 from Chicago's Little Village and Back of the Yards neighborhoods have documented
2 merchants locking their doors and shortening their hours during enforcement sweeps, leading
3 to losses in sales, local tax receipts, and neighborhood vitality. In Los Angeles County,
4 federal immigration actions destabilized businesses and disrupted county service delivery,
5 leading the Board of Supervisors to declare a Local Emergency and to allocate resources to
6 restore community access and economic stability.

7 Immigration enforcement on City property also generates acute public-safety risks.
8 The City has devoted substantial resources to enhancing public safety and as a result has
9 seen a recent 30% drop in crime. Effective public safety requires the cooperation of all City
10 residents, one third of whom are immigrants. The City's efforts to reduce crime and protect
11 public safety will be undermined if federal officers are operating on City property, blurring the
12 lines between local policing and immigration enforcement, and thereby discouraging
13 cooperation with local law enforcement.

14 The ordinance is not intended to and does not amend any existing City laws governing
15 permitting or licensing of City property. The ordinance is not intended to and does not
16 interfere with or obstruct lawful immigration enforcement. Federal immigration enforcement
17 officers regularly carry out immigration enforcement in the City. The purpose of this ordinance
18 is to preserve City resources for programs and services that further the City's mission and to
19 ensure that the use of City property does not undermine that mission by discouraging
20 residents' participation in the City's affairs.

21 City Departments are encouraged to provide training to their employees on the scope
22 and limits of this ordinance.

23
24 Section 2. Chapter 4 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising
25 Section 4.19 to read as follows:

1 **SEC. 4.19. USE OF CITY PROPERTY.**

2 (a) No person or entity may use ~~Real~~ and personal property belonging to, or subject
3 to the control of, any City and County department, board, commission, or ~~other~~ authority
4 (hereinafter "the City") unless the use shall only be used to advance or promote public programs
5 or other purposes authorized by the City and the City has ~~which have been duly~~ authorized the use by
6 the appropriate public agency.

7 (b) No City official, employee, department, board, commission, or other authority shall
8 authorize the use of any real or personal property subject to the control or jurisdiction of the City if the
9 use will disrupt City operations or discourage access to City services, unless the use furthers a City
10 purpose.

11 (c) The use of real or personal property to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration
12 law is not a City purpose.

13 (d) The use of real or personal property shall mean the right to occupy or use the property,
14 to the exclusion of others, and shall include but not be limited to a license, permit to enter, use permit,
15 or other similar instrument. It shall not mean non-exclusive access or use of the City's property
16 traditionally open and available to the public where that access or use is on the same terms as
17 members of the public and does not disrupt City operations.

18 (e) Upon finding that a City and County official or employee has engaged in
19 activities prohibited by this Section 4.19, that official or employee shall be subject to
20 disciplinary action in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Charter.

21 (f) Nothing in this Section 4.19 shall be construed to interfere with or inhibit any exercise
22 of the constitutionally protected rights of freedom of speech or assembly or to prevent the use of, or
23 access to, City property as required by law.

24 (g) The City Attorney is authorized to bring a cause of action against any person or entity
25 that violates this Section 4.19 by using City property for an unlawful or unauthorized purpose.

1
2 Section 3. No Conflict with Federal or State Law. Nothing in this ordinance shall be
3 interpreted or applied to create any requirement, power, or duty in conflict with any federal or
4 state law.

5
6 Section 4. No Conflict with Existing Property Interest or Agreements. Nothing in this
7 ordinance shall be interpreted or applied to affect or interfere with any property interest or
8 agreement, including but not limited to amendments to those agreements, deeds, easements,
9 leases, licenses, or permits, to occupy or use City real or personal property that is entered into
10 or effective before the effective date of this ordinance.

11
12 Section 5. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
13 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
14 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
15 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
16 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under
17 the official title of the ordinance.

18
19 Section 6. Undertaking for the General Welfare. In enacting and implementing this
20 ordinance, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. It is not
21 assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an obligation for breach of which it
22 is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused
23 injury.

24
25 Section 7. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word

1 of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be
2 invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision
3 shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance. The
4 Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each and
5 every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or
6 unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application
7 thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

8
9 Section 8. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
10 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
11 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
12 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

13
14 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
15 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

16 By: /s/
17 JANA CLARK
18 Deputy City Attorney

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
k:\jclark\ord draft 15 limits on use of city property .docx



City and County of San Francisco

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Tails
Ordinance

File Number: 251224

Date Passed: February 24, 2026

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to prohibit the use of City property without the City's authorization, except for uses traditionally available to the public without authorization; prohibit any City official or employee from authorizing the use of City property if that use would disrupt City operations or discourage access to City services, unless the use furthers a City purpose; stating that civil immigration enforcement is not a City purpose; and authorizing the City Attorney to bring a cause of action against anyone that uses City property for an unlawful or unauthorized purpose.

February 09, 2026 Rules Committee - RECOMMENDED AS COMMITTEE REPORT

February 10, 2026 Board of Supervisors - PASSED ON FIRST READING

Ayes: 11 - Chan, Chen, Dorsey, Fielder, Mahmood, Mandelman, Melgar, Sauter, Sherrill, Walton and Wong

February 24, 2026 Board of Supervisors - FINALLY PASSED

Ayes: 11 - Chan, Chen, Dorsey, Fielder, Mahmood, Mandelman, Melgar, Sauter, Sherrill, Walton and Wong

File No. 251224

I hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was FINALLY PASSED on 2/24/2026 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

[Signature]
Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

[Signature]
Daniel Lurie
Mayor

2 | 27 | 26
Date Approved