



**A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service**

NAPA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

2025-2026

April 13, 2026

FINAL REPORT

FEAR OF ICE IN THE VALLEY?

NAPA COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT'S RESPONSE

SUMMARY

The 2025-2026 Napa County Civil Grand Jury examined local law enforcement¹ interactions with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)² amid concerns over immigration enforcement in a community with a significant foreign-born population. This Report reviews relevant California laws, local policies and procedures, and community responses to immigration enforcement actions in Napa County.

- **Community and law enforcement collaboration:** Local community groups collaborate with local law enforcement to reduce fear and misinformation and to provide support during ICE actions. Napa law enforcement agencies issued a joint statement reaffirming that they do not enforce immigration laws as it is a federal, not state or local function. Instead, they comply with state protections in order to encourage community trust and emergency reporting.
- **Local law enforcement practices:** Agencies adhere to department policies not to inquire about immigration status, to engage in community outreach, and to comply with laws including SB 54 and the TRUTH Act. They distinguish judicial warrants from ICE administrative warrants³ and do not share license plate reader data with ICE or out-of-state agencies.
- **Napa County Jail practices:** The Napa County Jail, uniquely administered by the Napa County Department of Corrections instead of the Sheriff's Department as in other counties, follows SB 54 but may notify ICE of release dates for individuals charged but not convicted of certain crimes, potentially affecting their legal rights.

Compared to other Bay Area counties, Napa responded to a broader category of ICE requests for release of information, but only a few individuals were taken into ICE custody.

- **Findings and recommendations:** The Civil Grand Jury finds that local law enforcement effectively communicates its role in not enforcing immigration, but should expand its social media outreach, especially in Spanish. Recommendations include continuing community collaboration, more detailed and more frequent TRUTH Act reporting to the Napa County Board of Supervisors, and examination of ICE release notification procedures.

METHODOLOGY

The 2025-2026 Napa County Civil Grand Jury determined that public concern about local law enforcement involvement in federal immigration enforcement is a significant issue in our community. The Civil Grand Jury's investigation included interviews of local law enforcement officials, employers and members of the local community, and immigration rights advocates.

The Civil Grand Jury also reviewed state and local law enforcement policies and procedures, training records, automatic license plate reader logs, and records of inmates released to ICE; as well as statutes and case law regarding immigration enforcement in California.

It is important to note that laws and facts regarding immigration enforcement are rapidly changing. Therefore, the information provided in this Civil Grand Jury Report is current only as of the date of its publication.

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Recently expanded immigration enforcement actions across the U.S., particularly closer to home in Southern California, have raised concerns in Napa County and our immigrant communities.⁴ During multiple interviews, the Civil Grand Jury heard reports of fear directly related to immigration enforcement. This fear caused residents to avoid leaving their homes, resulting in the cancellation of public events, and drops in church and

school attendance. Reluctance to report crimes for fear of engagement with law enforcement was also noted.

The 2020 U.S. Census concluded that approximately 32,000 individuals, or 23% of Napa County's population, are foreign-born, but the Census did not ask about citizenship. A study from 2012 estimated that one-third of Napa County's foreign-born residents were U.S. citizens, one third were Legal Permanent Residents (green card holders), and one-third, or approximately 10,000 people, were undocumented foreign-born residents.⁵

Although the Civil Grand Jury has no jurisdiction to investigate federal government's actions, as a watchdog over local government it may investigate local law enforcement's interactions with the federal authorities.

Legal Background

United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is a federal⁶ law enforcement agency under the supervision of the United States Department of Homeland Security. The ICE mission statement says:

“U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) was created by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to handle the functions of the former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the U.S. Customs Service. ICE's important mission is to protect America from cross-border crime and illegal immigration that threaten national security and public safety. This mission is executed through the enforcement of more than 400 federal statutes and focuses on effective immigration enforcement, preventing terrorism and combating the illegal movement of people and goods, including:

