S.79

House Committee on Judiciary
Thursday, March 2, 2017

Rebecca Wasserman
Office of Legislative Council
February 14, 2017

Summary of Immigration-Related Executive Orders

Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements ("Border Security EO") dated January 25, 2017

Construction of a Border Wall: Directs the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") to fund and construct a border wall on the southern border of the United States (U.S.) and develop a long-term funding mechanism for this project.

Expand Detention Policy and Capacity: expands DHS' detention policies by, among other things, constructing new detention facilities, assigning asylum officers and immigration judges to detention facilities to conduct interviews and removal proceedings, ending the practice of "catch and release," detaining all individuals crossing the southern border, and detaining all aliens apprehended for violations of immigration law.

Expand Expedited Removal: directs DHS to expand use of "expedited removal" (no longer restricted to border regions or unlawful entrants in the U.S. for less than 14 days).

Federal-State Agreements: directs DHS to expand and enter into 287(g) agreements with state and local governments, and permits DHS to structure 287(g) agreements in a manner specific to each jurisdiction.

Removal Proceedings: directs DHS to ensure that individuals arriving by land from Mexico or Canada are returned to their home country pending a formal removal proceeding.

Limits Humanitarian Protection: requires DHS to limit two statutory mechanisms in place for immigrants: (1) "parole" (DHS discretion to stay in U.S or be released from detention for urgent humanitarian grounds or significant public benefit) and (2) "credible fear" determinations for asylum seekers.

Criminal Prosecution of Unlawful Entry: directs the Attorney General to prioritize the prosecution of any offense with a nexus to the southern border.

Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States ("Interior Enforcement EO") dated January 25, 2017

New Enforcement Priorities: asserts new priorities for enforcing removal of noncitizens.

Civil Fines and Penalties: directs DHS to issue guidance and promulgate regulations to collect penalties it is authorized to collect from unlawfully present noncitizens and "those who facilitate their presence" in the United States.

Additional Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Resources: directs DHS to hire an additional 10,000 ICE officers to conduct enforcement and removal operations.

Rebecca Wasserman
Office of Legislative Council
February 14, 2017

Federal-State Agreements: directs DHS to expand and enter into 287(g) agreements with state and local governments, and permits DHS to structure 287(g) agreements in a manner specific to each jurisdiction.

Sanctuary Jurisdictions: authorizes DHS to designate jurisdictions as "sanctuary jurisdictions," and directs DHS to ensure that any jurisdiction that limits cooperation under 8 U.S.C. § 1373 is not eligible to receive Federal grants, except as deemed necessary for law enforcement purposes.

Increase Immigration Prosecutions: increases funding for criminal prosecutions of foreign nationals crossing the border without inspections.

Reinstate Secure Communities Program: reinstates the Secure Communities Program, which required local law enforcement to share with DHS information about individuals in its custody and authorized DHS to issue detainers to local jails and correctional facilities for the purpose of holding an individual beyond the scheduled release date until ICE takes custody of the individual.

"Recalcitrant" Countries: directs the Secretary of State to ensure that diplomatic efforts and negotiations with other countries include a requirement that foreign states accept the return of their nationals.

Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States ("Travel EO") January 27, 2017

Suspension of U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP): suspends the USRAP for 120 days (with certain exceptions allowed on a case-by-case basis), reduces the number of refugees to be admitted to the U.S. in the coming fiscal year from 110,000 to 50,000, and directs DHS to determine the extent to which state and local jurisdictions can have an increased role in determining the placement or resettlement of refugees in their jurisdiction.

Syrian Refugees: suspends the processing and admission of Syrian refugees until the President determines that sufficient changes have been made to USRAP to ensure admittance of Syrian refugees is consistent with national interest.

Immigration from Countries of Particular Concern: suspends immigrant and nonimmigrant entries for nationals of Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen for at least 90 days.

Suspension of the Visa Waiver Program: suspends the Visa Interview Waiver Program, requiring all nonimmigrant visa applicants to attend an interview if it is required by statute.

Screening Standards and Procedures: directs federal agencies to develop screening standards and procedures for all immigration benefits to identify fraud and detect whether a person intends to do harm.

Biometric Entry-Exit: directs agencies to expedite the completion and implementation of a biometric entry-exit system for all travelers to the United States.

Exec. Order No. 13768, 82 FR 8799, 2017 WL 388889(Pres.)
Executive Order 13768

Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States

January 25, 2017

***8799** By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), and in order to ensure the public safety of the American people in communities across the United States as well as to ensure that our Nation's immigration laws are faithfully executed, I hereby declare the policy of the executive branch to be, and order, as follows:

Section 1. Purpose. Interior enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws is critically important to the national security and public safety of the United States. Many aliens who illegally enter the United States and those who overstay or otherwise violate the terms of their visas present a significant threat to national security and public safety. This is particularly so for aliens who engage in criminal conduct in the United States.

Sanctuary jurisdictions across the United States willfully violate Federal law in an attempt to shield aliens from removal from the United States. These jurisdictions have caused immeasurable harm to the American people and to the very fabric of our Republic.

Tens of thousands of removable aliens have been released into communities across the country, solely because their home countries refuse to accept their repatriation. Many of these aliens are criminals who have served time in our Federal, State, and local jails. The presence of such individuals in the United States, and the practices of foreign nations that refuse the repatriation of their nationals, are contrary to the national interest.

Although Federal immigration law provides a framework for Federal-State partnerships in enforcing our immigration laws to ensure the removal of aliens who have no right to be in the United States, the Federal Government has failed to discharge this basic sovereign responsibility. We cannot faithfully execute the immigration laws of the United States if we exempt classes or categories of removable aliens from potential enforcement. The purpose of this order is to direct executive departments and agencies (agencies) to employ all lawful means to enforce the immigration laws of the United States.

Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the executive branch to:
(a) Ensure the faithful execution of the immigration laws of the United States, including the INA, against all removable aliens, consistent with Article II, Section 3 of the United States Constitution and section 3331 of title 5, United States Code;

(b) Make use of all available systems and resources to ensure the efficient and faithful execution of the immigration laws of the United States;

(c) Ensure that jurisdictions that fail to comply with applicable Federal law do not receive Federal funds, except as mandated by law;

(d) Ensure that aliens ordered removed from the United States are promptly removed; and

(e) Support victims, and the families of victims, of crimes committed by removable aliens.

Sec. 3. Definitions. The terms of this order, where applicable, shall have the meaning provided by section 1101 of title 8, United States Code. ***8800**

Sec. 4. Enforcement of the Immigration Laws in the Interior of the United States. In furtherance of the policy described in section 2 of this order, I hereby direct agencies to employ all lawful means to ensure the faithful execution of the immigration

laws of the United States against all removable aliens.

Sec. 5. Enforcement Priorities. In executing faithfully the immigration laws of the United States, the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary) shall prioritize for removal those aliens described by the Congress in sections 212(a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(6)(C), 235, and 237(a)(2) and (4) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(6)(C), 1225, and 1227(a)(2) and (4)), as well as removable aliens who:
(a) Have been convicted of any criminal offense;

(b) Have been charged with any criminal offense, where such charge has not been resolved;

(c) Have committed acts that constitute a chargeable criminal offense;

(d) Have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation in connection with any official matter or application before a governmental agency;

(e) Have abused any program related to receipt of public benefits;

(f) Are subject to a final order of removal, but who have not complied with their legal obligation to depart the United States; or

(g) In the judgment of an immigration officer, otherwise pose a risk to public safety or national security.

Sec. 6. Civil Fines and Penalties. As soon as practicable, and by no later than one year after the date of this order, the Secretary shall issue guidance and promulgate regulations, where required by law, to ensure the assessment and collection of all fines and penalties that the Secretary is authorized under the law to assess and collect from aliens unlawfully present in the United States and from those who facilitate their presence in the United States.

Sec. 7. Additional Enforcement and Removal Officers. The Secretary, through the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall, to the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, take all appropriate action to hire 10,000 additional immigration officers, who shall complete relevant training and be authorized to perform the law enforcement functions described in section 287 of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1357).

Sec. 8. Federal-State Agreements. It is the policy of the executive branch to empower State and local law enforcement agencies across the country to perform the functions of an immigration officer in the interior of the United States to the maximum extent permitted by law.
(a) In furtherance of this policy, the Secretary shall immediately take appropriate action to engage with the Governors of the States, as well as local officials, for the purpose of preparing to enter into agreements under section 287(g) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)).

(b) To the extent permitted by law and with the consent of State or local officials, as appropriate, the Secretary shall take appropriate action, through agreements under section 287(g) of the INA, or otherwise, to authorize State and local law enforcement officials, as the Secretary determines are qualified and appropriate, to perform the functions of immigration officers in relation to the investigation, apprehension, or detention of aliens in the United States under the direction and the supervision of the Secretary. Such authorization shall be in addition to, rather than in place of, Federal performance of these duties.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, the Secretary may structure each agreement under section 287(g) of the INA in a manner that provides the most effective model for enforcing Federal immigration laws for that jurisdiction. ***8801**

Sec. 9. Sanctuary Jurisdictions. It is the policy of the executive branch to ensure, to the fullest extent of the law, that a State, or a political subdivision of a State, shall comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373.
(a) In furtherance of this policy, the Attorney General and the Secretary, in their discretion and to the extent consistent with

law, shall ensure that jurisdictions that willfully refuse to comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373 (sanctuary jurisdictions) are not eligible to receive Federal grants, except as deemed necessary for law enforcement purposes by the Attorney General or the Secretary. The Secretary has the authority to designate, in his discretion and to the extent consistent with law, a jurisdiction as a sanctuary jurisdiction. The Attorney General shall take appropriate enforcement action against any entity that violates 8 U.S.C. 1373, or which has in effect a statute, policy, or practice that prevents or hinders the enforcement of Federal law.

(b) To better inform the public regarding the public safety threats associated with sanctuary jurisdictions, the Secretary shall utilize the Declined Detainer Outcome Report or its equivalent and, on a weekly basis, make public a comprehensive list of criminal actions committed by aliens and any jurisdiction that ignored or otherwise failed to honor any detainers with respect to such aliens.

(c) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is directed to obtain and provide relevant and responsive information on all Federal grant money that currently is received by any sanctuary jurisdiction.

Sec. 10. Review of Previous Immigration Actions and Policies. (a) The Secretary shall immediately take all appropriate action to terminate the Priority Enforcement Program (PEP) described in the memorandum issued by the Secretary on November 20, 2014, and to reinstitute the immigration program known as "Secure Communities" referenced in that memorandum.
(b) The Secretary shall review agency regulations, policies, and procedures for consistency with this order and, if required, publish for notice and comment proposed regulations rescinding or revising any regulations inconsistent with this order and shall consider whether to withdraw or modify any inconsistent policies and procedures, as appropriate and consistent with the law.

(c) To protect our communities and better facilitate the identification, detention, and removal of criminal aliens within constitutional and statutory parameters, the Secretary shall consolidate and revise any applicable forms to more effectively communicate with recipient law enforcement agencies.

Sec. 11. Department of Justice Prosecutions of Immigration Violators. The Attorney General and the Secretary shall work together to develop and implement a program that ensures that adequate resources are devoted to the prosecution of criminal immigration offenses in the United States, and to develop cooperative strategies to reduce violent crime and the reach of transnational criminal organizations into the United States.

Sec. 12. Recalcitrant Countries. The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State shall cooperate to effectively implement the sanctions provided by section 243(d) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1253(d)), as appropriate. The Secretary of State shall, to the maximum extent permitted by law, ensure that diplomatic efforts and negotiations with foreign states include as a condition precedent the acceptance by those foreign states of their nationals who are subject to removal from the United States.

Sec. 13. Office for Victims of Crimes Committed by Removable Aliens. The Secretary shall direct the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take all appropriate and lawful action to establish within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement an office to provide proactive, timely, adequate, and professional services to victims of crimes committed by removable aliens and the family members of such victims. This office shall provide quarterly reports studying the effects of the victimization by criminal aliens present in the United States. ***8802**

Sec. 14. Privacy Act. Agencies shall, to the extent consistent with applicable law, ensure that their privacy policies exclude persons who are not United States citizens or lawful permanent residents from the protections of the Privacy Act regarding personally identifiable information.

Sec. 15. Reporting. Except as otherwise provided in this order, the Secretary and the Attorney General shall each submit to the President a report on the progress of the directives contained in this order within 90 days of the date of this order and again within 180 days of the date of this order.

Sec. 16. Transparency. To promote the transparency and situational awareness of criminal aliens in the United States, the Secretary and the Attorney General are hereby directed to collect relevant data and provide quarterly reports on the following:
(a) the immigration status of all aliens incarcerated under the supervision of the Federal Bureau of Prisons;

(b) the immigration status of all aliens incarcerated as Federal pretrial detainees under the supervision of the United States Marshals Service; and

(c) the immigration status of all convicted aliens incarcerated in State prisons and local detention centers throughout the United States.

Sec. 17. Personnel Actions. The Office of Personnel Management shall take appropriate and lawful action to facilitate hiring personnel to implement this order.

Sec. 18. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

(i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.
(b) This order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations. ***8803**

(c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

THE WHITE HOUSE,January 25, 2017.

Exec. Order No. 1376882 FR 87992017 WL 388889(Pres.)

End of Document

2017 WL 359824 (White House)

The White House

Office of Communications

EXECUTIVE ORDER: BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

January 25, 2017

*1 The White House

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

EXECUTIVE ORDER

- - - - - - -

BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) (INA), the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109 367) (Secure Fence Act), and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (Public Law 104 208 Div. C) (IIRIRA), and in order to ensure the safety and territorial integrity of the United States as well as to ensure that the Nation's immigration laws are faithfully executed, I hereby order as follows:

Section 1. Purpose. Border security is critically important to the national security of the United States. Aliens who illegally enter the United States without inspection or admission present a significant threat to national security and public safety. Such aliens have not been identified or inspected by Federal immigration officers to determine their admissibility to the United States. The recent surge of illegal immigration at the southern border with Mexico has placed a significant strain on Federal resources and overwhelmed agencies charged with border security and immigration enforcement, as well as the local communities into which many of the aliens are placed.

Transnational criminal organizations operate sophisticated drug- and human-trafficking networks and smuggling operations on both sides of the southern border, contributing to a significant increase in violent crime and United States deaths from dangerous drugs. Among those who illegally enter are those who seek to harm Americans through acts of terror or criminal conduct. Continued illegal immigration presents a clear and present danger to the interests of the United States.

