File No.	160022	Committee Item No.	1
<del>-</del>		Board Item No.	17

### **COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee:	Public Safety and Neighborhood Services	Date <sub>.</sub>	April 7, 2016	
Board of Supervisors Meeting Cmte Board		Date .	MAY 10, 2016	
	Motion Resolution Ordinance Legislative Digest Budget and Legislative Analyst Report Youth Commission Report Introduction Form Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Re MOU Grant Information Form Grant Budget Subcontract Budget Contract/Agreement Form 126 – Ethics Commission Award Letter Application Public Correspondence	eport		
OTHER	(Use back side if additional space is neede	ed)		
	Referral FYI - 01/20/2016 Referral YC - 02/12/2016 Response YC - 02/18/2016 Referral FYI Substitute - 03/29/2016 Presidential Transfer Memo - 03/30/2016			
Completed by: Erica Major Date April 1, 2016 Completed by: Date 4 In you C				

[Administrative Code - Due Process for All and Sanctuary]

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 felony and held to answer for a

NOTE:

violent felony.

Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font.

Additions to Codes are in single-underline italics Times New Roman font.

Deletions to Codes are in strikethrough italics Times New Roman font.

Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.

Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font.

Asterisks (\* \* \* \*) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

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 12I.1, 12I.2, 12I.3, and 12I.4 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 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 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 Adminstrative Code

Section 12I.3.

- (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, except as permitted under Adminstrative Code Section 12I.3, 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 121. 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") shiftsed the burden of federal civil immigration enforcement onto local law enforcement. S-Comm comes came into operation after the state sends sent fingerprints that state and local law enforcement agencies haved transmitted to the California Department of Justice ("Cal DOJ") to positively identify the arrestees and to check their criminal history. The FBI would forwards 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 sends 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 <u>and issued by a neutral</u> magistrate, there <u>isare</u> no such requirements for the issuance of a civil immigration detainer. At

1

least one Several federal courts in Indiana has ye 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. III. 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 doesid 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. Other 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 <u>to</u> <u>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 haved a U.S. citizen spouse or child. Complying with civil immigration detainers thus resultsed in the deportation of potential aspiring U.S. citizens.

According to the 2011 Warren Institute Study, Latinos makede 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 hasd a disproportionate impact on Latinos.</u>

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:

- $(\pm \underline{a})$  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.
- $(\underline{\mathfrak{Z}}\underline{c})$  The individual has served all the time required for his or her sentence.
- $(4\underline{d})$  The individual has posted a bond, or has been released on his or her own recognizance.
  - $(\underline{\mathfrak{z}}\underline{e})$  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-cight* (48) hours, *excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays,* and advise the authorized federal immigration officer prior to the release of that individual.

"Convicted" means <u>the</u> 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.

"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.

#### 121.3. 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 <u>and may respond to a federal immigration officer's notification request</u> if <u>the continued</u> <u>detention is consistent with state and federal law, and</u> 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 <u>or notification request</u>; 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 <u>or respond to a notification request</u> 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) 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.
- (ed) 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. 12I.4. PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER.

The intent of this Chapter <u>121</u> is to address requests for non-mandatory civil immigration detainers, <u>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, <u>notification of release of individuals</u>, <u>transmission of personal information, or civil immigration documents, based solely on alleged violations of the civil provisions of immigration laws</u>. 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.</u>

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

?5

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:

Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2015\1600286\01073298.doc

#### **REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST**

(3/22/2016, Substituted)

[Administrative Code - Due Process for All and Sanctuary]

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 felony and held to answer for a violent felony.

#### **Existing Law**

Administrative Code Chapter 12I prohibits detaining individuals on the basis of a Federal civil immigration detainer unless that individual has been convicted of a violent felony in the seven years prior and has been held to answer for a violent felony. Administrative Code Chapter 12H prohibits the use of City funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law or to gather or disseminate information regarding immigration, except under certain exceptions. Law enforcement officials may identify and report adults booked for a felony and suspected of violating the civil immigration laws, and juveniles with sustained felony petitions or tried as adults and suspected of violating the civil immigration laws. In addition, Administrative Code Chapter 12H allows City officials to; (1) report adults with prior felony convictions who have been booked into county jail; (2) cooperate with Federal immigration authorities requests for information for adults with prior felony conviction; or (3) report as required by state or federal law those adults with prior felony convictions.

