

Attachment 1. Summary of Bay Area Counties & Cities with Policies Pertaining to ICE

Over the past two months, some Bay Area cities and counties have adopted policies pertaining to ICE actions; Table 1 provides an overview of the key features of each. All policies ban ICE from using county or city-owned property.

Other jurisdictions are considering similar policies. As of the writing of this staff report, the City of San Francisco is scheduled to consider a vote on February 3, 2026 banning ICE from using city-owned property and considering a ban on Port of San Francisco properties, preventing staging near the waterfront. Contra Costa County will be considering a policy during their meeting on February 3, 2026, and the City of Pacifica is considering a Resolution during their meeting on February 9, 2026.

Table 1. Bay Area Counties & Cities with Policies Pertaining to ICE

Jurisdiction, Policy (date passed/enacted)	Key Features
City of Oakland, Mayoral Executive Orders (January 29, 2026)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prohibits federal agents from using city property for immigration enforcement. - Establishes a citywide “Protect the Town” Task Force, a rapid-response team. - Prohibits the Oakland Police Department from acting at the direction of the National Guard if they are deployed to the city.
Alameda County, Resolution (January 27, 2026)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Established “ICE-Free Zones” on all county-owned/controlled properties and requires that standardized signage and physical barriers (like locked gates) be installed at all county facilities. Signs also available for private properties. - Requires that County employees who witness ICE activity on county land are required to document the incident and report it to the County Administrator, County Counsel, and the Board of Supervisors. - Directs the County Manager to develop a comprehensive response plan for immigration enforcement activity.
City of Berkeley, Ordinance (January 27, 2026)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bans ICE from using city-owned properties for enforcement operations. - Includes policies on data sharing, stating that city employees cannot provide information that would assist in civil immigration enforcement.
City of San Jose, Resolution (January 13, 2026)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bans ICE from using city-owned properties for enforcement operations and required that standardized signage and physical barriers be installed at city facilities. - Requires City employees who witness ICE activity on city property report it to their supervisors, who must then notify the City Manager’s office. However, the policy does not allow City staff to physically obstruct federal agents if they

Jurisdiction, Policy (date passed/enacted)	Key Features
<p>Santa Clara County, Ordinance (December 9, 2025)</p>	<p>are in pursuit of a suspect or if there is an immediate danger to life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prohibits federal immigration agents from using county-owned land for staging, surveillance, or processing detainees; also includes installing locked gates and “No Enforcement” signage. Signs also available for private properties. - Created a “Three-Stage” Response Plan, a tiered response system that escalates based on the level of federal activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Stage 1:</i> Daily monitoring and community “Know Your Rights” education. <i>Stage 2:</i> Triggered by targeted local arrests; involves mobilizing the Rapid Response Network. <i>Stage 3:</i> Triggered by “mass raid” events; involves the county providing emergency food, shelter, legal aid, and childcare for families affected by federal enforcement. - Explicitly states it will not interfere with federal agents who possess a judicial warrant signed by a judge; only blocks “administrative” or “civil” enforcement actions that lack a court order.
<p>San Mateo County, Ordinance (November 18, 2025)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bans ICE from using county-owned property (including the Coyote Point firearms range) as a staging area or operational base for enforcement actions without a judicial warrant. - Prohibits any law enforcement officer (sworn or civilian) from wearing face coverings that obscure their identity while performing duties on county property. Requires officers to display their name or badge number and agency affiliation. - Requires the Sheriff’s Office and the Probation Department to track every request for assistance from federal immigration agencies and disclose them (whether granted or denied) in quarterly public reports. - Reiterates the existing ban on using local personnel, equipment, or funds to assist with traffic enforcement if the primary purpose is to aid immigration enforcement.