Federal immigration law both imposes the responsibility and provides the means for the Federal Government, in cooperation with border States, to secure the Nation's southern border. Although Federal immigration law provides a robust framework for Federal-State partnership in enforcing our immigration laws and the Congress has authorized and provided appropriations to secure our borders the Federal Government has failed to discharge this basic sovereign responsibility. The purpose of this order is to direct executive departments and agencies (agencies) to deploy all lawful means to secure the Nation's southern border, to prevent further illegal immigration into the United States, and to repatriate illegal aliens swiftly, consistently, and humanely.

Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the executive branch to:

(a) secure the southern border of the United States through the immediate construction of a physical wall on the southern border, monitored and supported by adequate personnel so as to prevent illegal immigration, drug and human trafficking, and acts of terrorism;

*2 (b) detain individuals apprehended on suspicion of violating Federal or State law, including Federal immigration law, pending further proceedings regarding those violations;

(c) expedite determinations of apprehended individuals' claims of eligibility to remain in the United States;

(d) remove promptly those individuals whose legal claims to remain in the United States have been lawfully rejected, after any appropriate civil or criminal sanctions have been imposed; and

(e) cooperate fully with States and local law enforcement in enacting Federal-State partnerships to enforce Federal immigration priorities, as well as State monitoring and detention programs that are consistent with Federal law and do not undermine Federal immigration priorities.

Sec. 3. Definitions. (a) "Asylum officer" has the meaning given the term in section 235(b)(1)(E) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)).

(b) "Southern border" shall mean the contiguous land border between the United States and Mexico, including all points of entry.

(c) "Border States" shall mean the States of the United States immediately adjacent to the contiguous land border between the United States and Mexico.

(d) Except as otherwise noted, "the Secretary" shall refer to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(e) "Wall" shall mean a contiguous, physical wall or other similarly secure, contiguous, and impassable physical barrier.

(f) "Executive department" shall have the meaning given in section 101 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) "Regulations" shall mean any and all Federal rules, regulations, and directives lawfully promulgated by agencies.

(h) "Operational control" shall mean the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband.

Sec. 4. Physical Security of the Southern Border of the United States. The Secretary shall immediately take the following steps to obtain complete operational control, as determined by the Secretary, of the southern border:

(a) In accordance with existing law, including the Secure Fence Act and IIRIRA, take all appropriate steps to immediately plan, design, and construct a physical wall along the southern border, using appropriate materials and technology to most effectively achieve complete operational control of the southern border;

(b) Identify and, to the extent permitted by law, allocate all sources of Federal funds for the planning, designing, and constructing of a physical wall along the southern border;

(c) Project and develop long-term funding requirements for the wall, including preparing Congressional budget requests for the current and upcoming fiscal years; and

(d) Produce a comprehensive study of the security of the southern border, to be completed within 180 days of this order, that shall include the current state of southern border security, all geophysical and topographical aspects of the southern border, the availability of Federal and State resources necessary to achieve complete operational control of the southern border, and a strategy to obtain and maintain complete operational control of the southern border.

*3 Sec. 5. Detention Facilities. (a) The Secretary shall take all appropriate action and allocate all legally available resources to immediately construct, operate, control, or establish contracts to construct, operate, or control facilities to detain aliens at or near the land border with Mexico.

(b) The Secretary shall take all appropriate action and allocate all legally available resources to immediately assign asylum officers to immigration detention facilities for the purpose of accepting asylum referrals and conducting credible fear determinations pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)) and applicable regulations and reasonable fear determinations pursuant to applicable regulations.

(c) The Attorney General shall take all appropriate action and allocate all legally available resources to immediately assign immigration judges to immigration detention facilities operated or controlled by the Secretary, or operated or controlled pursuant to contract by the Secretary, for the purpose of conducting proceedings authorized under title 8, chapter 12, subchapter II, United States Code.

Sec. 6. Detention for Illegal Entry. The Secretary shall immediately take all appropriate actions to ensure the detention of aliens apprehended for violations of immigration law pending the outcome of their removal proceedings or their removal from the country to the extent permitted by law. The Secretary shall issue new policy guidance to all Department of Homeland Security personnel regarding the appropriate and consistent use of lawful detention authority under the INA, including the termination of the practice commonly known as "catch and release," whereby aliens are routinely released in the United States shortly after their apprehension for violations of immigration law.

Sec. 7. Return to Territory. The Secretary shall take appropriate action, consistent with the requirements of section 1232 of title 8, United States Code, to ensure that aliens described in section 235(b)(2)(C) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(2)(C)) are returned to the territory from which they came pending a formal removal proceeding.

Sec. 8. Additional Border Patrol Agents. Subject to available appropriations, the Secretary, through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall take all appropriate action to hire 5,000 additional Border Patrol agents, and all appropriate action to ensure that such agents enter on duty and are assigned to duty stations as soon as is practicable.

Sec. 9. Foreign Aid Reporting Requirements. The head of each executive department and agency shall identify and quantify all sources of direct and indirect Federal aid or assistance to the Government of Mexico on an annual basis over the past five years, including all bilateral and multilateral development aid, economic assistance, humanitarian aid, and military aid. Within 30 days of the date of this order, the head of each executive department and agency shall submit this information to the Secretary of State. Within 60 days of the date of this order, the Secretary shall submit to the President a consolidated report reflecting the levels of such aid and assistance that has been provided annually, over each of the past five years.

*4 Sec. 10. Federal-State Agreements. It is the policy of the executive branch to empower State and local law enforcement agencies across the country to perform the functions of an immigration officer in the interior of the United States to the maximum extent permitted by law.

(a) In furtherance of this policy, the Secretary shall immediately take appropriate action to engage with the Governors of the States, as well as local officials, for the purpose of preparing to enter into agreements under section 287(g) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)).

(b) To the extent permitted by law, and with the consent of State or local officials, as appropriate, the Secretary shall take appropriate action, through agreements under section 287(g) of the INA, or otherwise, to authorize State and local law enforcement officials, as the Secretary determines are qualified and appropriate, to perform the functions of immigration officers in relation to the investigation, apprehension, or detention of aliens in the United States under the direction and the supervision of the Secretary. Such authorization shall be in addition to, rather than in place of, Federal performance of these duties.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, the Secretary may structure each agreement under section 287(g) of the INA in the manner that provides the most effective model for enforcing Federal immigration laws and obtaining operational control over the border for that jurisdiction.

Sec. 11. Parole, Asylum, and Removal. It is the policy of the executive branch to end the abuse of parole and asylum provisions currently used to prevent the lawful removal of removable aliens.

(a) The Secretary shall immediately take all appropriate action to ensure that the parole and asylum provisions of Federal immigration law are not illegally exploited to prevent the removal of otherwise removable aliens.

(b) The Secretary shall take all appropriate action, including by promulgating any appropriate regulations, to ensure that asylum referrals and credible fear determinations pursuant to section 235(b)(1) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1125(b)(1)) and 8 CFR 208.30, and reasonable fear determinations pursuant to 8 CFR 208.31, are conducted in a manner consistent with the plain language of those provisions.

(c) Pursuant to section 235(b)(1)(A)(iii)(I) of the INA, the Secretary shall take appropriate action to apply, in his sole and unreviewable discretion, the provisions of section 235(b)(1)(A)(i) and (ii) of the INA to the aliens designated under section 235(b)(1)(A)(iii)(II).

(d) The Secretary shall take appropriate action to ensure that parole authority under section 212(d)(5) of the INA (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is exercised only on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the plain language of the statute, and in all circumstances only when an individual demonstrates urgent humanitarian reasons or a significant public benefit derived from such parole.

***5** (e) The Secretary shall take appropriate action to require that all Department of Homeland Security personnel are properly trained on the proper application of section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) and section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)), to ensure that unaccompanied alien children are properly processed, receive appropriate care and placement while in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, and, when appropriate, are safely repatriated in accordance with law.

Sec. 12. Authorization to Enter Federal Lands. The Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Interior and any other heads of agencies as necessary, shall take all appropriate action to:

(a) permit all officers and employees of the United States, as well as all State and local officers as authorized by the Secretary, to have access to all Federal lands as necessary and appropriate to implement this order; and

(b) enable those officers and employees of the United States, as well as all State and local officers as authorized by the Secretary, to perform such actions on Federal lands as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to implement this order.

Sec. 13. Priority Enforcement. The Attorney General shall take all appropriate steps to establish prosecution guidelines and allocate appropriate resources to ensure that Federal prosecutors accord a high priority to prosecutions of offenses having a nexus to the southern border.

Sec. 14. Government Transparency. The Secretary shall, on a monthly basis and in a publicly available way, report statistical data on aliens apprehended at or near the southern border using a uniform method of reporting by all Department of Homeland Security components, in a format that is easily understandable by the public.

Sec. 15. Reporting. Except as otherwise provided in this order, the Secretary, within 90 days of the date of this order, and the Attorney General, within 180 days, shall each submit to the President a report on the progress of the directives contained in this order.

Sec. 16. Hiring. The Office of Personnel Management shall take appropriate action as may be necessary to facilitate hiring personnel to implement this order.

Sec. 17. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

(i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(b) This order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

(c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

*6 DONALD J. TRUMP

THE WHITE HOUSE,

January 25, 2017.

2017 WL 359824 (White House)

End of Document

Exec. Order No. 13769, 82 FR 8977, 2017 WL 412752(Pres.)
Executive Order 13769

Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States

January 27, 2017

***8977** By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq., and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and to protect the American people from terrorist attacks by foreign nationals admitted to the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Purpose. The visa-issuance process plays a crucial role in detecting individuals with terrorist ties and stopping them from entering the United States. Perhaps in no instance was that more apparent than the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when State Department policy prevented consular officers from properly scrutinizing the visa applications of several of the 19 foreign nationals who went on to murder nearly 3,000 Americans. And while the visa-issuance process was reviewed and amended after the September 11 attacks to better detect would-be terrorists from receiving visas, these measures did not stop attacks by foreign nationals who were admitted to the United States.

Numerous foreign-born individuals have been convicted or implicated in terrorism-related crimes since September 11, 2001, including foreign nationals who entered the United States after receiving visitor, student, or employment visas, or who entered through the United States refugee resettlement program. Deteriorating conditions in certain countries due to war, strife, disaster, and civil unrest increase the likelihood that terrorists will use any means possible to enter the United States. The United States must be vigilant during the visa-issuance process to ensure that those approved for admission do not intend to harm Americans and that they have no ties to terrorism.

In order to protect Americans, the United States must ensure that those admitted to this country do not bear hostile attitudes toward it and its founding principles. The United States cannot, and should not, admit those who do not support the Constitution, or those who would place violent ideologies over American law. In addition, the United States should not admit those who engage in acts of bigotry or hatred (including "honor" killings, other forms of violence against women, or the persecution of those who practice religions different from their own) or those who would oppress Americans of any race, gender, or sexual orientation.

Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the United States to protect its citizens from foreign nationals who intend to commit terrorist attacks in the United States; and to prevent the admission of foreign nationals who intend to exploit United States immigration laws for malevolent purposes.

Sec. 3. Suspension of Issuance of Visas and Other Immigration Benefits to Nationals of Countries of Particular Concern. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall immediately conduct a review to determine the information needed from any country to adjudicate any visa, admission, or other benefit under the INA (adjudications) in order to determine that the individual seeking the benefit is who the individual claims to be and is not a security or public-safety threat.
(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the President y8978a report on the results of the review described in subsection (a) of this section, including the Secretary of Homeland Security's determination of the information needed for adjudications and a list of countries that do not provide adequate information, within 30 days of the date of this order. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a copy of the report to the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence.

(c) To temporarily reduce investigative burdens on relevant agencies during the review period described in subsection (a) of this section, to ensure the proper review and maximum utilization of available resources for the screening of foreign nationals, and to ensure that adequate standards are established to prevent infiltration by foreign terrorists or criminals, pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), I hereby proclaim that the immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of aliens from countries referred to in section 217(a)(12) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(12), would be

detrimental to the interests of the United States, and I hereby suspend entry into the United States, as immigrants and nonimmigrants, of such persons for 90 days from the date of this order (excluding those foreign nationals traveling on diplomatic visas, North Atlantic Treaty Organization visas, C-2 visas for travel to the United Nations, and G-1, G-2, G-3, and G-4 visas).

(d) Immediately upon receipt of the report described in subsection (b) of this section regarding the information needed for adjudications, the Secretary of State shall request all foreign governments that do not supply such information to start providing such information regarding their nationals within 60 days of notification.

(e) After the 60-day period described in subsection (d) of this section expires, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the President a list of countries recommended for inclusion on a Presidential proclamation that would prohibit the entry of foreign nationals (excluding those foreign nationals traveling on diplomatic visas, North Atlantic Treaty Organization visas, C-2 visas for travel to the United Nations, and G-1, G-2, G-3, and G-4 visas) from countries that do not provide the information requested pursuant to subsection (d) of this section until compliance occurs.

(f) At any point after submitting the list described in subsection (e) of this section, the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security may submit to the President the names of any additional countries recommended for similar treatment.

(g) Notwithstanding a suspension pursuant to subsection (c) of this section or pursuant to a Presidential proclamation described in subsection (e) of this section, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security may, on a case-by-case basis, and when in the national interest, issue visas or other immigration benefits to nationals of countries for which visas and benefits are otherwise blocked.

(h) The Secretaries of State and Homeland Security shall submit to the President a joint report on the progress in implementing this order within 30 days of the date of this order, a second report within 60 days of the date of this order, a third report within 90 days of the date of this order, and a fourth report within 120 days of the date of this order.

Sec. 4. Implementing Uniform Screening Standards for All Immigration Programs. (a) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall implement a program, as part of the adjudication process for immigration benefits, to identify individuals seeking to enter the United States on a fraudulent basis with the intent to cause harm, or who are at risk of causing harm subsequent to their admission. This program will include the development of a uniform screening standard and procedure, such as in-person interviews; a database of identity documents proffered by applicants to ensure that duplicate documents are not ***8979** used by multiple applicants; amended application forms that include questions aimed at identifying fraudulent answers and malicious intent; a mechanism to ensure that the applicant is who the applicant claims to be; a process to evaluate the applicant's likelihood of becoming a positively contributing member of society and the applicant's ability to make contributions to the national interest; and a mechanism to assess whether or not the applicant has the intent to commit criminal or terrorist acts after entering the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the President an initial report on the progress of this directive within 60 days of the date of this order, a second report within 100 days of the date of this order, and a third report within 200 days of the date of this order.

Sec. 5. Realignment of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program for Fiscal Year 2017. (a) The Secretary of State shall suspend the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) for 120 days. During the 120-day period, the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall review the USRAP application and adjudication process to determine what additional procedures should be taken to ensure that those approved for refugee admission do not pose a threat to the security and welfare of the United States, and shall implement such additional procedures. Refugee applicants who are already in the USRAP process may be admitted upon the initiation and completion of these revised procedures. Upon the date that is 120 days after the date of this order, the Secretary

of State shall resume USRAP admissions only for nationals of countries for which the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence have jointly determined that such additional procedures are adequate to ensure the security and welfare of the United States.
(b) Upon the resumption of USRAP admissions, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is further directed to make changes, to the extent permitted by law, to prioritize refugee claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution, provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual's country of nationality. Where necessary and appropriate, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security shall recommend legislation to the President that would assist with such prioritization.