#### Amendments to Current Law

This Ordinance would amend Administrative Code Chapters 12H and 12I to prohibit the use of City funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of Federal immigration law or to gather or disseminate information regarding immigration or release status, except for individuals who have been convicted of a violent felony and held to answer for a violent felony.

n:\legana\as2016\1600286\01073938.doc



Afcelver VIA BUALL ATRIL 7, 2016 FILE NO. 160022

# **City and County of San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department**

ALLEN A. NANCE
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

375 WOODSIDE AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127 (415) 753-7556

April 7, 2016

Erica Major
Assistant Committee Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

re: BOS FILE 160022 re: Administrative Code - Due Process for All and Sanctuary

Dear Ms. Major:

Please find below comments from the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department regarding BOS File #160022:

- 1. As written, we believe that 12I.3 does not permit the Juvenile Probation Department to enforce federal immigration law since the term "Convicted of a Violent Felony" does not apply to juvenile cases which are civil court and not criminal court matters. Further, the clause that references "... and held to answer for a violent felony" would be applicable if the word "or" was used in place of the word "and."
- 2. As a matter of clarification, the criminal conduct alleged in these juvenile matters carries the same weight and impact on victims and public safety as those incidents committed by adult offenders. At the same time, the legislature and the People view juvenile offenders and adult offenders dissimilarly in many respects. If this distinction should be extended to matters of immigration as well, the language in the ordinance should be explicit to exclude the inclusion of juvenile court matters involving violent felonies where the minor is not held at the detention hearing and no sustained felony is found by the juvenile court.

Please do not hesitate to contact my office should more clarification be necessary.

Sincerely,

Allen A. Nance

Chief Probation Officer

1516-RBM-19

(415) 554-6446 (415) 554-6140 FAX www.sfgov.org/youth\_commission

#### Youth Commission

City Hall ~ Room 345 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4532



# YOUTH COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

TO:

Erica Major, Committee Clerk, Public Safety & Neighborhood Services

Committee

FROM:

Youth Commission

DATE:

Thursday, February 18, 2016

RE:

Referral response to BOS Files No. 160022

At our **Tuesday**, **February 16**, **2016 meeting**, the Youth Commission voted to unanimously support the following motion:

To support BOS File No. 160022—Ordinance amending Administrative Code, Chapter 12I, to prohibit law enforcement officials from responding to a federal immigration officer's request for voluntary notification that a person will be released from local custody, except for adults who have been convicted of a violent felony and held to answer for a violent felony.

\*\*\*

Youth Commissioners thank the Board of Supervisors for their attention to issue. If you have any questions, please contact our office at (415) 554-6446, or your Youth Commissioner.

Chair, Luis Avalos-Nunez

Adopted on February 16, 2016

2015-2016 San Francisco Youth Commission



# San Francisco Sheriff's Department

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

AFFERDED TO IN CUM MITTEE 4/7/2016 FILE NO.160027

March 11, 2016 Reference: 2016-037

To:

All Personnel

From:

Sheriff Vicki L. Hennessy Light of Hannessy

Re:

SFSD Central Warrant Bureau Confirmation of Warrants in the Criminal

Data Base – General ICE Warrants – Criminal and Civil in the Criminal

Justice Data Base - Specific

San Francisco Sheriff's Central Warrant Bureau is responsible for verifying criminal and traffic warrants from all local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. When we receive a request from a law enforcement officer on a specific subject, we either confirm or do not confirm the warrant for booking. The warrant clerk is always required to contact the issuing agency and ask for additional information to make sure the officer has the right person. Once a criminal warrant is confirmed for booking it is up to the arresting agency to book the individual on the warrant at the county jail. The SFSD clerk confirming the warrant does not have the authority to tell the officer to either book or not book.

#### Immigration and Custom Enforcement (ICE) Warrants

It has recently come to my attention that the majority of warrants from ICE entered into the Criminal Justice Data Base are **not** actually criminal warrants. Most appear in the system with no charges attached to the warrant and say "deported criminal", "aggravated felon" or "failure to appear for removal". These are, in effect, "administrative" warrants and are another method of requesting a civil detainer of the subject, which is not allowed by the San Francisco Due Process for All Ordinance. There are also some "criminal" warrants which are to be confirmed for booking according to established procedure.

