

Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the NM Legislature. The LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

Current and previously issued FIRs are available on the NM Legislative Website ([www.nmlegis.gov](http://www.nmlegis.gov)) and may also be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

**SPONSOR** Roybal Caballero/ Martinez **ORIGINAL DATE** 2/6/19 **LAST UPDATED** 2/18/19 **HB** 195

**SHORT TITLE** No Resources For Federal Immigration Law **SB** \_\_\_\_\_

**ANALYST** Edwards

### ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY19	FY20	FY21	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
<b>Total</b>	Potentially Substantial, See Fiscal Implications			See Fiscal Implications	Recurring	General Fund/Local Government Funds

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates Senate Bill 196.

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

#### Responses Received From

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

Department of Public Safety (DPS)

Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM)

New Mexico Attorney General (NMAG)

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 195 provides that no state or local law enforcement agency may use state or federal funds or resources to detect or apprehend anyone whose only violation of law is that they are a foreign citizen in the US in violation of federal immigration laws. By terms of the amended language, actors would be authorized to receive such persons only on a judicial warrant or order from a criminal proceeding.

House Bill 195 exempts counties with existing intergovernmental service agreements to house federal immigration detainees.

Section 3 of House Bill 195 repeals Section 29-1-10 NMSA 1978 (granting state and local law enforcement permission to participate in the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965).

## FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

It is not clear either in the bill or in other portions of Chapter 29, NMSA 1978, what the consequences are if a state or local police officer enforces federal immigration law in violation of this section. The bill could have negative consequences for the state and local governments if such foreign citizens were allowed to sue the state or local government for a violation of these provisions.

Furthermore, this bill could potentially make New Mexico a sanctuary state in the view of the federal government. In the case of many federal law enforcement grant the federal government requires immigration cooperation assurances as a prerequisite to receiving funding. Should this bill pass, the state could stand to lose millions of dollars in federal funding. For example, over the summer of 2018, New Mexico, along with the rest of the nation, did not receive the more than \$335 million allocated for state and local justice assistance formula grants (JAG) after a federal judge issued an injunction that barred the Department of Justice from imposing immigration assurances as a prerequisite to receiving JAG funding in any jurisdiction. At the Department of Public Safety (DPS), the nearly \$1 million in JAG funds received annually covers overtime incurred from DPS investigative agents in support of the Controlled Substances Act and training for agents to enhance investigative skills.

This bill may eliminate Operation Stonegarden for border protection and other federal homeland security funding, of which New Mexico receives almost \$3 million per year.

## SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

House Bill 195 exempts counties with existing intergovernmental service agreements to house federal immigration detainees. Therefore, New Mexico facilities, such as the Cibola Correctional Facility, that currently are authorized to detain immigrants would not be affected until the expiration of their contracts.

By terms of the amended language, actors would be authorized to receive such persons only on a judicial warrant or order from a criminal proceeding. An administrative warrant, such as those typically used by federal law enforcement to arrest or detain immigrants it believes are in the US without legal status, would not be adequate.

NMAG notes in response to Senate Bill 196, a duplicate of this bill:

Some local and state law enforcement agencies cooperate in federal immigration enforcement authorized by the Immigration and Nationality Act “287 (g)” agreements, which allow federal immigration officers essentially to deputize local or state law enforcement to do their work. However, compliance with such agreements is voluntary. President Donald Trump’s Executive Order 13767 (“Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements”) issued January 25, 2017 encouraged expansion of the use of 287 (g) agreements by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), but by its express terms noted that these agreements should be made only to “the extent permitted by law, and **with the consent of State or local officials**, as appropriate,” and use of the agreements “shall be in addition to, rather than in place of, Federal performance of these duties.” (Emphasis added)...

Passage of Senate Bill 196 likely would not violate federal law, though it limits New Mexico law enforcement's exercise of the federal government's immigration enforcement responsibilities.

## TECHNICAL ISSUES

NMAG points out in response to Senate Bill 196, a duplicate of this bill:

Senate Bill 196 contains a list of specific prohibitions against using New Mexico resources for enforcement of federal immigration laws (“identifying, detecting, apprehending, arresting, detaining or prolonging the detention of a person”). Senate Bill 196 applies to a similarly extensive list of governmental actors (“neither the state nor a political subdivision of the state or their agencies or instrumentalities, including home rule municipalities. . .”). It prohibits using or authorizing the use of “public funds, personnel, property, equipment or resources” for federal immigration enforcement. This may be perfectly fine, and a simpler, more global prohibition may not be possible. However, caution is in order, as New Mexico courts have read long lists to exclude terms not expressly included. *Holguin v. Fulco Oil Services LLC*, 2010-NMCA-091, pgh. 23, 139 N.M. 98, 245 P. 3d 42 (finding “If the Legislature intended for the statute to apply to all . . . there would be no need to include the specific list. . .” and noting that a “statute must be construed so that no part of the statute is rendered surplusage or superfluous.”)

For instance, if lawmakers want to prohibit all political subdivisions of the state from spending their resources for federal immigration law enforcement, they may want to make clear whether the prohibition applies to contracted agents of the political subdivision (such as private contractors who may be seen as “instrumentalities” of the county). Senate Bill 196’s use of the phrase “agencies or instrumentalities” in the list of governmental actors prohibited from cooperating with federal immigration enforcement may be inadequate to achieve a universal prohibition on local and state law enforcement cooperation in federal immigration activities, as designating a private actor as an “instrumentality” of government requires determining whether “under the totality of the circumstances the government entity is so intertwined with the private entity that the private entity has become an alter ego of the public entity.” *See Memorial Med. Ctr. V. Tatsch Constr., Inc.*, 2000-NMSC-030, pgh. 35, 129 N.M. 677, 12 P. 3d 431.

TE/gb/al