(c) Pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), I hereby proclaim that the entry of nationals of Syria as refugees is detrimental to the interests of the United States and thus suspend any such entry until such time as I have determined that sufficient changes have been made to the USRAP to ensure that admission of Syrian refugees is consistent with the national interest.

(d) Pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), I hereby proclaim that the entry of more than 50,000 refugees in fiscal year 2017 would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, and thus suspend any such entry until such time as I determine that additional admissions would be in the national interest.

(e) Notwithstanding the temporary suspension imposed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security may jointly determine to admit individuals to the United States as refugees on a case-by-case basis, in their discretion, but only so long as they determine that the admission of such individuals as refugees is in the national interest_including when the person is a religious minority in his country of nationality facing religious persecution, when admitting the person would enable the United States to conform its conduct to a preexisting international agreement, or when the person is already in transit and denying admission would cause undue hardship_and it would not pose a risk to the security or welfare of the United States.

The President *8980
(f) The Secretary of State shall submit to the President an initial report on the progress of the directive in subsection (b) of this section regarding prioritization of claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution within 100 days of the date of this order and shall submit a second report within 200 days of the date of this order.

(g) It is the policy of the executive branch that, to the extent permitted by law and as practicable, State and local jurisdictions be granted a role in the process of determining the placement or settlement in their jurisdictions of aliens eligible to be admitted to the United States as refugees. To that end, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall examine existing law to determine the extent to which, consistent with applicable law, State and local jurisdictions may have greater involvement in the process of determining the placement or resettlement of refugees in their jurisdictions, and shall devise a proposal to lawfully promote such involvement.

Sec. 6. Rescission of Exercise of Authority Relating to the Terrorism Grounds of Inadmissibility. The Secretaries of State and Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, consider rescinding the exercises of authority in section 212 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1182, relating to the terrorism grounds of inadmissibility, as well as any related implementing memoranda.

Sec. 7. Expedited Completion of the Biometric Entry-Exit Tracking System. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall expedite the completion and implementation of a biometric entry-exit tracking system for all travelers to the United States, as recommended by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the President periodic reports on the progress of the directive contained in subsection (a) of this section. The initial report shall be submitted within 100 days of the date of this order, a second report shall be submitted within 200 days of the date of this order, and a third report shall be submitted within 365 days of the date of this order. Further, the Secretary shall submit a report every 180 days thereafter until the system is fully deployed and operational.

Sec. 8. Visa Interview Security. (a) The Secretary of State shall immediately suspend the Visa Interview Waiver Program and ensure compliance with section 222 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1202, which requires that all individuals seeking a nonimmigrant visa undergo an in-person interview, subject to specific statutory exceptions.

(b) To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of State shall immediately expand the Consular Fellows Program, including by substantially increasing the number of Fellows, lengthening or making permanent the period of service, and making language training at the Foreign Service Institute available to Fellows for assignment to posts outside of their area of core linguistic ability, to ensure that non-immigrant visa-interview wait times are not unduly affected.

Sec. 9. Visa Validity Reciprocity. The Secretary of State shall review all nonimmigrant visa reciprocity agreements to ensure that they are, with respect to each visa classification, truly reciprocal insofar as practicable with respect to validity period and fees, as required by sections 221(c) and 281 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1201(c) and 1351, and other treatment. If a country does not treat United States nationals seeking nonimmigrant visas in a reciprocal manner, the Secretary of State shall adjust the visa validity period, fee schedule, or other treatment to match the treatment of United States nationals by the foreign country, to the extent practicable.

Sec. 10. Transparency and Data Collection. (a) To be more transparent with the American people, and to more effectively implement policies and practices that serve the national interest, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall, consistent with applicable law and national security, collect and make publicly available within 180 days, and every 180 days thereafter: ***8981**

(i) information regarding the number of foreign nationals in the United States who have been charged with terrorism-related offenses while in the United States; convicted of terrorism-related offenses while in the United States; or removed from the United States based on terrorism-related activity, affiliation, or material support to a terrorism-related organization, or any other national security reasons since the date of this order or the last reporting period, whichever is later;

(ii) information regarding the number of foreign nationals in the United States who have been radicalized after entry into the United States and engaged in terrorism-related acts, or who have provided material support to terrorism-related organizations in countries that pose a threat to the United States, since the date of this order or the last reporting period, whichever is later; and

(iii) information regarding the number and types of acts of gender-based violence against women, including honor killings, in the United States by foreign nationals, since the date of this order or the last reporting period, whichever is later; and

(iv) any other information relevant to public safety and security as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, including information on the immigration status of foreign nationals charged with major offenses.

(b) The Secretary of State shall, within one year of the date of this order, provide a report on the estimated long-term costs of the USRAP at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Sec. 11. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

(i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(b) This order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations. ***8982**

(c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

THE WHITE HOUSE,January 27, 2017.

Exec. Order No. 1376982 FR 89772017 WL 412752(Pres.)

End of Document

Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20528

Homeland Security

February 20, 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Kevin McAleenan
Acting Commissioner
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Thomas D. Homan
Acting Director
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Lori Scialabba
Acting Director
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Joseph B. Maher
Acting General Counsel

Dimple Shah
Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs

Chip Fulghum
Acting Undersecretary for Management

FROM:

John Kelly
Secretary

SUBJECT:

Implementing the President's Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements Policies

This memorandum implements the Executive Order entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements," issued by the President on January 25, 2017, which establishes the President's policy regarding effective border security and immigration enforcement through faithful execution of the laws of the United States. It implements new policies designed to stem illegal immigration and facilitate the detection, apprehension, detention, and removal of aliens who have no lawful basis to enter or remain in the United States. It constitutes guidance to all Department personnel, and supersedes all existing conflicting policy, directives, memoranda, and other guidance regarding this subject matter—to the extent of the conflict—except as otherwise expressly stated in this memorandum.

A. Policies Regarding the Apprehension and Detention of Aliens Described in Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The President has determined that the lawful detention of aliens arriving in the United States and deemed inadmissible or otherwise described in section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) pending a final determination of whether to order them removed, including determining eligibility for immigration relief, is the most efficient means by which to enforce the immigration laws at our borders. Detention also prevents such aliens from committing crimes while at large in the United States, ensures that aliens will appear for their removal proceedings, and substantially increases the likelihood that aliens lawfully ordered removed will be removed.

These policies are consistent with INA provisions that mandate detention of such aliens and allow me or my designee to exercise discretionary parole authority pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of the INA only on a case-by-case basis, and only for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit. Policies that facilitate the release of removable aliens apprehended at and between the ports of entry, which allow them to abscond and fail to appear at their removal hearings, undermine the border security mission. Such policies, collectively referred to as "catch-and-release," shall end.

Accordingly, effective upon my determination of (1) the establishment and deployment of a joint plan with the Department of Justice to surge the deployment of immigration judges and asylum officers to interview and adjudicate claims asserted by recent border entrants; and, (2) the establishment of appropriate processing and detention facilities, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) personnel should only release from detention an alien detained pursuant to section 235(b) of the INA, who was apprehended or encountered after illegally entering or attempting to illegally enter the United States, in the following situations on a case-by-case basis, to the extent consistent with applicable statutes and regulations:

1. When removing the alien from the United States pursuant to statute or regulation;

2. When the alien obtains an order granting relief or protection from removal or the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) determines that the individual is a U.S. citizen, national of the United States, or an alien who is a lawful permanent resident, refugee, asylee, holds temporary protected status, or holds a valid immigration status in the United States;

3. When an ICE Field Office Director, ICE Special Agent-in-Charge, U.S. Border Patrol Sector Chief, CBP Director of Field Operations, or CBP Air & Marine Operations Director consents to the alien's withdrawal of an application for admission, and the alien contemporaneously departs from the United States;

4. When required to do so by statute, or to comply with a binding settlement agreement or order issued by a competent judicial or administrative authority;

5. When an ICE Field Office Director, ICE Special Agent-in-Charge, U.S. Border Patrol Sector Chief, CBP Director of Field Operations, or CBP Air & Marine Operations Director authorizes the alien's parole pursuant to section 212(d)(5) of the INA with the written concurrence of the Deputy Director of ICE or the Deputy Commissioner of CBP, except in exigent circumstances such as medical emergencies where seeking prior approval is not practicable. In those exceptional instances, any such parole will be reported to the Deputy Director or Deputy Commissioner as expeditiously as possible; or

6. When an arriving alien processed under the expedited removal provisions of section 235(b) has been found to have established a "credible fear" of persecution or torture by an asylum officer or an immigration judge, provided that such an alien affirmatively establishes to the satisfaction of an ICE immigration officer his or her identity, that he or she presents neither a security risk nor a risk of absconding, and provided that he or she agrees to comply with any additional conditions of release imposed by ICE to ensure public safety and appearance at any removal hearings.

To the extent current regulations are inconsistent with this guidance, components will develop or revise regulations as appropriate. Until such regulations are revised or removed, Department officials shall continue to operate according to regulations currently in place.

As the Department works to expand detention capabilities, detention of all such individuals may not be immediately possible, and detention resources should be prioritized based upon potential danger and risk of flight if an individual alien is not detained, and parole determinations will be made in accordance with current regulations and guidance. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 212.5, 235.3. This guidance does not prohibit the return of an alien who is arriving on land to the foreign territory contiguous to the United States from which the alien is arriving pending a removal proceeding under section 240 of the INA consistent with the direction of an ICE Field Office Director, ICE Special Agent-in-Charge, CBP Chief Patrol Agent, or CBP Director of Field Operations.

B. Hiring More CBP Agents/Officers

CBP has insufficient agents/officers to effectively detect, track, and apprehend all aliens illegally entering the United States. The United States needs additional agents and officers to ensure complete operational control of the border. Accordingly, the Commissioner of CBP shall—while ensuring consistency in training and standards—immediately begin the process of hiring 5,000 additional Border Patrol agents, as well as 500 Air & Marine Agents/Officers, subject to the availability of resources, and take all actions necessary to ensure that such agents/officers enter on duty and are assigned to appropriate duty stations, including providing for the attendant resources and additional personnel necessary to support such agents, as soon as practicable.

Human Capital leadership in CBP and ICE, in coordination with the Under Secretary for

Management, Chief Financial Officer, and Chief Human Capital Officer, shall develop hiring plans that balance growth and interagency attrition by integrating workforce shaping and career paths for incumbents and new hires.

C. Identifying and Quantifying Sources of Aid to Mexico

The President has directed the heads of all executive departments to identify and quantify all sources of direct and indirect Federal aid or assistance to the Government of Mexico. Accordingly, the Under Secretary for Management shall identify all sources of direct or indirect aid and assistance, excluding intelligence activities, from every departmental component to the Government of Mexico on an annual basis, for the last five fiscal years, and quantify such aid or assistance. The Under Secretary for Management shall submit a report to me reflecting historic levels of such aid or assistance provided annually within 30 days of the date of this memorandum.

D. Expansion of the 287(g) Program in the Border Region

Section 287(g) of the INA authorizes me to enter into a written agreement with a state or political subdivision thereof, for the purpose of authorizing qualified officers or employees of the state or subdivision to perform the functions of an immigration officer in relation to the investigation, apprehension, or detention of aliens in the United States. This grant of authority, known as the 287(g) Program, has been a highly successful force multiplier that authorizes state or local law enforcement personnel to perform all law enforcement functions specified in section 287(a) of the INA, including the authority to investigate, identify, apprehend, arrest, detain, transport and conduct searches of an alien for the purposes of enforcing the immigration laws. From January 2006 through September 2015, the 287(g) Program led to the identification of more than 402,000 removable aliens, primarily through encounters at local jails.

Empowering state and local law enforcement agencies to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration law is critical to an effective enforcement strategy. Aliens who engage in criminal conduct are priorities for arrest and removal and will often be encountered by state and local law enforcement officers during the course of their routine duties. It is in the interest of the Department to partner with those state and local jurisdictions through 287(g) agreements to assist in the arrest and removal of criminal aliens.

To maximize participation by state and local jurisdictions in the enforcement of federal immigration law near the southern border, I am directing the Director of ICE and the Commissioner of CBP to engage immediately with all willing and qualified law enforcement jurisdictions that meet all program requirements for the purpose of entering into agreements under 287(g) of the INA.

The Commissioner of CBP and the Director of ICE should consider the operational functions and capabilities of the jurisdictions willing to enter into 287(g) agreements and structure such agreements in a manner that employs the most effective enforcement model for that jurisdiction, including the jail enforcement model, task force officer model, or joint jail enforcement-task force officer model. In furtherance of my direction herein, the Commissioner of

CBP is authorized, in addition to the Director of ICE, to accept state services and take other actions as appropriate to carry out immigration enforcement pursuant to 287(g).

E. Commissioning a Comprehensive Study of Border Security

The Under Secretary for Management, in consultation with the Commissioner of CBP, Joint Task Force (Border), and Commandant of the Coast Guard, is directed to commission an immediate, comprehensive study of the security of the southern border (air, land and maritime) to identify vulnerabilities and provide recommendations to enhance border security. The study should include all aspects of the current border security environment, including the availability of federal and state resources to develop and implement an effective border security strategy that will achieve complete operational control of the border.

F. Border Wall Construction and Funding

A wall along the southern border is necessary to deter and prevent the illegal entry of aliens and is a critical component of the President's overall border security strategy. Congress has authorized the construction of physical barriers and roads at the border to prevent illegal immigration in several statutory provisions, including section 102 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1103 note.

Consistent with the President's Executive Order, the will of Congress and the need to secure the border in the national interest, CBP, in consultation with the appropriate executive departments and agencies, and nongovernmental entities having relevant expertise—and using materials originating in the United States to the maximum extent permitted by law—shall immediately begin planning, design, construction and maintenance of a wall, including the attendant lighting, technology (including sensors), as well as patrol and access roads, along the land border with Mexico in accordance with existing law, in the most appropriate locations and utilizing appropriate materials and technology to most effectively achieve operational control of the border.

The Under Secretary for Management, in consultation with the Commissioner of CBP shall immediately identify and allocate all sources of available funding for the planning, design, construction and maintenance of a wall, including the attendant lighting, technology (including sensors), as well as patrol and access roads, and develop requirements for total ownership cost of this project, including preparing Congressional budget requests for the current fiscal year (e.g., supplemental budget requests) and subsequent fiscal years.