Therefore, when asked to query the criminal justice data base to confirm an ICE warrant, CWB will follow these guidelines:

- 1. Contact the ICE confirmation phone number per procedure to make the usual inquiries.
- 2. Confirm the warrant as either criminal or administrative.
  - a. If the warrant returns as a **criminal warrant**, follow established procedure for criminal warrant confirmations.

- b. If the warrant comes back as a **civil or administrative warrant**, inform the requesting party that while it is confirmed, it is a civil warrant and will not be accepted for booking at the San Francisco County Jail.
  - CWB staff will hot print any relevant information. CWB will print out the NCIC hit and immediately copy the clerk's log sheet into an ICE file.
  - ii. The information will be scanned into an ICE folder and maintained on the shared drive.
- 3. Booking staff at County Jail #1 presented with a civil or administrative ICE warrant for booking from any agency, will refuse the arrest and document such refusal. This does not apply to criminal ICE warrants that have been confirmed.

I have attached examples of both a criminal ICE warrant and two civil/administrative ICE warrants to assist you in the determination.

If there are any discrepancies or questions not covered by this directive, please contact Sheriff's Legal through the Central Warrant Bureau emergency notification process at: (415) 558-2411.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

## SAMPLE RESPONSE FROM NCIC INQUIRY: ADMINISTRATIVE (CIVIL) WARRANTS

#### Administrative Warrant of Removal:

WARRING RECARDING FORLOWING PRESERV FURILIZED OF NYC/NJ07770847 HAS AN CHISTANDING ACHINISTRATIVE WARRART OF RENOVAL FROM THE UNITED GYATES. CONTACT LESC

AT (877) 999-5372 FOR IMMEDIATE HIT CONFIRMATION AND AVAILABILITY OF BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS EMPORCEMENT DEPAIDED.

#### Administrative Warrant of Arrests

\*\*\*\*\* END OF IMMIGRATION VIGHTOR FILE RESPONSE\*\*\*\*\*

NARNING BECARDING TOLLOWING RECORD—PROJECT OF NIC/MROTTOBAY RAB AN OUTSTANDING ADMINISTRATIVE WASHRING OF ARREST FOR IMMIGRATION VIOLATIONS FOR FAILURE TO COMPAN AITH WATTERED SECURITY REGIGERATION. CONTACT LESC AT (877) 999-5372 FOR IMMEDIATE HIT COMPRENATION AND AVAILABILITY OF BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOME EMPORCEMENT DETAINER.

#### SAMPLE RESPONSE FROM NCIC INQUIRY: CRIMINAL ICE WARRANT

#### One Example of a Criminal Warrant

\*\*\*MESSAGE KEY ZW SEARCHES WANTED PERSON FILE FELONY RECORDS REGARDLESS OF EXTRADITION AND MISDEMEANOR RECORDS INDICATING POSSIBLE INTERSTATE EXTRADITION FROM THE INQUIRING AGENCY'S LOCATION. ALL OTHER NCIC PERSONS FILES ARE SEARCHED WITHOUT LIMITATIONS. MKE/WANTED PERSON EXL/1 - FULL EXTRADITION UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED IN THE MIS FIELD ORI/VTICE0900 NAM/TEST, TEST SEX/M RAC/W POB/EY DOB/19000101 HGT/509 WGT/175 EYE/BRO HAI/BLK MNU/PP-1234567 SOC/123456789 OFF/FRAUD - FALSE STATEMENT DOW/20090114 OCA/2-M-TEST VLD/20120411 MIS/CRIMINAL WARRANT IN VIOLATION OF TITLE 18 USC, SECTION 1542, FALSE STATEMENT MIS/ON A PASSPORT APPLICATION: ISSUED BY THE U S DISTRICT COURT, MASTERN MIB/DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA DNA/N ORI IS ICE LESC 802 872-6020 DOB/19730515 AKA/TESTER, TEST AKA/ALPHA, BET MNU/PP-5678943 800/9854321 NIC/W123456789 DTB/20090115 1510 EST DLU/20120411 1301 EST IMMED CONFIRM WARRANT AND EXTRADITION WITH ORI

Again, members shall continue to act upon <u>eriminal</u> warrants entered by ICB into NCIC pursuant to relevant directives (e.g., G.O. 302.06, WALES).