- **Border and National Security:** Protecting the nation by enforcing immigration laws, preventing illegal movement of people and contraband.
- **Interior Enforcement:** Identifying and removing dangerous individuals or those in the U.S. illegally.
- **Preventing Terrorism:** Investigating threats and identifying noncitizens with terrorist ties.
- **Combating Criminal Networks:** Investigating trafficking, smuggling, and financial crimes.”⁷

Local California law enforcement cannot impede or interfere with ICE actions. Involvement and/or cooperation between local law enforcement and ICE is governed by three California statutes: the 2013 Trust Act, the 2016 TRUTH Act, and the 2017 California Values Act. Also relevant are 2015’s SB 34, which regulates the use of Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) data collected by law enforcement agencies, as well as possibly two new statutes currently in litigation banning most masks and generally requiring identification or badges to be worn.

Trust Act (AB 4)

California’s Trust Act⁸, adopted in 2013, prohibits law enforcement officers from retaining custody of an individual on the basis of an ICE hold or “detainer” after that individual becomes eligible for release.

There is an exception if, at the time that the individual becomes eligible for release from custody, certain conditions are met, including, among other things, that the individual has been convicted of one of thirty-one serious criminal offenses.⁹ (Gov’t. Code § 7282 et seq.)

TRUTH Act (AB 2792)

The Trust Act was supplemented in 2016 with the adoption of AB 2792, the Transparent Review of Unjust Transfers and Holds (TRUTH) Act¹⁰ (Gov't. Code § 7284 et seq.) It requires a local law enforcement agency, prior to an interview between ICE agents and an individual in custody regarding civil immigration violations, to provide the individual a written consent form, as specified, that would explain, among other things, the purpose of the interview, that it is voluntary, and that the individual may decline to be interviewed. The Act further requires local law enforcement to provide copies of the documentation received from ICE to the individual and to notify the individual regarding the intent of the agency to comply with ICE requests. It also provides that records related to ICE access are covered by the Public Records Act. It further requires the Napa County Board of Supervisors to hold at least one public community forum each year, to provide information to the public about ICE's access to individuals, as well as receive and consider public comments.

California Values Act (SB 54)

The California Values Act (SB 54; California Government Code § 7284 et seq.)¹¹ adopted in 2017 that took effect on January 1, 2018, restricts state and local law enforcement's cooperation with ICE. Key provisions include:

- Limits on Cooperation: Local law enforcement personnel cannot use resources to investigate, detain, or arrest

individuals for immigration enforcement purposes, except in specific cases as listed in the Trust Act.

- Information Sharing Restrictions: Local law enforcement agencies are prohibited from sharing personal information about individuals (e.g., release dates) with ICE unless it pertains to individuals convicted of specific offenses, or unless the information is publicly available.
- ICE Detainer Restrictions: Local law enforcement agencies cannot comply with ICE detainer requests (requests to hold individuals for immigration purposes) unless supported by a judicial warrant or unless the individual meets specific criminal criteria outlined in the law.
- Access to Facilities: SB 54 limits ICE's access to local jails for immigration enforcement purposes, requiring judicial warrants for transfers.
- Notification: Individuals must be informed of their legal rights before any ICE interviews take place, and local law enforcement agencies must provide the individual with a written consent form that explains the purpose of the interview, that the interview is voluntary, and that he or she may decline to be interviewed or may choose to be interviewed only with his or her attorney present.

The federal government sued California over the constitutionality of SB 54, and in July 2018, U.S. District Judge John A. Mendez largely upheld SB 54, dismissing most of the federal government claims. United States v. California, 314 F. Supp. 3d 1077 (E.D. Cal. 2018).

The court ruled that SB 54 does not directly conflict with the Immigration and Naturalization Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1373, because SB 54 regulates state and local resources, not federal authority, and states are not obligated to assist federal immigration enforcement under the Tenth Amendment's anti-commandeering doctrine. The court found that SB 54's restrictions on information sharing and transfers were permissible exercises of state authority to regulate local law enforcement practices. The only provision struck down was a requirement for state employers to notify employees of immigration inspections, which was deemed preempted by federal law (not part of SB 54's core immigration provisions).

The Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals largely affirmed this ruling in 2019, reinforcing that states can limit cooperation with ICE without violating the Supremacy Clause, as long as they don't directly obstruct federal law. United States v. California, 921 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 2019) *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 124 (2020). The court concluded:

“SB 54 may well frustrate the federal government’s immigration enforcement efforts. However, whatever the wisdom of the underlying policy adopted by California, that frustration is permissible, because California has the right, pursuant to the anticommandeering rule, to refrain from assisting with federal efforts. The United States stresses that, in crafting the [Immigration and Naturalization Act], Congress expected cooperation between states and federal immigration authorities. That is likely the case. But when questions of federalism are involved, we must distinguish between expectations and

requirements. In this context, the federal government was free to expect as much as it wanted, but it could not require California's cooperation without running afoul of the Tenth Amendment."

United States v. California, 921 F.3d at 890–91. In 2020, the U.S. Supreme Court denied further review, so this decision stands as precedent.

SB 34 (2015)

Many law enforcement jurisdictions, including those in Napa County, use Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) technology¹². ALPRs are camera systems that capture the license plate data of vehicles, along with related information. Law enforcement agencies use ALPRs for a variety of proactive and reactive policing purposes. These include gathering intelligence and evidence, helping to identify potential suspects, and facilitating crime scene analysis.

Adopted in 2015, SB 34 (Civil Code § 1798.29 et seq.) provides that ALPR data may not be shared with out-of-state or federal authorities including ICE.¹³ There have been reported violations in Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and Riverside counties.¹⁴ The California Attorney General recently sued at least one jurisdiction¹⁵ over alleged violations, with no disposition as of this Report.

SB 627 and SB 805 (2025)

Two additional new statutes impact ICE actions in California, but implementation is on hold due to litigation brought by the federal government. The No Secret Police Act (SB 627¹⁶) and the No

Vigilantes Act (SB 805¹⁷) were signed into law by Governor Gavin Newsom on September 20, 2025. The No Secret Police Act prohibits federal law enforcement officers from wearing face coverings, except in limited circumstances. The No Vigilantes Act requires local and federal law enforcement officers to visibly display identification that includes their agency affiliation and either the officer or agent name or badge number when performing law enforcement duties, except in limited circumstances. On February 9, 2026, the facial covering ban was struck down by a federal court, although the visible identification was upheld but is currently being appealed.¹⁸

Immigration Enforcement in Napa

The Civil Grand Jury heard testimony from multiple sources that ICE actions in Napa Valley in 2025 did not include any blanket enforcement efforts (“raids”), but was limited to individualized (“targeted”) cases. Nevertheless, there is often widespread anxiety in the immigrant community which can result in over-reacting to routine local law enforcement activities for fear of ICE’s involvement. A coalition of community groups formed Napa Valley Together, created to “reduce the climate of fear created by misinformation”.¹⁹ The North Bay Rapid Response Network²⁰ (a broader group of immigration advocacy organizations in Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties) provides a 24-hour hotline to immigrants fearing a raid by federal immigration agents, dispatches trained legal observers to the affected location, provides legal defense to individuals, and offers accompaniment to impacted people, families and communities. They also distribute “Know Your Rights” red cards²¹ throughout the community.

These organizations have been in close contact with local law enforcement, meeting in late 2024 in preparation for the incoming presidential administration. On December 30, 2024, the local law enforcement agencies announced a joint Statement from Law Enforcement Agencies²² worth repeating in full here:

“As local law enforcement leaders in Napa County, we are acutely aware of concerns and fears some members of the communities we serve are experiencing related to immigration enforcement. It is important that we reiterate our commitment to public service and safety of all our residents, regardless of immigration status. Our primary goal is safety. A safe community needs effective law enforcement agencies. To be effective, we need trust and cooperation between all residents and the law enforcement sworn to protect them. There are some things we’d like you to know about the work we do and don’t do on your behalf as it relates to immigration enforcement.