G. Expanding Expedited Removal Pursuant to Section 235(b)(1)(A)(iii)(I) of the INA

It is in the national interest to detain and expeditiously remove from the United States aliens apprehended at the border, who have been ordered removed after consideration and denial of their claims for relief or protection. Pursuant to section 235(b)(1)(A)(i) of the INA, if an immigration officer determines that an arriving alien is inadmissible to the United States under

section 212(a)(6)(C) or section 212(a)(7) of the INA, the officer shall, consistent with all applicable laws, order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review, unless the alien is an unaccompanied alien child as defined in 6 U.S.C. § 279(g)(2), indicates an intention to apply for asylum or a fear of persecution or torture or a fear of return to his or her country, or claims to have a valid immigration status within the United States or to be a citizen or national of the United States.

Pursuant to section 235(b)(1)(A)(iii)(I) of the INA and other provisions of law, I have been granted the authority to apply, by designation in my sole and unreviewable discretion, the expedited removal provisions in section 235(b)(1)(A)(i) and (ii) of the INA to aliens who have not been admitted or paroled into the United States, who are inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C) or section 212(a)(7) of the INA, and who have not affirmatively shown, to the satisfaction of an immigration officer, that they have been continuously physically present in the United States for the two-year period immediately prior to the determination of their inadmissibility. To date, this authority has only been exercised to designate for application of expedited removal, aliens encountered within 100 air miles of the border and 14 days of entry, and aliens who arrived in the United States by sea other than at a port of entry.[1]

The surge of illegal immigration at the southern border has overwhelmed federal agencies and resources and has created a significant national security vulnerability to the United States. Thousands of aliens apprehended at the border, placed in removal proceedings, and released from custody have absconded and failed to appear at their removal hearings. Immigration courts are experiencing a historic backlog of removal cases, primarily proceedings under section 240 of the INA for individuals who are not currently detained.

During October 2016 and November 2016, there were 46,184 and 47,215 apprehensions, respectively, between ports of entry on our southern border. In comparison, during October 2015 and November 2015 there were 32,724 and 32,838 apprehensions, respectively, between ports of entry on our southern border. This increase of 10,000–15,000 apprehensions per month has significantly strained DHS resources.

Furthermore, according to EOIR information provided to DHS, there are more than 534,000 cases currently pending on immigration court dockets nationwide—a record high. By contrast, according to some reports, there were nearly 168,000 cases pending at the end of fiscal year (FY) 2004 when section 235(b)(1)(A)(i) was last expanded.[2] This represents an increase of more than 200% in the number of cases pending completion. The average removal case for an alien who is not detained has been pending for more than two years before an immigration judge.[3] In some immigration courts, aliens who are not detained will not have their cases heard by an

---

[1] Notice Designating Aliens Subject to Expedited Removal Under Section 235(b)(1)(a)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 67 Fed. Reg. 68924 (Nov. 13, 2002); Designating Aliens For Expedited Removal, 69 Fed. Reg. 48877 (Aug. 11, 2004); Eliminating Exception to Expedited Removal Authority for Cuban Nationals Encountered in the United States or Arriving by Sea, 82 Fed. Reg. 4902 (Jan. 17, 2017).

[2] Syracuse University, *Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC) Data Research*; available at http://trac.syr.edu/phptools/immigration/court_backlog/.

[3] *Id.*

immigration judge for as long as five years. This unacceptable delay affords removable aliens with no plausible claim for relief to remain unlawfully in the United States for many years.

To ensure the prompt removal of aliens apprehended soon after crossing the border illegally, the Department will publish in the *Federal Register* a new Notice Designating Aliens Subject to Expedited Removal Under Section 235(b)(1)(a)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which may, to the extent I determine is appropriate, depart from the limitations set forth in the designation currently in force. I direct the Commissioner of CBP and the Director of ICE to conform the use of expedited removal procedures to the designations made in this notice upon its publication.

H. Implementing the Provisions of Section 235(b)(2)(C) of the INA to Return Aliens to Contiguous Countries

Section 235(b)(2)(C) of the INA authorizes the Department to return aliens arriving on land from a foreign territory contiguous to the United States, to the territory from which they arrived, pending a formal removal proceeding under section 240 of the INA. When aliens so apprehended do not pose a risk of a subsequent illegal entry or attempted illegal entry, returning them to the foreign contiguous territory from which they arrived, pending the outcome of removal proceedings saves the Department's detention and adjudication resources for other priority aliens.

Accordingly, subject to the requirements of section 1232, Title 8, United States Code, related to unaccompanied alien children and to the extent otherwise consistent with the law and U.S. international treaty obligations, CBP and ICE personnel shall, to the extent appropriate and reasonably practicable, return aliens described in section 235(b)(2)(A) of the INA, who are placed in removal proceedings under section 240 of the INA—and who, consistent with the guidance of an ICE Field Office Director, CBP Chief Patrol Agent, or CBP Director of Field Operations, pose no risk of recidivism—to the territory of the foreign contiguous country from which they arrived pending such removal proceedings.

To facilitate the completion of removal proceedings for aliens so returned to the contiguous country, ICE Field Office Directors, ICE Special Agents-in-Charge, CBP Chief Patrol Agent, and CBP Directors of Field Operations shall make available facilities for such aliens to appear via video teleconference. The Director of ICE and the Commissioner of CBP shall consult with the Director of EOIR to establish a functional, interoperable video teleconference system to ensure maximum capability to conduct video teleconference removal hearings for those aliens so returned to the contiguous country.

I. Enhancing Asylum Referrals and Credible Fear Determinations Pursuant to Section 235(b)(1) of the INA

With certain exceptions, any alien who is physically present in the United States or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival and including an alien who is brought to the United States after having been interdicted in international or United States waters), irrespective of such alien's status, may apply for asylum. For those aliens who are subject

to expedited removal under section 235(b) of the INA, aliens who claim a fear of return must be referred to an asylum officer to determine whether they have established a credible fear of persecution or torture.[4] To establish a credible fear of persecution, an alien must demonstrate that there is a "significant possibility" that the alien could establish eligibility for asylum, taking into account the credibility of the statements made by the alien in support of the claim and such other facts as are known to the officer.[5]

The Director of USCIS shall ensure that asylum officers conduct credible fear interviews in a manner that allows the interviewing officer to elicit all relevant information from the alien as is necessary to make a legally sufficient determination. In determining whether the alien has demonstrated a significant possibility that the alien could establish eligibility for asylum, or for withholding or deferral of removal under the Convention Against Torture, the asylum officer shall consider the statements of the alien and determine the credibility of the alien's statements made in support of his or her claim and shall consider other facts known to the officer, as required by statute.[6]

The asylum officer shall make a positive credible fear finding only after the officer has considered all relevant evidence and determined, based on credible evidence, that the alien has a significant possibility of establishing eligibility for asylum, or for withholding or deferral of removal under the Convention Against Torture, based on established legal authority.[7]

The Director of USCIS shall also increase the operational capacity of the Fraud Detection and National Security (FDNS) Directorate and continue to strengthen the integration of its operations to support the Field Operations, Refugee, Asylum, and International Operations, and Service Center Operations Directorate, to detect and prevent fraud in the asylum and benefits adjudication processes, and in consultation with the USCIS Office of Policy and Strategy as operationally appropriate.

The Director of USCIS, the Commissioner of CBP, and the Director of ICE shall review fraud detection, deterrence, and prevention measures throughout their respective agencies and provide me with a consolidated report within 90 days of the date of this memorandum regarding fraud vulnerabilities in the asylum and benefits adjudication processes, and propose measures to enhance fraud detection, deterrence, and prevention in these processes.

J. Allocation of Resources and Personnel to the Southern Border for Detention of Aliens and Adjudication of Claims

The detention of aliens apprehended at the border is critical to the effective enforcement of the immigration laws. Aliens who are released from custody pending a determination of their removability are highly likely to abscond and fail to attend their removal hearings. Moreover, the screening of credible fear claims by USCIS and adjudication of asylum claims by EOIR at

---

[4] *See* INA § 235(b)(1)(A)-(B); 8 C.F.R. §§ 235.3, 208.30.
[5] *See* INA § 235(b)(1)(B)(v).
[6] *See id.*
[7] *Id.*

detention facilities located at or near the point of apprehension will facilitate an expedited resolution of those claims and result in lower detention and transportation costs.

Accordingly, the Director of ICE and the Commissioner of CBP should take all necessary action and allocate all available resources to expand their detention capabilities and capacities at or near the border with Mexico to the greatest extent practicable. CBP shall focus these actions on expansion of "short-term detention" (defined as 72 hours or less under 6 U.S.C. § 211(m)) capability, and ICE will focus these actions on expansion of all other detention capabilities. CBP and ICE should also explore options for joint temporary structures that meet appropriate standards for detention given the length of stay in those facilities.

In addition, to the greatest extent practicable, the Director of USCIS is directed to increase the number of asylum officers and FDNS officers assigned to detention facilities located at or near the border with Mexico to properly and efficiently adjudicate credible fear and reasonable fear claims and to counter asylum-related fraud.

K. Proper Use of Parole Authority Pursuant to Section 212(d)(5) of the INA

The authority to parole aliens into the United States is set forth in section 212(d)(5) of the INA, which provides that the Secretary may, in his discretion and on a case-by-case basis, temporarily parole into the United States any alien who is an applicant for admission for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit. The statutory language authorizes parole in individual cases only where, after careful consideration of the circumstances, it is necessary because of demonstrated urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit. In my judgment, such authority should be exercised sparingly.

The practice of granting parole to certain aliens in pre-designated categories in order to create immigration programs not established by Congress, has contributed to a border security crisis, undermined the integrity of the immigration laws and the parole process, and created an incentive for additional illegal immigration.

Therefore, the Director of USCIS, the Commissioner of CBP, and the Director of ICE shall ensure that, pending the issuance of final regulations clarifying the appropriate use of the parole power, appropriate written policy guidance and training is provided to employees within those agencies exercising parole authority, including advance parole, so that such employees are familiar with the proper exercise of parole under section 212(d)(5) of the INA and exercise such parole authority only on a case-by-case basis, consistent with the law and written policy guidance.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this memorandum, pending my further review and evaluation of the impact of operational changes to implement the Executive Order, and additional guidance on the issue by the Director of ICE, the ICE policy directive establishing standards and procedures for the parole of certain arriving aliens found to have a credible fear of persecution or

torture shall remain in full force and effect.[8] The ICE policy directive shall be implemented in a manner consistent with its plain language. In every case, the burden to establish that his or her release would neither pose a danger to the community, nor a risk of flight remains on the individual alien, and ICE retains ultimate discretion whether it grants parole in a particular case.

L. Proper Processing and Treatment of Unaccompanied Alien Minors Encountered at the Border

In accordance with section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (codified in part at 8 U.S.C. § 1232) and section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. § 279), unaccompanied alien children are provided special protections to ensure that they are properly processed and receive the appropriate care and placement when they are encountered by an immigration officer. An unaccompanied alien child, as defined in section 279(g)(2), Title 6, United States Code, is an alien who has no lawful immigration status in the United States, has not attained 18 years of age; and with respect to whom, (1) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States, or (2) no parent of legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.

Approximately 155,000 unaccompanied alien children have been apprehended at the southern border in the last three years. Most of these minors are from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, many of whom travel overland to the southern border with the assistance of a smuggler who is paid several thousand dollars by one or both parents, who reside illegally in the United States.

With limited exceptions, upon apprehension, CBP or ICE must promptly determine if a child meets the definition of an "unaccompanied alien child" and, if so, the child must be transferred to the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) within 72 hours, absent exceptional circumstances.[9] The determination that the child is an "unaccompanied alien child" entitles the child to special protections, including placement in a suitable care facility, access to social services, removal proceedings before an immigration judge under section 240 of the INA, rather than expedited removal proceedings under section 235(b) of the INA, and initial adjudication of any asylum claim by USCIS.[10]

Approximately 60% of minors initially determined to be "unaccompanied alien children" are placed in the care of one or more parents illegally residing in the United States. However, by Department policy and practice, such minors maintained their status as "unaccompanied alien children," notwithstanding that they may no longer meet the statutory definition once they have been placed by HHS in the custody of a parent in the United States who can care for the minor. Exploitation of that policy led to abuses by many of the parents and legal guardians of those minors and has contributed to significant administrative delays in adjudications by immigration

---

[8] ICE Policy No. 11002.1: Parole of Arriving Aliens Found to Have a Credible Fear of Persecution or Torture (Dec. 8, 2009).

[9] *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1232(b)(3).

[10] *See generally* 8 U.S.C. § 1232; INA § 208(b)(3)(C).

courts and USCIS.

To ensure identification of abuses and the processing of unaccompanied alien children consistent with the statutory framework and any applicable court order, the Director of USCIS, the Commissioner of CBP, and the Director of ICE are directed to develop uniform written guidance and training for all employees and contractors of those agencies regarding the proper processing of unaccompanied alien children, the timely and fair adjudication of their claims for relief from removal, and, if appropriate, their safe repatriation at the conclusion of removal proceedings. In developing such guidance and training, they shall establish standardized review procedures to confirm that alien children who are initially determined to be "unaccompanied alien child[ren]," as defined in section 279(g)(2), Title 6, United States Code, continue to fall within the statutory definition when being considered for the legal protections afforded to such children as they go through the removal process.

M. Accountability Measures to Protect Alien Children from Exploitation and Prevent Abuses of Our Immigration Laws

Although the Department's personnel must process unaccompanied alien children pursuant to the requirements described above, we have an obligation to ensure that those who conspire to violate our immigration laws do not do so with impunity—particularly in light of the unique vulnerabilities of alien children who are smuggled or trafficked into the United States.

The parents and family members of these children, who are often illegally present in the United States, often pay smugglers several thousand dollars to bring their children into this country. Tragically, many of these children fall victim to robbery, extortion, kidnapping, sexual assault, and other crimes of violence by the smugglers and other criminal elements along the dangerous journey through Mexico to the United States. Regardless of the desires for family reunification, or conditions in other countries, the smuggling or trafficking of alien children is intolerable.

Accordingly, the Director of ICE and the Commissioner of CBP shall ensure the proper enforcement of our immigration laws against any individual who—directly or indirectly—facilitates the illegal smuggling or trafficking of an alien child into the United States. In appropriate cases, taking into account the risk of harm to the child from the specific smuggling or trafficking activity that the individual facilitated and other factors relevant to the individual's culpability and the child's welfare, proper enforcement includes (but is not limited to) placing any such individual who is a removable alien into removal proceedings, or referring the individual for criminal prosecution.