FILE NO. 160027-JUBAN MED + PRESENTENO



### **DEPARTMENT BULLETIN**

.4 7 July A 16-015-02/08/16

#### **Enforcement of Immigration Laws**

Members are reminded that it is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department to foster trust and cooperation with all people of this City and to encourage them to communicate with San Francisco police officers without fear of inquiry regarding their immigration status. It is also Department policy, consistent with its obligations under state and federal law, to adhere to the City of Refuge Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 12H.2-1. This ordinance prohibits the use of City resources to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration laws except in certain limited circumstances.

In accordance with the City of Refuge Ordinance and state law, members of the Department shall adhere to the following:

- DETENTION/DOCUMENTS. Members shall not stop, question, or detain any
  individual solely because of the individual's national origin, foreign appearance,
  inability to speak English, or immigration status (also see DGO 5.03, Investigative
  Detentions). The mere presence of so called "illegal aliens" is not a criminal offense.
  - a. In the course of their duties, e.g., traffic enforcement, investigations, taking reports, officers shall not ask for documents regarding an individual's immigration status.
- 2. ASSISTING THE INS. (U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT-ICE) Members shall not enforce immigration laws or assist the INS (ICE) in the enforcement of immigration laws.

Per DB 15-141, both sworn and non-sworn members are required to electronically acknowledge this Department Bulletin in HRMS.

GREGORY P. SUHR Chief of Police



## **DEPARTMENT BULLETIN**

A 16-048 04/01/16

#### Prohibition on the Enforcement of Administrative Immigration Warrants

Members are reminded that it is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department to foster trust and cooperation with all people of this City and to encourage them to communicate with San Francisco police officers without fear of inquiry regarding their immigration status. It is also Department policy (DGO 5.15 and reminder DB 16-015), consistent with its obligations under state and federal law, to adhere to the City of Refuge Ordinance, pursuant to SF Administrative Code §12H.2-1. This ordinance prohibits the use of City resources to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration laws except in certain limited circumstances.

One of those limited circumstances allows for the enforcement of federal <u>criminal</u> warrants for arrest. Federal <u>administrative (civil)</u> warrants are not to be enforced and will not be accepted by San Francisco Sheriff's Department personnel at CJ1. NCIC warrant responses will make clear whether the warrant is civil or criminal.

"Administrative Warrant of Removal" warrants shall not be enforced.

"Administrative Warrant of Arrest" warrants shall not be enforced.

"Criminal Warrant in violation of Title 18 USC, Section XXX." may be enforced (see DGO 6.18)

Attached are samples of NCIC print-outs of both administrative (civil) and criminal warrants that were provided for your reference by the SFSD.

Per DB 15-141, sworn members are required to electronically acknowledge this Department Bulletin in HRMS.

GREGORY P. SUHR Chief of Police

#### sample response from ncic inquiry: administrative (civil) Warrants

#### Administrative Worrant of Removals

BARGADO RECABULAD PACANTAS TAGERD - ECOLOT OF FIC/SIO7778647 HAS AN ONISTANDING MINISTEATIVE WARPART OF REMOVAL TROM THE UNITED GRATES.
CONTROL LESC.

at (BIT) 999-5371 for immeliate hit completeles and adapmentity of Supper of incidention and custome entorcement devaluer.

#### Administrative Warrant of Arrests

DERNING PROCESSIVE TRACESSION FROM THE OF ARREST OF MIC/HODTFORMY HAS AN CHIEFLANDING ADMINISTRATIVE WARRANT OF ARREST FOR INTIGRATION VIOLATIONS FOR FAILURE TO CHIEFF THE MINISTRATION BUILDWARMS DESCRIPTION AND LABORATE HER CORRESPONDED LABORATION AND CHIEFFANT OF MERCHAN OF INSIGNATION AND CHICAGO AND C