We don’t:

- Have any constitutional authority, jurisdiction, or powers of arrest on federal immigration violations;*
- Detain or question people about immigration documentation;*
- Determine immigration status to qualify victims of crime for services;*
- Assist in immigration enforcement investigations;*
- Use agency resources for immigration enforcement;*
- Use ICE agents as interpreters.*

We do:

- *Want to encourage anyone who needs our services or has an emergency to call 911;*
- *Serve anyone and everyone in need without regard to immigration status;*
- *Scrupulously comply with SB 54, known as the California Values Act, AB 2792, known as the Truth Act and AB 4, known as the Trust Act;*
- *Want to encourage the spread of truthful information within our community about law enforcement activities, when possible.*

Our policies tightly align with all California state laws that are designed to protect the rights of all residents, including those who have immigration concerns. We do not want the fear of immigration status to inhibit members of our communities from interacting with any member of our respective teams or, more importantly from reaching out if they are in an emergency or find themselves in need of our services.”

The Statement was signed by the Napa County Sheriff, Napa County District Attorney, Napa County Department of Corrections Director, Napa County Probation Department Chief, and the 5 City Municipal and Napa Valley College Chiefs of Police. While interviews and research by the Civil Grand Jury support the conclusion that local law enforcement has been abiding by their Statement, concerns within the immigrant communities persist, fueled by misinformation on social media and by reports of immigration enforcement actions occurring nationally.²³

Local law enforcement policies and practices

The Civil Grand Jury learned that local law enforcement agencies have been living up to the commitments of their December 2024 Statement. Policies pertaining to inquiries about immigration status appear to be followed as no violations have been reported. Local law enforcement officials have spoken at various churches and other public venues while in uniform, speaking in English and Spanish. They provided flyers picturing patches, uniforms, and vehicles used by local law enforcement to illustrate the differences between local law enforcement and ICE.²⁴ Their public relations efforts help to break down barriers within the immigrant community with the hope of making them more likely to call law enforcement when needed.

In particular, the Sheriff and Napa Police Departments work to dispel false alarms on social media about ICE actions. This has been done by posting on city and county websites, as well as contacting local community and advocacy groups to disseminate accurate information through trusted messengers including but not limited to Napa Valley Together member organizations. However, broader use of social and broadcast media, especially in Spanish, could be made by local law enforcement to reach members of the immigrant communities. The Civil Grand Jury heard testimony that area Spanish-language broadcasters are considered trusted sources of information.

Recently, the Sheriff and Napa Police Departments have also trained their staff to distinguish between judicial warrants, which are honored by local law enforcement, and ICE “administrative warrants” which are not honored. In addition, consistent with departmental policy and state law, the Sheriff

and Napa Police Departments have not shared any Automatic License Plate Reader data with ICE, or any other out-of-state agencies.

Napa County Jail

Unique among California's 58 counties, the Napa County Jail is administered by the Napa County Department of Corrections rather than the Sheriff's Department. The Napa County Department of Corrections reports to the Napa County Chief Executive Officer who in turn reports to the Napa County Board of Supervisors. The Napa County Jail has a detailed procedure governing responses to ICE communications²⁵ that adheres to SB 54. The Napa County Jail provides release information to ICE in the full range of cases permitted by California law, including:

- some misdemeanors;
- felony offenses that have been downgraded to misdemeanors; and
- certain cases involving violent offenses where the "individual is currently charged with a crime listed... and a magistrate has made a finding of probable cause as to that charge at the preliminary hearing."

The current Napa County Jail procedure allows for inmate release information to be provided to ICE for some individuals who have been charged but are not yet convicted of certain violent or serious crimes, potentially depriving residents of their ability to contest the charges if subsequently deported.

Jail practices in other Bay Area counties appear to vary, with some jails limiting release information to even less than what is fully permitted by SB

54. One investigative report found that Bay Area jails respond positively to ICE requests from zero to 23% of requests.²⁶ “Blanket refusals to comply with ICE detainer requests remain common practice across Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties”, while the San Francisco Sheriff reported ICE is only notified of the release of an individual with a “history of a conviction of a violent felony within seven years, a conviction of a serious felony within five years, or three separate convictions on three separate felonies within five years. We can't just say, unequivocally, no cooperation at all.”²⁷ The Sonoma County Jail maintains a detailed “Immigration Notification Matrix”²⁸ that appears to exclude some categories of disclosure permitted by California law, such as certain “wobbler” offenses (offenses which could be charged either as a felony or a misdemeanor depending on the circumstances), which Napa County may consider adopting.