N. Prioritizing Criminal Prosecutions for Immigration Offenses Committed at the Border

The surge of illegal immigration at the southern border has produced a significant increase in organized criminal activity in the border region. Mexican drug cartels, Central American gangs, and other violent transnational criminal organizations have established sophisticated criminal

enterprises on both sides of the border. The large-scale movement of Central Americans, Mexicans, and other foreign nationals into the border area has significantly strained federal agencies and resources dedicated to border security. These criminal organizations have monopolized the human trafficking, human smuggling, and drug trafficking trades in the border region.

It is in the national interest of the United States to prevent criminals and criminal organizations from destabilizing border security through the proliferation of illicit transactions and violence perpetrated by criminal organizations.

To counter this substantial and ongoing threat to the security of the southern border—including threats to our maritime border and the approaches—the Directors of the Joint Task Forces-West, -East, and -Investigations, as well as the ICE-led Border Enforcement Security Task Forces (BESTs), are directed to plan and implement enhanced counternetwork operations directed at disrupting transnational criminal organizations, focused on those involved in human smuggling. The Department will support this work through the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, CBP's National Targeting Center, and the DHS Human Smuggling Cell.

In addition, the task forces should include participants from other federal, state, and local agencies, and should target individuals and organizations whose criminal conduct undermines border security or the integrity of the immigration system, including offenses related to alien smuggling or trafficking, drug trafficking, illegal entry and reentry, visa fraud, identity theft, unlawful possession or use of official documents, and acts of violence committed against persons or property at or near the border.

In order to support the efforts of the BESTs and counter network operations of the Joint Task Forces, the Director of ICE shall increase of the number of special agents and analysts in the Northern Triangle ICE Attaché Offices and increase the number of vetted Transnational Criminal Investigative Unit international partners. This expansion of ICE's international footprint will focus both domestic and international efforts to dismantle transnational criminal organizations that are facilitating and profiting from the smuggling routes to the United States.

O. Public Reporting of Border Apprehensions Data

The Department has an obligation to perform its mission in a transparent and forthright manner. The public is entitled to know, with a reasonable degree of detail, information pertaining to the aliens unlawfully entering at our borders.

Therefore, consistent with law, in an effort to promote transparency and renew confidence in the Department's border security mission, the Commissioner of CBP and the Director of ICE shall develop a standardized method for public reporting of statistical data regarding aliens apprehended at or near the border for violating the immigration law. The reporting method shall include uniform terminology and shall utilize a format that is easily understandable by the public in a medium that can be readily accessed.

At a minimum, in addition to statistical information currently being publicly reported regarding apprehended aliens, the following information must be included: the number of convicted criminals and the nature of their offenses; the prevalence of gang members and prior immigration violators; the custody status of aliens and, if released, the reason for release and location of that release; and the number of aliens ordered removed and those aliens physically removed.

P. No Private Right of Action

This document provides only internal DHS policy guidance, which may be modified, rescinded, or superseded at any time without notice. This guidance is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter. Likewise, no limitations are placed by this guidance on the otherwise lawful enforcement or litigation prerogatives of DHS.

In implementing this guidance, I direct DHS Components to consult with legal counsel to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, including the Administrative Procedure Act.

Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20528

Homeland Security

February 20, 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR: Kevin McAleenan
Acting Commissioner
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Thomas D. Homan
Acting Director
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Lori Scialabba
Acting Director
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Joseph B. Maher
Acting General Counsel

Dimple Shah
Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs

Chip Fulghum
Acting Undersecretary for Management

FROM: John Kelly
Secretary

SUBJECT: **Enforcement of the Immigration Laws to Serve the National Interest**

This memorandum implements the Executive Order entitled "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States," issued by the President on January 25, 2017. It constitutes guidance for all Department personnel regarding the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States, and is applicable to the activities of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). As such, it should inform enforcement and removal activities, detention decisions, administrative litigation, budget requests and execution, and strategic planning.

With the exception of the June 15, 2012, memorandum entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children," and the November 20, 2014 memorandum entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents,"[1] all existing conflicting directives, memoranda, or field guidance regarding the enforcement of our immigration laws and priorities for removal are hereby immediately rescinded—to the extent of the conflict—including, but not limited to, the November 20, 2014, memoranda entitled "Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants," and "Secure Communities."

A. The Department's Enforcement Priorities

Congress has defined the Department's role and responsibilities regarding the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States. Effective immediately, and consistent with Article II, Section 3 of the United States Constitution and Section 3331 of Title 5, United States Code, Department personnel shall faithfully execute the immigration laws of the United States against all removable aliens.

Except as specifically noted above, the Department no longer will exempt classes or categories of removable aliens from potential enforcement. In faithfully executing the immigration laws, Department personnel should take enforcement actions in accordance with applicable law. In order to achieve this goal, as noted below, I have directed ICE to hire 10,000 officers and agents expeditiously, subject to available resources, and to take enforcement actions consistent with available resources. However, in order to maximize the benefit to public safety, to stem unlawful migration and to prevent fraud and misrepresentation, Department personnel should prioritize for removal those aliens described by Congress in Sections 212(a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(6)(C), 235(b) and (c), and 237(a)(2) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

Additionally, regardless of the basis of removability, Department personnel should prioritize removable aliens who: (1) have been convicted of any criminal offense; (2) have been charged with any criminal offense that has not been resolved; (3) have committed acts which constitute a chargeable criminal offense; (4) have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation in connection with any official matter before a governmental agency; (5) have abused any program related to receipt of public benefits; (6) are subject to a final order of removal but have not complied with their legal obligation to depart the United States; or (7) in the judgment of an immigration officer, otherwise pose a risk to public safety or national security. The Director of ICE, the Commissioner of CBP, and the Director of USCIS may, as they determine is appropriate, issue further guidance to allocate appropriate resources to prioritize enforcement activities within these categories—for example, by prioritizing enforcement activities against removable aliens who are convicted felons or who are involved in gang activity or drug trafficking.

[1] The November 20, 2014, memorandum will be addressed in future guidance.

B. Strengthening Programs to Facilitate the Efficient and Faithful Execution of the Immigration Laws of the United States

Facilitating the efficient and faithful execution of the immigration laws of the United States—and prioritizing the Department's resources—requires the use of all available systems and enforcement tools by Department personnel.

Through passage of the immigration laws, Congress established a comprehensive statutory regime to remove aliens expeditiously from the United States in accordance with all applicable due process of law. I determine that the faithful execution of our immigration laws is best achieved by using all these statutory authorities to the greatest extent practicable. Accordingly, Department personnel shall make full use of these authorities.

Criminal aliens have demonstrated their disregard for the rule of law and pose a threat to persons residing in the United States. As such, criminal aliens are a priority for removal. The Priority Enforcement Program failed to achieve its stated objectives, added an unnecessary layer of uncertainty for the Department's personnel, and hampered the Department's enforcement of the immigration laws in the interior of the United States. Effective immediately, the Priority Enforcement Program is terminated and the Secure Communities Program shall be restored. To protect our communities and better facilitate the identification, detention, and removal of criminal aliens within constitutional and statutory parameters, the Department shall eliminate the existing Forms I-247D, I-247N, and I-247X, and replace them with a new form to more effectively communicate with recipient law enforcement agencies. However, until such forms are updated they may be used as an interim measure to ensure that detainers may still be issued, as appropriate.

ICE's Criminal Alien Program is an effective tool to facilitate the removal of criminal aliens from the United States, while also protecting our communities and conserving the Department's detention resources. Accordingly, ICE should devote available resources to expanding the use of the Criminal Alien Program in any willing jurisdiction in the United States. To the maximum extent possible, in coordination with the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), removal proceedings shall be initiated against aliens incarcerated in federal, state, and local correctional facilities under the Institutional Hearing and Removal Program pursuant to section 238(a) of the INA, and administrative removal processes, such as those under section 238(b) of the INA, shall be used in all eligible cases.

The INA § 287(g) Program has been a highly successful force multiplier that allows a qualified state or local law enforcement officer to be designated as an "immigration officer" for purposes of enforcing federal immigration law. Such officers have the authority to perform all law enforcement functions specified in section 287(a) of the INA, including the authority to investigate, identify, apprehend, arrest, detain, and conduct searches authorized under the INA, under the direction and supervision of the Department.

There are currently 32 law enforcement agencies in 16 states participating in the 287(g)

Program. In previous years, there were significantly more law enforcement agencies participating in the 287(g) Program. To the greatest extent practicable, the Director of ICE and Commissioner of CBP shall expand the 287(g) Program to include all qualified law enforcement agencies that request to participate and meet all program requirements. In furtherance of this direction and the guidance memorandum, "Implementing the President's Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements Policies" (Feb. 20, 2017), the Commissioner of CBP is authorized, in addition to the Director of ICE, to accept State services and take other actions as appropriate to carry out immigration enforcement pursuant to section 287(g) of the INA.

C. Exercise of Prosecutorial Discretion

Unless otherwise directed, Department personnel may initiate enforcement actions against removable aliens encountered during the performance of their official duties and should act consistently with the President's enforcement priorities identified in his Executive Order and any further guidance issued pursuant to this memorandum. Department personnel have full authority to arrest or apprehend an alien whom an immigration officer has probable cause to believe is in violation of the immigration laws. They also have full authority to initiate removal proceedings against any alien who is subject to removal under any provision of the INA, and to refer appropriate cases for criminal prosecution. The Department shall prioritize aliens described in the Department's Enforcement Priorities (Section A) for arrest and removal. This is not intended to remove the individual, case-by-case decisions of immigration officers.

The exercise of prosecutorial discretion with regard to any alien who is subject to arrest, criminal prosecution, or removal in accordance with law shall be made on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the head of the field office component, where appropriate, of CBP, ICE, or USCIS that initiated or will initiate the enforcement action, regardless of which entity actually files any applicable charging documents: CBP Chief Patrol Agent, CBP Director of Field Operations, ICE Field Office Director, ICE Special Agent-in-Charge, or the USCIS Field Office Director, Asylum Office Director or Service Center Director.

Except as specifically provided in this memorandum, prosecutorial discretion shall not be exercised in a manner that exempts or excludes a specified class or category of aliens from enforcement of the immigration laws. The General Counsel shall issue guidance consistent with these principles to all attorneys involved in immigration proceedings.

D. Establishing the Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement (VOICE) Office

Criminal aliens routinely victimize Americans and other legal residents. Often, these victims are not provided adequate information about the offender, the offender's immigration status, or any enforcement action taken by ICE against the offender. Efforts by ICE to engage these victims have been hampered by prior Department of Homeland Security (DHS) policy extending certain Privacy Act protections to persons other than U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents, leaving victims feeling marginalized and without a voice. Accordingly, I am establishing the Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement (VOICE) Office within the Office of

the Director of ICE, which will create a programmatic liaison between ICE and the known victims of crimes committed by removable aliens. The liaison will facilitate engagement with the victims and their families to ensure, to the extent permitted by law, that they are provided information about the offender, including the offender's immigration status and custody status, and that their questions and concerns regarding immigration enforcement efforts are addressed.

To that end, I direct the Director of ICE to immediately reallocate any and all resources that are currently used to advocate on behalf of illegal aliens (except as necessary to comply with a judicial order) to the new VOICE Office, and to immediately terminate the provision of such outreach or advocacy services to illegal aliens.

Nothing herein may be construed to authorize disclosures that are prohibited by law or may relate to information that is Classified, Sensitive but Unclassified (SBU), Law Enforcement Sensitive (LES), For Official Use Only (FOUO), or similarly designated information that may relate to national security, law enforcement, or intelligence programs or operations, or disclosures that are reasonably likely to cause harm to any person.

E. Hiring Additional ICE Officers and Agents

To enforce the immigration laws effectively in the interior of the United States in accordance with the President's directives, additional ICE agents and officers are necessary. The Director of ICE shall—while ensuring consistency in training and standards—take all appropriate action to expeditiously hire 10,000 agents and officers, as well as additional operational and mission support and legal staff necessary to hire and support their activities. Human Capital leadership in CBP and ICE, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Management and the Chief Human Capital Officer, shall develop hiring plans that balance growth and interagency attrition by integrating workforce shaping and career paths for incumbents and new hires.

F. Establishment of Programs to Collect Authorized Civil Fines and Penalties

As soon as practicable, the Director of ICE, the Commissioner of CBP, and the Director of USCIS shall issue guidance and promulgate regulations, where required by law, to ensure the assessment and collection of all fines and penalties which the Department is authorized under the law to assess and collect from aliens and from those who facilitate their unlawful presence in the United States.

G. Aligning the Department's Privacy Policies With the Law

The Department will no longer afford Privacy Act rights and protections to persons who are neither U.S. citizens nor lawful permanent residents. The DHS Privacy Office will rescind the DHS *Privacy Policy Guidance memorandum*, dated January 7, 2009, which implemented the DHS "mixed systems" policy of administratively treating all personal information contained in DHS record systems as being subject to the Privacy Act regardless of the subject's immigration status. The DHS Privacy Office, with the assistance of the Office of the General Counsel, will

develop new guidance specifying the appropriate treatment of personal information DHS maintains in its record systems.

H. Collecting and Reporting Data on Alien Apprehensions and Releases

The collection of data regarding aliens apprehended by ICE and the disposition of their cases will assist in the development of agency performance metrics and provide transparency in the immigration enforcement mission. Accordingly, to the extent permitted by law, the Director of ICE shall develop a standardized method of reporting statistical data regarding aliens apprehended by ICE and, at the earliest practicable time, provide monthly reports of such data to the public without charge.

The reporting method shall include uniform terminology and shall utilize a format that is easily understandable by the public and a medium that can be readily accessed. At a minimum, in addition to statistical information currently being publicly reported regarding apprehended aliens, the following categories of information must be included: country of citizenship, convicted criminals and the nature of their offenses, gang members, prior immigration violators, custody status of aliens and, if released, the reason for release and location of their release, aliens ordered removed, and aliens physically removed or returned.

The ICE Director shall also develop and provide a weekly report to the public, utilizing a medium that can be readily accessed without charge, of non-Federal jurisdictions that release aliens from their custody, notwithstanding that such aliens are subject to a detainer or similar request for custody issued by ICE to that jurisdiction. In addition to other relevant information, to the extent that such information is readily available, the report shall reflect the name of the jurisdiction, the citizenship and immigration status of the alien, the arrest, charge, or conviction for which each alien was in the custody of that jurisdiction, the date on which the ICE detainer or similar request for custody was served on the jurisdiction by ICE, the date of the alien's release from the custody of that jurisdiction and the reason for the release, an explanation concerning why the detainer or similar request for custody was not honored, and all arrests, charges, or convictions occurring after the alien's release from the custody of that jurisdiction.