EMPLICATION VIOLATION - EXTINGL SECTIFF REGISTRATION

DELIVITED SOCIETY AND STRIBED CALIFORD CIZIFF STRIPE

HOSTIGO OF AND

HOSTIGORD

CONTROLORD

CON

#### SAMPLE RESPONSE FROM NCIC INQUIRY: CRIMINAL ICE WARRANT

#### One Example of a <u>Criminal</u> Warrant

\*\*\*\*MESCAGE KEY ZW SEARCHES WANTED PERSON FILE PELONY RECORDS REGARDLESS OF EXTRADITION AND MISDEMEANOR RECORDS INDICATING POSSIBLE INTERSTATE EXTRADITION FROM THE INQUIENCA RESERVES LOCATION. ALL OTHER NCIC PERSONS PILES ARE SEARCHED WITHOUT LIMITATIONS.

MKE/MANTED PERSON

EXL/1 - FULL EXTRADITION UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED IN THE MIS FIELD OFLYTICESSOO NAM/TEST, THST SEX/M RAC/M POS/EY

DOB/126900 NAM/TEST, THST SEX/M RAC/M POS/EY

DOB/12690114 NGT/505 WGT/175 EYE/BRO HAI/BLK

EKM/LOT

MMU/PP-1234867 SOC/123486789

OFF/FRAUD - FALSE STATEMENT

DOM/20090114 OCA/2-M-TEST

VID/20120111

MIS/CRIMINAL WARRANT IN VIGLATION OF TITLE 18 USC, SECTION 1542, FALSE STATEMENT

WIS/ON A PASSFORT APPLICATION, ISSUED BY THE U S DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN MIS/DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

DURA/N

ORI IS ICE LESC BB2 872-6020

DOB/19730515

AKA/TESTER, TEST

AKA/ALPHA, BUT

MNU/PP-SETSP43

SOC/855321

INC/W123455789 PTE/2009011S IS10 EST DEM/20120411 1301 EST

IMMED CONFIEM WARRANT AND EXTRADITION WITH ORI

Again, members shall continue to act upon  $\underline{criminal}$  warrants catered by ICE into NCIC pursuant to relevant directives (e.g., G.O. 302.06, Walles).

#### **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**

Youth Commission

TO:



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

FROM:	Erica Major, Assistant Committee C Services Committee	Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood
DATE:	February 12, 2016	
SUBJECT:	REFERRAL FROM BOARD OF SU	JPERVISORS
Commission recommend:	n is being referred as per Char	wing, which at the request of the Youth ter Section 4.124 for comment and de any response it deems appropriate
File: 160022	2	
enforcemer for voluntar	ry notification that a person will be who have been convicted of a viole	hapter 12I, to prohibit law deral immigration officer's request e released from local custody, except ent felony and held to answer for a
	irn this cover sheet with the Co committee Clerk, Public Safety and	nmission's response to <b>Erica Major,</b> I Neighborhood Services.
*****	*************	*************
RESPONSE	FROM YOUTH COMMISSION	Date:
No Co	omment	
Reco	mmendation Attached	
	· -	Chairperson, Youth Commission

#### **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

#### MEMORANDUM

TO:

Vicki Hennessy, Sheriff, Sheriff's Department

Greg Suhr, Chief, Police Department

Allen Nance, Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Probation Department Karen Fletcher, Chief Adult Probation Officer, Adult Probation Department

George Gascon, District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney Jeff Adachi, Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender Brian Strong, Program Director, Capital Planning Program Ben Rosenfield, City Controller, Office of the Controller Barbara A. Garcia, Director, Department of Public Health Micki Callahan, Director, Department of Human Resources

Adrienne Pon, Executive Director, Office of Civic Engagement and

**Immigrant Affairs** 

FROM:

Erica Major, Assistant Committee Clerk, Government Audit and Oversight

Committee, Board of Supervisors

DATE:

March 29, 2016

SUBJECT:

SUBSTITUTE LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Avalos on March 22, 2016:

File No. 160022

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 felony and held to answer for a violent felony.

