

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Desmond, Jim](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#)
Cc: [FGG, Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External] ORDINANCE: FED LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCESS TO COUNTY FACILITIES (please include with documents for agenda #20)
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 11:51:53 AM

Good Morning Supervisors,

It is clear that ICE and the Border Patrol (BPS) have far exceeded their legal authority and engaged in overly hostile and violent activity. But this proposed ordinance doesn't do the job.

The exceptions in the ordinance (Sec. 957) make it essentially unenforceable. Federal law enforcement agency personnel or out-of-state law enforcement personnel could simply claim it's an inspection under regulatory authority, just as they've lied so often in the past; and saying "In response to an imminent threat to life or public safety pursuant to a narrowly tailored policy adopted by the Chief Administrative Officer" without specifying the policy is so vague that it would not stand up in Court.

Similarly, agents at airports should not be excepted generically (Sec. 970.) I have read that some of these ICE arrests are at airports.

It would also be good to mention adherence to the ICE or BPS training manual, laws, and the US Constitution to make the proscribed actions more specific and also it would help defend the ordinance if these limits were spelled out.

But now that ICE and BPS are under extreme fire for their lies and unconstitutional actions, my inclination is to let them self-implode.

And I can't help mentioning that the Board Letter says 'If...[you take] action within recommendation #1' but there is nothing labeled recommendation 2. Proofreader PLEASE.

Regards,

Paul Henkin