I. No Private Right of Action

This document provides only internal DHS policy guidance, which may be modified, rescinded, or superseded at any time without notice. This guidance is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter. Likewise, no limitations are placed by this guidance on the otherwise lawful enforcement or litigation prerogatives of DHS.

In implementing these policies, I direct DHS Components to consult with legal counsel to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, including the Administrative Procedure Act.

United States Code Annotated
Title 8. Aliens and Nationality (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 12. Immigration and Nationality (Refs & Annos)
Subchapter II. Immigration
Part IX. Miscellaneous

8 U.S.C.A. § 1373

§ 1373. Communication between Government agencies and the Immigration and Naturalization Service

Effective: September 30, 1996
Currentness

(a) In general

Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

(b) Additional authority of government entities

Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no person or agency may prohibit, or in any way restrict, a Federal, State, or local government entity from doing any of the following with respect to information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual:

(1) Sending such information to, or requesting or receiving such information from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(2) Maintaining such information.

(3) Exchanging such information with any other Federal, State, or local government entity.

(c) Obligation to respond to inquiries

The Immigration and Naturalization Service shall respond to an inquiry by a Federal, State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within the jurisdiction of the agency for any purpose authorized by law, by providing the requested verification or status information.

CREDIT(S)

(Pub.L. 104-208, Div. C, Title VI, § 642, Sept. 30, 1996, 110 Stat. 3009-707.)

Notes of Decisions (10)

8 U.S.C.A. § 1373, 8 USCA § 1373
Current through P.L. 114-254. Also includes P.L. 114-256 to 114-280, 114-282 to 114-288, 114-290 to 114-314, 114-316, 114-318 to 114-321, 114-325, and 114-326. Title 26 current through 114-329.

End of Document

United States Code Annotated
Title 8. Aliens and Nationality (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 14. Restricting Welfare and Public Benefits for Aliens
Subchapter IV. General Provisions

8 U.S.C.A. § 1644

§ 1644. Communication between State and local government agencies and Immigration and Naturalization Service

Effective: August 22, 1996
Currentness

Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no State or local government entity may be prohibited, or in any way restricted, from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of an alien in the United States.

CREDIT(S)

(Pub.L. 104-193, Title IV, § 434, Aug. 22, 1996, 110 Stat. 2275.)

Notes of Decisions (3)

8 U.S.C.A. § 1644, 8 USCA § 1644
Current through P.L. 114-254. Also includes P.L. 114-256 to 114-280, 114-282 to 114-288, 114-290 to 114-314, 114-316, 114-318 to 114-321, 114-324 to 114-326. Title 26 current through 114-329.

End of Document

179 F.3d 29
United States Court of Appeals,
Second Circuit.

The CITY OF NEW YORK and Rudolph Giuliani, as Mayor of the City of New York, Plaintiffs–Appellants,

v.

The UNITED STATES of America and Janet Reno, as Attorney General of the United States, Defendants–Appellees.

Docket No. 97–6182
|
Argued June 11, 1998.
|
Decided May 27, 1999.

City of New York brought action for declaratory and injunctive relief against United States, challenging constitutionality of two federal statutes that preempted City executive order prohibiting City officials from voluntarily providing federal authorities with information about immigration status of aliens unless certain conditions were met. The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, John G. Koeltl, Judge, 971 F.Supp. 789, granted United States' motion for judgment on the pleadings. City appealed. The Court of Appeals, Winter, Chief Judge, held that: (1) statutes did not violate Tenth Amendment, and (2) statutes did not violate guarantee clause.

Affirmed.

West Headnotes (14)

[1] **Federal Courts**
Judgment on the pleadings

District court's grant of motion for judgment on the pleadings is reviewed de novo. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 12(c), 28 U.S.C.A.

Cases that cite this headnote

[2] **Constitutional Law**
Facial invalidity

Facial challenge to a legislative act is the most difficult challenge to mount successfully, since the challenger must establish that no set of circumstances exists under which the act would be valid.

3 Cases that cite this headnote

[3] **Constitutional Law**
Overbreadth in General

Because overbreadth doctrine is not recognized outside the limited context of the First Amendment, a showing that a statute might operate unconstitutionally under some conceivable set of circumstances is insufficient to render it wholly invalid. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[4] **States**
Surrender of state sovereignty and coercion of state

Tenth Amendment limits the power of Congress to regulate by directly compelling states to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 10.

Cases that cite this headnote

[5] **States**
Surrender of state sovereignty and coercion of state

However plenary Congress's power to legislate in a particular area may be, the Tenth Amendment prohibits Congress from commanding states to administer a federal regulatory program in that area; moreover, Congress cannot circumvent that prohibition by conscripting state's officers directly. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 10.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[6] **Aliens, Immigration, and Citizenship**

Power to deny admission or remove in general

Aliens, Immigration, and Citizenship

Power to naturalize

Federal government has broad constitutional powers in determining what aliens shall be admitted to the United States, the period they may remain, regulation of their conduct before naturalization, and the terms and conditions of their naturalization.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[7] **Municipal Corporations**

Political Status and Relations

States

Powers of United States and Infringement on State Powers

Tenth Amendment was not violated by federal statutes that preempted Executive Order prohibiting officials of City of New York from voluntarily providing federal authorities with information about immigration status of aliens unless certain conditions were met; Congress did not compel state and local governments to enact or administer any federal regulatory program, Congress did not affirmatively conscript states or localities into federal government's service, statutes prohibited states from compelling passive resistance to particular federal programs, and City failed to demonstrate impermissible intrusion on state and local power to control information obtained in course of official business or to regulate duties of state and local government employees. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 10; Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, § 434, 8 U.S.C.A. § 1644; Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997, § 642, 8 U.S.C.A. § 1373.

10 Cases that cite this headnote

[8] **States**

Surrender of state sovereignty and coercion of state

Even where Congress has the authority under the Constitution to pass laws requiring or prohibiting certain acts, it lacks the power directly to compel the states to require or prohibit those acts.

Cases that cite this headnote

[9] **States**

Surrender of state sovereignty and coercion of state

Congress may not directly compel states or localities to enact or to administer policies or programs adopted by the federal government.

Cases that cite this headnote

[10] **States**

Powers of United States and Infringement on State Powers

Congress may not directly shift to the states enforcement and administrative responsibilities allocated to the federal government by the Constitution.

Cases that cite this headnote

[11] **States**

Surrender of state sovereignty and coercion of state

While Congress may condition federal funding on state compliance with a federal regulatory scheme or preempt state powers in particular areas, it may not directly force states to assume enforcement or administrative responsibilities constitutionally vested in the federal government; this prohibition stands even if state officials consent to such federal directives.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[12] **States**

Conflicting or conforming laws or regulations

Supremacy clause bars states from taking actions that frustrate federal laws and

regulatory schemes. U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 6, cl. 2.

Cases that cite this headnote

[13] **States**

Cooperation between state and United States

States do not retain under the Tenth Amendment an untrammeled right to forbid all voluntary cooperation by state or local officials with particular federal programs. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 10.

Cases that cite this headnote

[14] **Municipal Corporations**

Political Status and Relations

States

Guaranty by United States of republican form of government

Guarantee clause was not violated by federal statutes that preempted Executive Order prohibiting officials of City of New York from voluntarily providing federal authorities with information about immigration status of aliens unless certain conditions were met; statutes did not alter City's government. U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 4, § 4; Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, § 434, 8 U.S.C.A. § 1644; Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997, § 642, 8 U.S.C.A. § 1373.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

Attorneys and Law Firms

*30 Deborah R. Douglas, Assistant Corporation Counsel for the City of New York (Jeffrey D. Friedlander, Acting Corporation Counsel, and Kristin M. Helmers, Assistant Corporation Counsel, of counsel), *31 New York, New York, for Plaintiffs–Appellants.

Martin J. Siegel, Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York (Mary Jo White, United States Attorney, and Sara L. Shudofsky, Assistant United States Attorney, of counsel), New York, New York, for Defendants–Appellees.

Helaine Barnett, The Legal Aid Society (Scott A. Rosenberg, Hwan–Hui Helen Lee, of counsel), New York, New York, for Amicus Curiae The Legal Aid Society in support of Plaintiffs–Appellants.

B e f o r e: WINTER, Chief Judge, WALKER, and JACOBS, Circuit Judges.

Opinion

WINTER, Chief Judge:

The City of New York prohibits its employees from voluntarily providing federal immigration authorities with information concerning the immigration status of any alien. In 1996, Congress passed Section 434 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 ("Welfare Reform Act"), Pub.L. No. 104–193, 110 Stat. 2105 (1996), and Section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 ("Immigration Reform Act"), Pub.L. No. 104–208, 110 Stat. 3009 (1996). These Sections prohibit state and local governments from limiting their employees in the voluntary provision of information about the immigration status of aliens to the Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS"). The City and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani (collectively, "the City") appeal from Judge Koeltl's dismissal of their action challenging the facial constitutionality of those enactments. We hold that both Sections survive the City's facial challenge and therefore affirm.

BACKGROUND

In August 1989, Edward Koch, then New York City's mayor, issued Executive Order No. 124. The Order prohibits any City officer or employee from transmitting information regarding the immigration status of any individual to federal immigration authorities unless: (i) such employee's agency is required by law to disclose such information, (ii) an alien explicitly authorizes a City agency to verify his or her immigration status, or (iii) an alien is suspected by a City agency of engaging in criminal behavior.[1] However, even if a *32 City agency's line workers suspect an alien of criminal activity, the Executive

Order prohibits them from transmitting information regarding such alien directly to the federal authorities. Instead, it requires each agency to designate certain officers or employees to receive reports on suspected criminal activity from line workers and to determine on a case by case basis what action, if any, to take on such reports. Mayor Koch's successors, David Dinkins and Rudolph Giuliani, have reissued the Executive Order.

On August 22, 1996, the President signed the Welfare Reform Act into law. Section 434, entitled "Communication between State and Local Government Agencies and the Immigration and Naturalization Service," provides that no state or local government entity may be restricted from exchanging information with the INS regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of individuals in the United States.[2] The Conference Report accompanying the bill explained: "The conferees intend to give State and local officials the authority to communicate with the INS regarding the presence, whereabouts, or activities of illegal aliens.... The conferees believe that immigration law enforcement is as high a priority as other aspects of Federal law enforcement, and that illegal aliens do not have the right to remain in the United States undetected and unapprehended." H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 104–725, at 383 (1996), *reprinted in* 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2183, 2649, 2771.

On September 30, 1996, the Immigration Reform Act was signed into law. Section 642, entitled "Communication between Government Agencies and the Immigration and the Naturalization Service," expands Section 434 by prohibiting any government entity or official from restricting any other government entity or official from exchanging information with the INS about the immigration or citizenship status of any individual. It further provides that no governmental agency—federal, state, or local—may be prohibited from: (i) exchanging such information with the INS; (ii) maintaining such information; or (iii) exchanging such information with any other federal, state, or local government entity.[3] The Report of the Senate Judiciary Committee accompanying the Senate Bill explained that the "acquisition, maintenance, and exchange of immigration-related information by State and local agencies is consistent with, and potentially of considerable *33 assistance to, the Federal regulation of immigration and the achieving of the purposes and objectives of the Immigration and Nationality Act." S.Rep. No. 104–249, at 19–20 (1996).

Eleven days after the Immigration Reform Act was signed by the President, the City commenced this action against the United States (the "Government") for declaratory and injunctive relief, claiming that Sections 434 and 642 do not invalidate the City's Executive Order because they are facially unconstitutional. Specifically, the City contended that Sections 434 and 642, which are directed at state and local government entities (or officials) and not private parties, violate the Tenth Amendment because they directly forbid state and local government entities from controlling the use of information regarding the immigration status of individuals obtained in the course of their official business. The City maintained further that such interference with a state's control over its own workforce—*i.e.,* over its power to determine the duties of its employees with regard to confidential information that the employees acquire in their official capacity—lies outside Congress's plenary power over immigration. Finally, the City argued that Sections 434 and 642 violate the Guarantee Clause of Article IV of the Constitution.

After both parties moved for judgment on the pleadings under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(c), the district court granted the Government's motion and dismissed the City's claims, holding that Sections 434 and 642 violate neither the Tenth Amendment nor the Guarantee Clause. This appeal followed.

DISCUSSION

[1] We review *de novo* a district court's dismissal of a complaint under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(c). *See Sheppard v. Beerman,* 94 F.3d 823, 827 (2d Cir.1996).

[2] **[3]** The City's burden in this case is substantial. As the Supreme Court has noted, "[a] facial challenge to a legislative Act is ... the most difficult challenge to mount successfully, since the challenger must establish that no set of circumstances exists under which the Act would be valid." *United States v. Salerno,* 481 U.S. 739, 745, 107 S.Ct. 2095, 95 L.Ed.2d 697 (1987). Because the Supreme Court has not recognized an "overbreadth" doctrine outside the limited context of the First Amendment, a showing that a statute "might operate unconstitutionally under some conceivable set of circumstances is insufficient

to render it wholly invalid." *General Elec. Co. v. New York State Dep't of Labor,* 936 F.2d 1448, 1456 (2d Cir.1991); *accord United States v. Sage,* 92 F.3d 101, 106 (2d Cir.1996).

A. *The Tenth Amendment Claim*

[4] **[5]** The Tenth Amendment provides that "[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." U.S. Const. amend. X. In *New York v. United States,* 505 U.S. 144, 157, 112 S.Ct. 2408, 120 L.Ed.2d 120 (1992), the Supreme Court viewed the Tenth Amendment as "confirm[ing] that the power of the Federal Government is subject to limits that may, in a given instance, reserve power to the States." For example, the Tenth Amendment limits the power of Congress to regulate by " 'directly compelling [states] to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program.' " *Id.* at 161, 112 S.Ct. 2408 (quoting *Hodel v. Virginia Surface Mining and Reclamation Ass'n,* 452 U.S. 264, 288, 101 S.Ct. 2352, 69 L.Ed.2d 1 (1981)). State governments, the Court explained, are not federal regulatory agencies. *See id.* at 163, 178, 112 S.Ct. 2408. Thus, however plenary Congress's power to legislate in a particular area may be, the Tenth Amendment prohibits Congress from commanding states to administer a federal regulatory program in that area. Moreover, "Congress cannot circumvent that prohibition by conscripting the State's ***34** officers directly." *Printz v. United States,* 521 U.S. 898, 117 S.Ct. 2365, 2384, 138 L.Ed.2d 914 (1997).

[6] **[7]** The City does not dispute that Congress has plenary power to legislate on the subject of aliens. As the Supreme Court explained in *Takahashi v. Fish and Game Commission*:

> The Federal Government has broad constitutional powers in determining what aliens shall be admitted to the United States, the period they may remain, regulation of their conduct before naturalization, and the terms and conditions of their naturalization.