If you have any additional comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Referral from the Office of the Clerk of the Board Government Audit and Oversight Committee March 29, 2016 Page 2

C:

Theodore Toet, Sheriff's Department
Katherine Gorwood, Sheriff's Department
Eileen Hirst, Sheriff's Department
Christine Fountain, Police Department
Sergeant Rachael Kilshaw, Police Department
Sheryl Cowan, Juvenile Probation Department
LaShaun Williams, Adult Probation Department
Cristine Soto DeBerry, Office of the District Attorney
Maxwell Szabo, Office of the District Attorney
Todd Rydstrom, Office of the Controller
Peg Stevenson, Office of the Controller
Greg Wagner, Department of Public Health
Colleen Chawla, Department of Public Health
Susan Gard, Department of Human Resources

#### **BOARD of SUPERVISORS**



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

#### MEMORANDUM

TO:

Vicki Hennessy, Sheriff, Sheriff's Office Greg Suhr, Chief, Police Department

George Gascon, District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney

Dennis Herrera, City Attorney, Office of the City Attorney Jeff Adachi, Public Defender, Office of the Public Defender

Karen L. Fletcher, Chief Adult Probation Officer, Adult Probation Department

Allen Nance, Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Probation Department

Nicole Elliott, Liaison to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office of Criminal

**Justice** 

FROM:

Erica Major, Assistant Committee Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood

Services Committee, Board of Supervisors

DATE:

January 20, 2016

SUBJECT:

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Avalos on January 12, 2016:

File No. 160022

Ordinance amending Administrative Code, Chapter 12I, to prohibit law enforcement officials from responding to a federal immigration officer's request for voluntary notification that a person will be released from local custody, except for adults who have been convicted of a violent felony and held to answer for a violent felony.

If you have any comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c:
Kathy Gorwood, Sheriff's Office
Christine Fountain, Police Department
Sergeant Rachael Kilshaw, Police Department
Cristine Soto DeBerry, Office of the District Attorney
Maxwell Szabo, Office of the District Attorney
Jon Givner, Office of the City Attorney
LaShaun Williams, Adult Probation Department
Sheryl Cowan, Juvenile Probation Department

BOS-11, GAO, PSNS COB, LAS Pap. Pape. A. Mayors office

## President, District 5 BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-7450
Fax No. 554-7454
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

### **London Breed**

	PRESIDENTIAL ACTION	
Date:	March 29, 2016	
To:	Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors	
Madam Clo Pursuant to	erk, o Board Rules, I am hereby:	
	Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)	2016
. :	File No.	A Hor
	Title. (Primary Sponsor)	30 AH
$\boxtimes$	Transferring (Board Rule No. 3.3)	MID: 3
	File No. 160022 Avalos	<u>ω</u>
	(Primary Sponsor)  Title. Administrative Code - Due Process for All and Sanctuary	
	From: Government Audit & Oversight Committee	
	To: Public Safety & Neighborhood Services Committee	
	Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)	
	Supervisor	
	Replacing Supervisor	
	For:	Meeting
	(Date) (Committee)  London Breed, President	·

London Breed, President Board of Supervisors Print Form

# **Introduction Form**

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):	or meeting date
☐ 1. For reference to Committee.	
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.	
2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.	
3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.	
4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor	inquires"
☐ 5. City Attorney request.	
☐ 6. Call File No. from Committee.	
7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).	
8. Substitute Legislation File No. 160022	
9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).	•
☐ 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.	
11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on	·
Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following Small Business Commission	
☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commiss	sion
Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperativ	7 <b>e</b>
Sponsor(s):	
Supervisor John Avalos	
Subject:	
Ordinance – Due Process for All and Sanctuary	
The text is listed below or attached:	
	)
Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:	
For Clerk's Use Only:	
890	

Print Form

# **Introduction Form**

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):	Time stamp or meeting date
☐ 1. For reference to Committee.	
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.	
2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.	
☐ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.	
4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor	inquires"
5. City Attorney request.	
6. Call File No. from Committee.	
7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).	
8. Substitute Legislation File No.	
9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).	
☐ 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.	
11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on	
Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following	ing:
☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Comm	nission
☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission	on
Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative	
ponsor(s):	
Supervisor John Avalos, David Campus, Jane Kim, Eric Mar, Agran Pesk	<u> </u>
Ordinance - Administrative Code - Due Process for All Notification	1
Ordinance - Administrative Code - Due Process for An Protincation	
The text is listed below or attached:	
Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:	
For Clerk's Use Only:	