The Napa County 2025 TRUTH Act report²⁹ (based on 2024 data) indicated receipt of 158 ICE requests for advance release information. Of the 158 requests, the Napa County Jail determined only 36 requests involving individuals whose information could be disclosed under the TRUTH Act. Of those 36, seven individuals were taken into custody by ICE (six males and one female), all of whom were Hispanic. The Napa County Jail supplemented the 2024 data with a verbal report at the August 2025 TRUTH Act hearing regarding the first half of 2025. ICE took six individuals into custody in just the first six months of 2025.

The Civil Grand Jury reviewed the records of the Napa County Jail’s responses to ICE requests for the first three quarters of 2025 (January 1 to September 30). The Napa County Jail provided notification to ICE two to four hours prior to inmate release in eighteen cases. ICE took custody of

nine individuals, compared to seven out of 36 for calendar year 2024. Individuals remanded to ICE custody had records for general battery (2 individuals), assault with a deadly weapon, DUI with bodily injury, false imprisonment and assault with a deadly weapon; felony possession of a controlled substance (2 individuals), and possession of stolen property.³⁰ In one instance, ICE was notified based upon a judicial finding of probable cause, not based upon a felony conviction, and that criminal case remains pending.

In comparison, the Sonoma County Sheriff's 2025 TRUTH Act report³¹ painted a similar picture, but with more detailed information. The Sonoma County Jail received 484 requests for release of information, responded in 64 cases with ten individuals taken into custody, along with two individuals transferred pursuant to federal judicial warrants. The Sonoma County TRUTH Act report also provided details as to ICE Notices by types of offenses, age, gender, country of origin, and recidivism. This information could be useful to Napa County policymakers.

The Civil Grand Jury concludes that the TRUTH Act reporting on an annual basis does not provide the Napa County Board of Supervisors and the community with timely information, detailed enough to be broadly disseminated. Due to local concerns about rapidly moving developments in nationwide immigration enforcement, the community would be well-served by more frequent and detailed TRUTH Act reports. The Civil Grand Jury further concludes that the Napa County Board of Supervisors should review the Napa County Jail practices regarding individuals with misdemeanor offenses or charges without convictions and whether their release dates should be excluded from ICE notifications.

FINDINGS

The Civil Grand Jury finds:

- F1: Napa County law enforcement agencies have worked well with the community to explain that they do not enforce immigration law, because it is a federal and not local function. Despite this, fears persist and therefore efforts should continue to expand the use of social and broadcast media, particularly in Spanish.
- F2: TRUTH Act annual reporting does not provide the Napa County Board of Supervisors and the community with timely and sufficiently detailed information.
- F3: The Napa County Jail uses the full extent of its discretion under SB 54 in providing release information to ICE regarding those convicted of offenses listed under SB 54, including certain misdemeanors. In at least one instance, information was released regarding those who were charged with, but not convicted of, certain offenses listed under SB 54.

COMMENDATION

The 2025-2026 Napa County Civil Grand Jury commends the production of the December 2024 “Statement From Law Enforcement Agencies” regarding immigration enforcement and their clear and consistent public efforts to disseminate and abide by it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Civil Grand Jury recommends:

- R1: The Napa County Sheriff and Police Departments should continue to deepen community collaborations and encourage their public information staff to expand the use of social and broadcast media, particularly in Spanish.
- R2: By June 30, 2026, the Napa County Board of Supervisors should request more frequent TRUTH Act reports from the Napa County Jail (to be provided at evening meetings of the Board, allowing broader public participation).
- R3: By June 30, 2026, the Napa County Board of Supervisors should request that the Napa County Jail TRUTH Act reports include data related to each individual for whom release information was sent to ICE, identification of the individual offense(s) and whether they were convictions or only charges, as well as using the Immigration Notification Matrix categories used by the Sonoma County Jail in their TRUTH Act reports.
- R4: By June 30, 2026, the Napa County Board of Supervisors should review the Napa County Jail practices regarding individuals with misdemeanor offenses, “wobbler” offenses, or charges without convictions and whether their release dates should be excluded from ICE notifications.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the Napa County Sheriff is *required* to respond to F1 and R1 within 60 days of receipt of this report, and the Napa County Board of Supervisors is *required* to respond to F2 and F3 and R2, R3, and R4 within 90 days of receipt of this report.