334 U.S. 410, 419, 68 S.Ct. 1138, 92 L.Ed. 1478 (1948); *see also Hines v. Davidowitz,* 312 U.S. 52, 66, 61 S.Ct. 399, 85 L.Ed. 581 (1941) ("the regulation of aliens is so intimately blended and intertwined with responsibilities of the national government" that federal policy in this area always takes precedence over state policy). Rather, the City asserts that the Tenth Amendment prohibits Congress from exercising its power to regulate aliens in a way that forbids states and localities from enacting laws that essentially restrict state and local officials from cooperating in the federal regulation of aliens, even on a voluntary basis.

The City's Tenth Amendment claim rests on two basic arguments. The first is that the scope of state sovereignty under the Amendment includes the power to choose not to participate in federal regulatory programs and that such power in turn includes the authority to forbid state or local agencies, officials, and employees from aiding such a program even on a voluntary basis. The second argument is that the federal government may not use its powers to legislate in certain areas to disrupt the actual operation of state and local government by, for example, regulating the use of state and local resources—here officially-acquired information—and/or the duties or responsibilities of state and local employees.

The City's scope-of-state-sovereignty argument relies principally upon language in *Printz,* 117 S.Ct. at 2384, and *New York,* 505 U.S. at 168, 112 S.Ct. 2408, that suggests that states may not be denied a bona fide choice as to whether or not to participate in a federal regulatory program. In the City's view, such a choice includes the power to forbid even voluntary cooperation by state and local officials and workers in such a federal program. We do not read these cases so broadly.

[8] **[9]** **[10]** **[11]** Unlike Sections 434 and 642, the federal programs in *Printz* and *New York* conscripted states (or their officers) to enact or administer federal regulatory programs. *See Printz,* 117 S.Ct. at 2376 (distinguishing federal directives to states that "require only the provision of information to the Federal Government" from those that "force[ ][the] participation of the States' executive in the actual administration of a federal program," even though both kinds of directive leave states with no "choice" but to comply). The central teaching of these cases is that "even where Congress has the authority under the Constitution to pass laws requiring or prohibiting certain acts, it lacks the power directly to compel the States to require or prohibit those acts." *New York,* 505 U.S. at 166, 112 S.Ct. 2408. Congress may not, therefore, directly compel states or localities

to enact or to administer policies or programs adopted by the federal government. It may not directly shift to the states enforcement and administrative responsibilities allocated to the federal government by the Constitution. Such a reallocation would not only diminish the political accountability of both state and federal officers, *see New York,* 505 U.S. at 168, 112 S.Ct. 2408; *Printz,* 117 S.Ct. at 2382, but it would also "compromise the structural framework of dual sovereignty," *Printz,* 117 S.Ct. at 2383, and separation of powers, *see id.* at 2378 ("[T]he power of the President would be subject to reduction, if Congress could act as effectively without the President as with him, by simply requiring ***35** state officers to execute its laws."). Thus, while Congress may condition federal funding on state compliance with a federal regulatory scheme or preempt state powers in particular areas, *see New York,* 505 U.S. at 166–68, 112 S.Ct. 2408, it may not directly force states to assume enforcement or administrative responsibilities constitutionally vested in the federal government. [4]

In the case of Sections 434 and 642, Congress has not compelled state and local governments to enact or administer any federal regulatory program. Nor has it affirmatively conscripted states, localities, or their employees into the federal government's service. These Sections do not directly compel states or localities to require or prohibit anything. Rather, they prohibit state and local governmental entities or officials only from directly restricting the voluntary exchange of immigration information with the INS. *See Printz,* 117 S.Ct. at 2376.

The City's sovereignty argument asks us to turn the Tenth Amendment's shield against the federal government's using state and local governments to enact and administer federal programs into a sword allowing states and localities to engage in passive resistance that frustrates federal programs. If Congress may not forbid states from outlawing even voluntary cooperation with federal programs by state and local officials, states will at times have the power to frustrate effectuation of some programs. Absent any cooperation at all from local officials, some federal programs may fail or fall short of their goals unless federal officials resort to legal processes in every routine or trivial matter, often a practical impossibility. For example, resistance to *Brown v. Board of Education,* 347 U.S. 483, 74 S.Ct. 686, 98 L.Ed. 873 (1954), was often in the nature of a refusal by local government to cooperate until under a court order to do so.

[12] A system of dual sovereignties cannot work without informed, extensive, and cooperative interaction of a voluntary nature between sovereign systems for the mutual benefit of each system. The operation of dual sovereigns thus involves mutual dependencies as well as differing political and policy goals. Without the Constitution, each sovereign could, to a degree, hold the other hostage by selectively withholding voluntary cooperation as to a particular program(s). The potential for deadlock thus inheres in dual sovereignties, but the Constitution has resolved that problem in the Supremacy Clause, which bars states from taking actions that frustrate federal laws and regulatory schemes. *See Barnett Bank v. Nelson,* 517 U.S. 25, 31, 116 S.Ct. 1103, 134 L.Ed.2d 237 (1996) (citing *Hines v. Davidowitz,* 312 U.S. 52, 67, 61 S.Ct. 399, 85 L.Ed. 581 (1941)).

[13] We therefore hold that states do not retain under the Tenth Amendment an untrammeled right to forbid all voluntary cooperation by state or local officials with particular federal programs. Given that the City's challenge to Sections 434 and 642 is facial and that the Executive Order is on its face a mandatory non-cooperation directive relating solely to a particular federal program, we need not locate with precision the line between invalid federal measures that seek to impress state and local governments into the administration of federal programs and valid federal measures that prohibit states from compelling passive resistance to particular federal programs. It suffices to say that, at least in the context of the City's facial challenge, Sections 434 and 642 are of the latter variety.

***36** We turn now to the argument that Sections 434 and 642 offend the Tenth Amendment because they interfere with the operations of state and local government by regulating: (i) the use of confidential information that state and local governments acquire in the course of official business and that therefore belongs to the particular governmental entity and (ii) the scope and nature of the duties of employees of state and local governments regarding such information.

In support of its position regarding interference with the use of officially acquired information, the City argues that *Printz* invalidated certain provisions of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act on the ground that "[t]he Brady Act does not merely require [chief

law enforcement officers] to report information in their private possession ... [but also] requires them to provide *information that belongs to the State and is available to them only in their official capacity.*" *Printz,* 117 S.Ct. at 2383 n. 17 (emphasis added). Thus, the City argues, although Sections 434 and 642 do not require any state or local official to provide the INS with information that belongs to state and local government, these provisions nevertheless eviscerate its control over such information.

With regard to its argument concerning its power to direct its workforce, the City argues that inherent in our dual-sovereignty system is the power of state and local governments to determine the duties and responsibilities of their employees. In particular, it relies on *Gregory v. Ashcroft,* which stated:

> [t]hrough the structure of its government, and the character of those who exercise government authority, a State defines itself as a sovereign. "It is obviously essential to the independence of the States, and to their peace and tranquility, that their power to prescribe the qualifications of their own officers ... should be exclusive, and free from external interference, except so far as plainly provided by the Constitution of the United States."

501 U.S. 452, 460, 111 S.Ct. 2395, 115 L.Ed.2d 410 (1991) (quoting *Taylor v. Beckham,* 178 U.S. 548, 570–71, 20 S.Ct. 890, 44 L.Ed. 1187 (1900)). Moreover, "[w]hatever the outer limits of state sovereignty may be, it surely encompasses the right to set the duties of office for state-created officials and to regulate the internal affairs of governmental bodies." *Koog v. United States,* 79 F.3d 452, 460 (5th Cir.1996).

The City's concerns are not insubstantial. The obtaining of pertinent information, which is essential to the performance of a wide variety of state and local governmental functions, may in some cases be difficult or impossible if some expectation of confidentiality is not preserved. Preserving confidentiality may in turn require that state and local governments regulate the use of such information by their employees. Finally, it is undeniable that Sections 434 and 642 do interfere with the City's control over confidential information obtained in the course of municipal business and over its employees' use of such information.

Nevertheless, the City has chosen to litigate this issue in a way that fails to demonstrate an impermissible intrusion on state and local power to control information obtained in the course of official business or to regulate the duties and responsibilities of state and local governmental employees. On the present record, the only state and local policy proffered by the City as disrupted by Sections 434 and 642 is the Executive Order described above. The City's facial challenge thus rests entirely on the interference of Sections 434 and 642 with that Executive Order and that Order alone.

The Executive Order is not a general policy that limits the disclosure of confidential information to only specific persons or agencies or prohibits such dissemination generally. Rather, it applies only to information *37 about immigration status and bars City employees from voluntarily providing such information only to federal immigration officials. On its face, it singles out a particular federal policy for non-cooperation while allowing City employees to share freely the information in question with the rest of the world. It imposes a policy of no-voluntary-cooperation that does not protect confidential information generally but does operate to reduce the effectiveness of a federal policy. For example, the City argues that the Executive Order is essential to the provision of municipal services and to the reporting of crimes because these governmental functions often require the obtaining of information from aliens who will be reluctant to give it absent assurances of confidentiality. But again, the Executive Order does not on its face prevent the sharing of information with anyone outside the INS.

At oral argument, the panel invited the City to inform us whether the information covered by the Executive Order might in fact be subject to other confidentiality provisions that would prevent its dissemination generally. If so, the Executive Order might be viewed more as an explanatory measure designed to reassure aliens that information they might impart was truly confidential, even from the INS. In that context, the Executive Order might seem more integral to the operation of City government, and Sections 434 and 642 might seem more intrusive. We invited the City to inform us by letter of other such confidentiality policies. However, the City's response provided us only with a list of policies that might or might not protect information about immigration status. Noting that "[e]xisting confidentiality statutes and regulations are numerous and ... pervasive throughout State and City

government," Appellants' Post–Argument Letter Brief at 1, the City's letter left it to us to determine the answer to our inquiry. We decline the task and limit our inquiry solely to the facial effect of Sections 434 and 642 on the Executive Order.

Given the circumscribed nature of our inquiry, we uphold Sections 434 and 642. Essentially, the foregoing discussion relating to the power of states to command passive resistance to federal programs governs the analysis here. The effect of those Sections here is to nullify an Order that singles out and forbids voluntary cooperation with federal immigration officials. Whether these Sections would survive a constitutional challenge in the context of generalized confidentiality policies that are necessary to the performance of legitimate municipal functions and that include federal immigration status is not before us and we offer no opinion on that question.

B. *The Republican Form of Government Claim*

[14] The City also contends that Sections 434 and 642 violate the Constitution's Guarantee Clause, which provides: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government." *U.S. Const. art. IV, § 4.* The City argues that by denying it the opportunity to enact and enforce its Executive Order, Sections 434 and 642 impermissibly interfere with the City's republican form of government.

Even assuming the justiciability of this claim, *cf. New York,* 505 U.S. at 183–86, 112 S.Ct. 2408, for the reasons stated above, we find on this record that Section 434's and 642's interference with the city's Executive Order is entirely permissible and in no way alters the form of New York City's government.

We therefore affirm.

All Citations

179 F.3d 29

Footnotes

1 Executive Order 124 provides in pertinent part:

> Section 2. Confidentiality of Information Respecting Aliens.
>
> a. No City officer or employee shall transmit information respecting any alien to federal immigration authorities unless
>
> (1) such officer's or employee's agency is required by law to disclose information respecting such alien, or
>
> (2) such agency has been authorized, in writing signed by such alien, to verify such alien's immigration status, or
>
> (3) such alien is suspected by such agency of engaging in criminal activity, including an attempt to obtain public assistance benefits through the use of fraudulent documents.
>
> b. Each agency shall designate one or more officers or employees who shall be responsible for receiving reports from such agency's line workers on aliens suspected of criminal activity and for determining, on a case by case basis, what action, if any, to take on such reports. No such determination shall be made by any line worker, nor shall any line worker transmit information respecting any alien directly to federal immigration authorities.
>
> c. Enforcement agencies, including the Police Department and the Department of Correction, shall continue to cooperate with federal authorities in investigating and apprehending aliens suspected of criminal activity. However, such agencies shall not transmit to federal authorities information respecting any alien who is the victim of a crime.
>
> Section 3. Availability of City Services to Aliens.
>
> Any service provided by a City agency shall be made available to all aliens who are otherwise eligible for such service unless such agency is required by law to deny eligibility for such service to aliens. Every City agency shall encourage aliens to make use of those services provided by such agency for which aliens are not denied eligibility by law.

2 Section 434 provides:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no State or local government entity may be prohibited, or in any way restricted, from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of an alien in the United States.

3 Section 642 of the Immigration Reform Act provides:

> (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending

to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no person or agency may prohibit, or in any way restrict, a Federal, State, or local government entity from doing any of the following with respect to information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual:

(1) Sending such information to, or requesting or receiving such information from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(2) Maintaining such information.

(3) Exchanging such information with any other Federal, State, or local government entity.

(c) OBLIGATION TO RESPOND TO INQUIRIES.—The Immigration and Naturalization Service shall respond to an inquiry by a Federal, State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within the jurisdiction of the agency for any purpose authorized by law, by providing the requested verification or status information.

4 This prohibition stands even if state officials "consent" to such federal directives. *See New York,* 505 U.S. at 182, 112 S.Ct. 2408 ("Where Congress exceeds its authority relative to the States, ... the departure from the constitutional plan cannot be ratified by the 'consent' of state officials.... State officials thus cannot consent to the enlargement of the powers of Congress beyond those enumerated in the Constitution."). Again, "consent" and "choice" are not, by themselves, significant for purposes of Tenth Amendment analysis.

End of Document

115 STATE STREET,
MONTPELIER, VT 05633-5301

PHONE: (802) 828-2231
FAX: (802) 828-2424

STATE OF VERMONT
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

To: House Committee on Judiciary

From: Luke Martland, Director and Chief Counsel; Rebecca Wasserman, Legislative Counsel

Date: March 1, 2017

Subject: S.79

I. Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum, which we will refer to during our testimony before the Committee, is to set forth some of the potential issues concerning S.79. Each section of the bill (the underlined text) is followed by our explanation and comments (the italicized text).

It is important to remember that we, as your attorneys, take no position as to policy or as to political issues. We do not advocate "for" or "against" any bill. Our role is more limited, to provide nonpartisan, accurate, and complete legal information and advice, including alerting you to potential issues, so that you can make the decisions you think appropriate. We hope that our testimony, and this memorandum, will achieve these goals.

II. Annotated text of S.79

Sec. 1. FINDINGS AND LEGISLATIVE INTENT

The General Assembly finds that:

(1) In Vermont, we celebrate the rich cultural heritage and diversity of our residents.

(2) All Vermont residents should be free from discrimination on the basis of their sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, race, color, religion, national origin, immigration status, age, or disability.