INVITED RESPONSES

The Civil Grand Jury *invites* the City of Napa Chief of Police to respond to F1 and R1 within 60 days of receipt of this report.

ENDNOTES

¹ As used in this report, local law enforcement refers to the Napa County Sheriff's Department, the Napa County Department of Corrections, and local municipal and college police departments in Napa County.

² As used in this report, "ICE" refers to U.S. Immigration Control and Enforcement, and also encompasses the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, a separate Department of Homeland Security agency that also engages in immigration enforcement, along with other federal agencies engaged in immigration enforcement.

³ A judicial warrant is a court order signed by a Judge, Magistrate or Court Commissioner. An "administrative warrant" or "immigration warrant" is issued by an agency without judicial review. See, California Attorney General, "Information Bulletin: National Crime Information Center Administrative Warrants", April 7, 2025. <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/2025-dle-08.pdf>

⁴ The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has declared a state of emergency in response to large scale immigration enforcement actions. "L.A. County declares state of emergency to fight against ICE immigration raid", Los Angeles Times, October 15, 2025, (<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-10-15/l-a-county-declares-state-of-emergency-to-fight-back-against-ice-immigration-raids>). The declaration of emergency may be found at the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors meeting agenda of October 14, 2025 at <https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/208457.pdf>.

⁵ Napa Valley Community Foundation, “A Profile of Immigrants in Napa County” (undated), (<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/542ec317e4b0d41ade8801fb/t/67c72f83ef2fdf1b4c4e4d6e/1741107075868/ICE+Matrix.2025.pdf/>)

⁶ Library of Congress, “Overview of Congress's Immigration Powers”, https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artI-S8-C18-8-1/ALDE_00001255/

⁷ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, ICE Mission Statement, <https://www.dhs.gov/topics/immigration-and-customs-enforcement>.

⁸ California Legislative Information, AB 4, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140AB4.

⁹ These offenses include: (A) Assault; (B) Battery; (C) Use of threats; (D) Sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, or crimes endangering children; (E) Child abuse or endangerment; (F) Burglary, robbery, theft, fraud, forgery, or embezzlement; (G) Driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, but only for a conviction that is a felony; (H) Obstruction of justice; (I) Bribery; (J) Escape; (K) Unlawful possession or use of a weapon, firearm, explosive device, or weapon of mass destruction; (L) Possession of an unlawful deadly weapon; (M) An offense involving the felony possession, sale, distribution, manufacture, or trafficking of controlled substances; (N) Vandalism with prior convictions; (O) Gang-related offenses; (P) An attempt or a conspiracy, to commit an offense specified in this section; (Q) A crime resulting in death, or involving the personal infliction of great bodily injury; (R) Possession or use of a firearm in the commission of an offense; (S) An offense that would require the individual

to register as a sex offender; (T) False imprisonment, slavery, and human trafficking; (U) Criminal profiteering and money laundering; (V) Torture and mayhem; (W) A crime threatening the public safety; (X) Elder and dependent adult abuse; (Y) A hate crime; (Z) Stalking; (AA) Soliciting the commission of a crime, as specified in, but not limited to, subdivision (c) of Section 286 of, and Sections 653j and 653.23 of, the Penal Code; (AB) An offense committed while on bail or released on his or her own recognizance; (AC) Rape, sodomy, oral copulation, or sexual penetration; (AD) Kidnapping; and (AE) a hit-and-run felony. Govt. Code § 7282.5 (a)(3).

¹⁰ California Legislative Information, AB 2792, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB2792.

¹¹ California Legislative Information, SB 54, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB54.