(3) Vermont must uphold the protection of religious freedom enshrined in the U.S. Constitution and the Vermont Constitution for all its people, and the State has a moral obligation to protect its residents from religious persecution.

(4) Article 3 of Chapter I of the Vermont Constitution prohibits any power from assuming any authority that interferes with or controls, in any manner, the rights of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship.

(5) Article 7 of Chapter I of the Vermont Constitution, also known as the Common Benefits Clause, provides that State benefits and protections are "for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community, and not for the particular emolument or advantage of any single person, family, or set of persons, who are a part only of that community."

(6) Vermont residents have a right to privacy with respect to religious affiliation and an expectation that religious affiliation or identification shall not affect their residency in the State.

(7) Vermont residents are afforded the benefits and protections of law enforcement and public safety without regard to their sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, race, color, religion, national origin, immigration status, age, or disability. Consequently, they have a reasonable expectation that government officials will not monitor them or otherwise single them out merely on the basis of these characteristics. They likewise have a reasonable expectation that State and local government officials will not contribute to the creation or development of a registry based on the personally identifying information as defined in this act. Indeed, Vermont residents have expressed grave concerns that the federal government seeks to create or develop such a registry,

which would be contrary to Vermont and American values. This act is intended to narrowly address those concerns without impeding Vermont residents' enjoyment of other legal rights and benefits.

(8) Vermont State and local law enforcement work tirelessly to protect the rights and security of all Vermont residents afforded them under the Vermont and U.S. Constitutions. Moreover, Vermont residents benefit from and are safer through the cooperative and mutually beneficial interaction between local, State, and federal law enforcement, including the U.S. Border Patrol.

(9) Vermont residents are more likely to engage with law enforcement and other officials by reporting emergencies, crimes, and acting as witnesses; to participate in economic activity; and to be engaged in civic life if they can be assured they will not be singled out on the basis of the personally identifying information as defined in this act.

(10) This act is not intended to interfere with the enforcement of Vermont's public safety laws or efforts to prioritize immigration enforcement concerning individuals who pose a threat to Vermont's public safety.

(11) The State of Vermont therefore has a substantial, sovereign interest in prohibiting State and local government officials from collecting or disclosing certain information to federal authorities for the purposes of registration of its residents based on the personally identifying information as defined in this act. These prohibitions are not intended to interfere with Vermont residents' rights to free and equal access to government benefits and protection or the collection or sharing of data necessary to provide such benefits and protections.

Explanation and comments:

- *In general, legislative findings provide: i) an explanation of why the General Assembly believes a certain bill is necessary; and ii) guidance as to how the bill should be interpreted and applied. The findings in Sec. 1 were largely provided by the Office of the Attorney General and Governor's Office for this purpose. If this bill becomes law, a court may refer to these findings in determining legislative intent and the scope of the law. However, a court may also look at other factors, such as the plain meaning of the statutory language in Sec. 2, see, Wolfe v. Yudichak, 153 Vt. 235, 239 (1989) ("Although our overall aim is to determine the intent of the Legislature, we must first look to the plain meaning of the words"), or even the statements of Representatives and Senators. See, Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC v. Shumlin, 838 F. Supp. 2d 183 (D. Vt. 2012), aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 733 F.3d 393 (2d Cir. 2013).*

- *Therefore, although legislative findings may well be of value in explaining how a law should be interpreted and applied, there is no guarantee that findings will necessarily cure all potential defects in a law. As discussed below, we have concerns that Sec. 2 is vague, potentially open to varied interpretations, and may lead to unintended consequences.*

Sec. 2. 20 V.S.A. chapter 207 is added to read:

CHAPTER 207. PROTECTION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

§ 4651. PROHIBITED DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

(a) As used in this section:

(1) "Personally identifying information" means information concerning a person's sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, race, color, religion, national origin, immigration status, age, or disability.

Explanation and comments:

- *11 attributes or characteristics are included in the definition of "personally identifying information."*

- *One of the proffered rationales for including a larger number of attributes or characteristics is the dicta in City of N.Y. v. United States, 179 F.3d 29 (2d Cir. 1999), which we will discuss during our Committee testimony. This is a*

legitimate legal argument. However, as we will explain to the Committee, dicta is not considered binding on subsequent courts. As a result, although it can be argued that the inclusion of a larger number of attributes may make this bill more defensible, contrary arguments can also be made.

- *In addition, as discussed below, the inclusion of a larger number of attributes may increase the possibility of unintended consequences and confusion as to how this bill should be interpreted and applied.*

(2) "Public agency" has the same meaning as in 1 V.S.A. § 317 and shall include all officers, employees, agents, and independent contractors of the public agency.

Explanation and comments:

- *1 V.S.A. § 317(a)(2) defines "public agency" as meaning "any agency, board, department, commission, committee, branch, instrumentality, or authority of the State or any agency, board, committee, department, branch, instrumentality, commission, or authority of any political subdivision of the State."*

- *This bill therefore applies to the State government, municipal and local governments, instrumentalities of the State, and employees, agents, and contractors.*

(b) A public agency shall not:

(1) collect information regarding the religious beliefs, practices, or affiliation of any individual for the purpose of registration of an individual based on his or her religious beliefs, practices, or affiliations;

Explanation and comments:

- *(b)(1) prohibits the collection of information regarding religious beliefs or practices, whereas (b)(2) prohibits the disclosure of any personally identifying information (including religion).*

- *This subdivision is narrowly tailored to registration based upon an individual's religion and seems to effectively prohibit the intended conduct.*

(2) knowingly disclose personally identifying information to any federal agency or official for the purpose of registration of an individual based on his or her personally identifying information; or

Explanation and comments:

- *Subdivision (b)(2) is broader than (b)(1) and prohibits any employee, agent, or independent contractor working for the State government, or for any municipal and local government, from disclosing any of the 11 personally identifying attributes to a federal agency or official for the purposes of registration.*

- *The term "registration" is not defined in this bill, but has been defined as "[t]he act of making a list ... particularly of an official character, or of making entries therein," Black's Law Dictionary, or as being registered or the making of an "entry in a register" and a "register" has been further defined as "a record or list of names, events, items, etc. often kept by an official" or an entry in such a record. Webster's New World Dictionary. Therefore, it is possible that the term "registration" in this bill could be interpreted broadly to encompass almost any list, registry, or database kept by a federal agency or official.*

- *The term "disclose" is not defined, but using its common definition would seem to cover the communication or transmission of information and data.*

- *The language in (b)(2) applies to existing registries or databases, and not merely new ones. For example, the intent of this bill seems to be that it will apply to existing registries and databases such as those maintained by ICE that contain information concerning immigration status. There is also no requirement that the registration be limited to only one of the 11 personally identifying characteristics.*

- *Pulling these threads together, (b)(2) could be read as potentially prohibiting the disclosure or transmission by any State or local employee, agent, or contractor, of any of the 11 personally identifying characteristics to any federal agency or official, if the federal agency is currently maintaining a list, record, or database that includes these characteristics.*

- *The State shares information concerning the personally identifying characteristics of Vermont residents with the federal government in many contexts and for many reasons that have little or nothing to do with immigration or the potential problems this bill is intended to address. To give a few examples:*
  - ✓ *<u>Vital records</u>: The State collects information concerning births, marriages, and deaths. Vermont is required to share this with the federal government. For example, information concerning each birth and death (including an individual's age at death, sex, and race) is shared with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and SSA. It appears that under a broad interpretation of this bill, this information sharing might have to cease upon passage.*
  - ✓ *<u>Medicaid</u>: The citizenship of Medicaid applicants must be verified. In addition, the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) may use personally identifying information to verify or monitor claims.*

- ✓ *Benefit programs: Vermont reports age, disability, and race to the federal government concerning recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds.*
- ✓ *Public safety: A Vermont law enforcement officer may enter personally identifying information into the NCIC system when an individual is charged with a crime, and DHS has access to NCIC.*

- *Two things must be stressed. First, we do not know the specifics of how data is shared as to the examples above, and, as a result, our concerns may not be valid. The examples are merely intended to illustrate how a broad interpretation of this bill may, but not necessarily will, have unintended impacts upon data sharing and transfer in many areas. Second, such a broad interpretation does not appear to be the intent of this bill, and the legislative findings may help to limit such a broad interpretation and resulting unintended consequences.*

- *It may be argued that the phrase "for the purpose of registration ... based on his or her personally identifying information" narrows the bill. This argument could be challenged based on the following:*
  - ✓ *First, if this language adds an intent requirement, it is not a discriminatory intent, but merely an intent to register, which as noted above can be understood as maintaining any list or database.*
  - ✓ *Second, many of the various federal lists or databases that include the 11 personally identifying characteristics have been created with the purpose of tracking individuals based on those characteristics.*
  - ✓ *Third, the argument seems circular: That providing information for inclusion on a list is prohibited if the purpose of providing that information is to add to the list.*
  - ✓ *To take one example, the Social Security Administration maintains information on the age of every, or almost every, American for the express purpose of tracking their age, and determining eligibility for benefits based on age. The Social Security Administration also maintains information on the disability status of many Americans for the same reason. Such data would seem to fit the definition of "registration" and also would seem to be maintained for the "purpose of registration ... based on his or her personally identifying information," in this case age or disability. As a result, we are not certain that the phrase "for the purpose of registration ... based on his or her personally identifying information" truly narrows the bill.*

- *In addition to a potential impact upon federal programs, this bill may impact existing Vermont laws, rules, or programs. One example is 20 V.S.A. § 2366, the fair and impartial policing statute, that requires law enforcement agencies to collect data concerning the age, gender, and race of individuals stopped, and posting this information online.*

(3) use public agency money, facilities, property, equipment, or personnel to assist in creating or enforcing any federal government program for the registration of an individual based on his or her personally identifying information.

Explanation and comments:

- *This does not follow the same structure as subdivisions (b)(1) or (b)(2). Whereas (b)(2) prohibits the disclosure of personally identifying information, this subsection prohibits any assistance in "creating or enforcing" a federal registration "program." The concerns as to potential unintended consequences discussed above would be even more relevant in the context of this language.*

(c) Any section, term, or provision of an agreement in existence on the effective date of this section that conflicts with subsection (b) of this section shall be invalidated on that date to the extent of the conflict.

Explanation and comments:

- *Subsection (c) invalidates any agreement, or provision of any agreement, that conflicts with this bill upon passage.*

- *As summarized above, we have concerns that a broad interpretation of subdivisions (b)(2) and (b)(3) might lead to unintended consequences. These concerns may be exacerbated if all agreements deemed in conflict are invalidated upon passage.*

- *Who will determine if any existing agreements, or parts of agreements, are in conflict with S.79 and therefore can no longer be followed or applied by State or local employees? Could this review process potentially create confusion or potentially interrupt data transfer or information sharing that this bill does not intend to impact?*

(d) Nothing in this section is intended to prohibit or impede any public agency from complying with the lawful requirements of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644. To the extent any State or local law enforcement policy or practice conflicts with the lawful requirements of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644, said policy or practice is, to the extent of such conflict, abolished.

Explanation and comments:

- *As discussed above, subdivision (b)(2) prohibits any employee, agent, or independent contractor working for the State government, or for any municipal and local government, from disclosing any of the 11 personally identifying attributes, including immigration status to a federal agency or official.*

- *As explained to the Committee, 8 U.S.C. § 1373(a) states that a "State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual."*

- *The Second Circuit has held that 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644 are constitutional and that "states do not retain under the Tenth Amendment an untrammeled right to forbid all voluntary cooperation by state or local officials with particular federal programs" such as immigration enforcement. City of N.Y. v. United States, 179 F.3d at 35 (emphasis supplied).*

- *The result seems to be that, pursuant to subdivision (b)(2) all State and local employees are barred from disclosing immigration status to a federal agency or official such as DHS or ICE. However, pursuant to the "carve out" in subsection (d), that same employee can voluntarily disclose immigration status to the ICE if he or she wishes to do so. Therefore, the reach of this bill may be more limited than believed and may not prevent all such disclosures.*

- *In addition, the second sentence in subsection (d) invalidates all State or local law enforcement policies or "practice[s]" that "conflict[]" with 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644. This could be interpreted as meaning that not only all formal or written policies, but also all informal or unwritten "practices" by law enforcement agencies to not share immigration information with the federal government will be invalidated as soon as this bill becomes law. Therefore, it could be argued that this bill may actually undermine local efforts (formal or informal) to restrict the sharing of immigration related information with federal agencies.*

- *It is unclear why the bill refers to "the lawful requirements of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644." All of the requirements of these statutes are "lawful." Including "lawful" is not necessary to hedge against a potential inappropriate use of these federal laws. In addition, without any guidance as to the meaning of "lawful requirements," including this phrase could subject this section to a legal challenge for vagueness if a law enforcement officer was unsure how to distinguish between the lawful v. unlawful requirements in the statute.*

- *The failure to provide "carve outs" as to other federal laws, regulations, or programs that might be impacted by this bill may be of concern and could be*

interpreted as a legislative decision to not exempt such laws, regulations, or programs from the reach of this bill. Please see above for our concerns as to how this bill might be interpreted to impact data sharing between Vermont and various federal agencies and officials.

- *The findings in Sec. 1 indicate that this bill is not intended to interfere with immigration enforcement concerning individuals who pose a threat to Vermont's public safety, and there has been discussion that information should not be shared with the federal government concerning civil immigration violations. However, although the findings provide some context to the Legislature's intent, the language in this subsection is potentially vague as to whether this "carve out" is limited to meant to apply to compliance with 8 USC 1373 and 1644 with respect to sharing information concerning immigration status for the purpose of only criminal enforcement, or might apply to both civil and criminal immigration enforcement.*

(e) Nothing in this section is intended to prohibit or impede any public agency from disclosing or exchanging aggregated information that cannot be used to identify an individual with any other public agency or federal agency or official.

Explanation and comments:

- *Subsection (e) allows the disclosure and sharing of aggregated information and we have no comments or concerns regarding this language.*

§ 4652. AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS PURSUANT TO 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) AND 19 U.S.C. § 1401(i)

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, only the Governor, in consultation with the Vermont Attorney General, is authorized to enter into, modify, or extend an agreement pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) or 19 U.S.C. § 1401(i).

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a State, county, or municipal law enforcement agency is authorized to enter into an agreement pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) or 19 U.S.C. § 1401(i) when necessary to address threats to the public safety or

welfare of Vermont residents arising out of a declaration of a State or national emergency.

Explanation and comments:

- *§ 4652 restricts the authority to enter into certain federal-state agreements to the Governor, in consultation with the Attorney General, unless the criteria set forth in subsection (b) are met. We have no concerns regarding this section.*

Sec. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE

This act shall take effect on passage.