¹² The Congressional Research Service has a useful brief report on issues involving ALPRs. “Automated License Plate Readers: Background and Legal Issues”, https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/IF/PDF/IF13068/IF13068.1.pdf (July 21, 2025).

¹³ Attorney General Guidance: “Information Bulletin: California Automated License Plate Reader Data Guidance”, <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/2023-dle-06.pdf> (October 27, 2023).

¹⁴ Johnson, K. and Al Elew, M.; “California police are illegally sharing license plate data with ICE and Border Patrol”, <https://calmatters.org/economy/technology/2025/06/california-police-sharing-license-plate-reader-data/> (June 13, 2025, accessed October 13,

2025); and KGO AB7 News, “SF and Oakland police illegally shared license plate data with federal agencies: report”

<https://abc7news.com/post/san-francisco-oakland-police-illegally-shared-license-plate-data-federal-agencies-report/17121472/> (July 14, 2025).

¹⁵ Press Release: “AG Bonta Sues El Cajon for Illegally Sharing License Plate Data with Out-of-State Law Enforcement,

<https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-sues-el-cajon-illegally-sharing-license-plate-data-out> (October 3, 2025).

¹⁶ SB 627, No Secret Police Act, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB627

¹⁷ AB 805, No Vigilantes Act, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB805.

¹⁸ Laurel Rosenthal, “Judge Strikes Down California’s Ban on Masks for Federal Agents”, New York Times, February 9, 2026.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/09/us/judge-rejects-california-mask-ban-ice.html>

¹⁹ Napa Valley Together, <https://napavalleytogether.org/about/>. Participating organizations include Immigration Institute of the Bay Area, On The Move's Neighborhood Initiative, Puertas Abiertas Community Resource Center, UpValley Family Centers, Community Leaders Coalition, and the Napa Valley Community Foundation.

²⁰ "North Bay Rapid Response, <https://www.northbayop.org/nbrnrn>.

²¹ Information found on these cards is available at the Napa County “Know Your Rights” webpage. <https://www.napacounty.gov/3823/Know-Your-Rights>

²² "Statement from Local Law Enforcement Agencies", December 30, 2024, found at <https://www.napacounty.gov/DocumentCenter/View/35917/2024-Countywide-community-statement---immigration-practices---English>.

²³ See. e.g., Raquel Issenberg, "Trump's immigration whiplash leaves Sonoma County on edge: Immigrant advocates report panic and confusion as federal deployment stirs fear across North Bay", Press Democrat, October 24, 2025, <https://www.pressdemocrat.com/2025/10/24/trumps-immigration-whiplash-leaves-sonoma-county-on-edge/>.

²⁴ Copies of the flyers are available in English and Spanish at <https://www.northbayop.org/nbrn-download-materials>.

²⁵ Napa County Department of Corrections, "ICE Detainer Requests & Consular Notification", available at <https://www.napacounty.gov/DocumentCenter/View/35617/Policy-604 ICE-Detainer-Requests-and-Consular-Notification>.

²⁶ "When ICE wants help deporting immigrants, San Francisco Bay Area rarely complies", NBC Bay Area, April 28, 2025, (<https://www.nbcbayarea.com/investigations/ice-san-francisco-bay-area-sanctuary-city-standoff/3851860/>). The April report did not include data from Napa County as the Truth Act report for 2024 was not yet compiled.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ "Immigration Notification Matrix", <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/542ec317e4b0d41ade8801fb/t/67c72f83ef2fdf1b4c4e4d6e/1741107075868/ICE+Matrix.2025.pdf>).

²⁹ "Napa County Community Forum", Napa County Board of Supervisors meeting, August 19, 2025, <https://napa.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=2f645305-e195-45d7-abcf-8477f7f28e49.pdf>.

³⁰ Napa County Jail procedures allow ICE notifications if the offense was a misdemeanor committed in the last five years, so it is possible that not all of these offenses were felonies.

³¹ “Sonoma County Sheriff’s Office: 2024 US Immigration and Customs Enforcement Data”, presented to the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors on July 22, 2025, <https://sonoma-county.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7487179&GUID=80A27B99-03C6-423C-A00B-66AC27938E3A>.