

LOW PAY, HIGH RISK
State Models for Advancing Immigrant Workers'
Rights

NELP





NELP

National
Employment
Law
Project

Low Pay, High Risk: State Models for Advancing Immigrant Workers' Rights

Updated November 2003

Prepared by:

Rebecca Smith, Immigrant Worker
Project Coordinator
National Employment Law Project
407 Adams Street SE, Suite 203
Olympia, Washington 98501
(360) 534-9160

Amy Sugimori, Staff Attorney
Luna Yasui, Staff Attorney
Sarah Massey, Communications Director
55 John Street, 7th Fl
New York, NY 10038
(212) 285-3025

About The Authors

Rebecca Smith is a staff attorney and NELP's Immigrant Worker Project Coordinator, with an office located in Olympia, Washington. Becki has represented low-wage immigrant workers on employment issues for over 20 years.

Contact Becki at (360) 534-9160 or rsmith@nelp.org.

Amy Sugimori is a staff attorney in NELP's New York City office. The focus of Amy's work is on the labor and employment rights of immigrant workers, especially in the New York area.

Contact Amy at (212) 285-3025 ext. 102 or asugimori@nelp.org.

About This Report

This report was prepared by the National Employment Law Project (NELP). NELP is a nonprofit policy advocacy and legal organization based in New York City. NELP has advocated on behalf of immigrant, low-wage and unemployed workers for over 30 years, and is particularly concerned with assisting these workers in overcoming barriers to employment and government systems of support. For further information about NELP, visit our website at <http://www.nelp.org>

NELP's Immigrant Worker Project seeks to end abusive treatment of immigrant workers. NELP's project supports organizing groups in educating immigrant workers about their rights and enforcing the same. NELP's work is directed toward a system of true equality for immigrant workers, with equal access to the courts, and to government systems of support, increased government enforcement of labor laws, and increased regulation of exploitative industries.

This report was made possible with the generous support of the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the French American Charitable Trust, the Public Welfare Foundation, and the Solidago Foundation.

Copyright 2003 by the National Employment Law Project.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank former NELP Staff Attorney Luna Yasui and NELP's former communications director, Sarah Massey, for their extensive work on the first edition of this report. We would like to thank Andrew Kashyap and former NELP Organizing Liaison Naomi Zauderer for their enormous contributions to this report. The authors thank NELP's former Administrative Assistant Steven Bautista for designing the report, NELP's Litigation Director Catherine Ruckelshaus for her many insightful contributions into the evolution of the report, and NELP's Communications Intern Michelle McLeod for the cover photo. We also thank Tyler Moran, Ana Avendano and Marielena Hincapie of the National Immigration Law Center and Michele Waslin at the National Council of La Raza for their leadership and advice. And, thank you to all of the advocates and organizers who generously shared their insight and resources to assist in the creation of "*Low Pay, High Risk: State Models for Advancing Immigrant Workers' Rights.*"

Table of Contents

About The Authors	3
About This Report	3
Acknowledgement	4
Executive Summary	8
Introduction: Immigrant Workers in the U.S. Economy and the States' Role in Protecting Their Rights	10
Chapter 1: Focus on Civil Rights of Limited English Speakers: Language Access to Government Benefits and Services	13
LEP Access to Work-Related Benefits and Enforcement of Workers' Rights on the State Level	14
Model Laws on Access to State Agency Services for LEP Workers	14
<i>State Language Access Laws</i>	14
<i>Local Language Access Ordinances</i>	15
<i>Proposed Local Language Access Ordinances</i>	16
Model State Anti-Discrimination Laws	16
State Laws That Offer Special Protections to Non-English Speaking Employees	17
<i>Highlighted Campaign: California</i>	17
<i>Highlighted Campaign: Connecticut</i>	17
<i>Highlighted Campaign: New York</i>	18
Talking Points on Language Access	18
What Can Advocates Do?	20
Chapter 2: Focus on Community Health and Safety: Ensuring Immigrant Access to Public Services without Fear of Deportation	21
Confidentiality Provisions in State Administered Benefits and Programs	21
<i>Limitations on Inquiry</i>	22
<i>Limitations on Reporting</i>	23
Model Confidentiality Provisions	23
Existing Local Confidentiality Laws	24
<i>San Francisco Administrative Code</i>	24
Highlighted Campaigns	25
Ensuring Immigrants' Access to Law Enforcement by Restricting State and Local Law Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws	27
Current Understanding of State and Local Enforcement of Immigration Law	27

State Attorney General Opinions	28
States Attempting to Enforce Immigration Laws	29
Model Language to Prohibit State and Local Enforcement of Immigration Laws	30
<i>Ensure that state and local resources and personnel are not used for immigration enforcement</i>	30
State Laws Limiting Use of Local Resources to Enforce Immigration Law	30
State Anti-Racial Profiling Provisions	30
Rejecting Enforcement of Immigration Laws on the Local Level	30
<i>Local Ordinances</i>	30
<i>Local Resolutions</i>	31
<i>Police Department Orders</i>	31
Local Opposition to the CLEAR Act and Sections of the USA PATRIOT Act	32
<i>Local Resolutions</i>	32
<i>Police Department Statements</i>	33
Talking Points Against State and Local Enforcement of Immigration Laws	33
What Can Advocates Do?	34
Drivers' License Proposals: Background	35
September 11, Drivers' Licenses and National Security	35
Review of State Activities 2002-2003	36
<i>Restrictive Proposals passed in 2002-2003.</i>	36
<i>Expansive Proposals in 2002-2003.</i>	37
<i>The Tale of California 2002-2003</i>	38
<i>Federal Drivers' License Legislation 2003</i>	38
Which forms of ID are most reliable?	39
Talking Points on Immigrant Access to Drivers' Licenses	39
<i>Safety on the Road</i>	40
<i>Restricting Access to Licenses has an Unfair Impact on Legal Immigrants</i>	40
<i>Difficult to Determine Immigration Status</i>	40
<i>Costs to States' Budgets of Restrictive Drivers' Licensing Proposals</i>	41
<i>State Drivers' Agencies are working at cross-purposes with police and banks.</i>	42
<i>Federal Child Support Funding</i>	42
What Can Advocates Do?	42
Chapter 4: Focus on Enforcing the Labor Rights of all Workers: Post Hoffman Plastics Issues	44
The U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB	44
Effect of Hoffman Ruling on Workers	44
<i>Availability of remedies under NLRA and federal anti-discrimination laws</i>	44
<i>National Labor Relations Act</i>	45
<i>Federal Anti-Discrimination Law</i>	45
<i>Availability of Remedies Under Federal Minimum Wage and Overtime Law</i>	45
Concerns About Discovery of Workers' Immigration Status	46
State Enforcement of Workers' Rights	47
<i>State Agency Enforcement</i>	47

Model State Labor Agency Statement	48
State Legislative Action	50
<i>Highlighted State Legislation: California Law</i>	51
What Can Advocates Do?	51
Chapter 5: Focus on Worker Health and Safety: Equal Access to Workers' Compensation Benefits	52
State Workers' Compensation Laws	52
Model State Legislation	53
Undocumented Workers and Vocational Rehabilitation	54
Undocumented Workers and Time Loss after <i>Hoffman</i>	54
<i>Highlighted Campaign: New York: workers file NAFTA complaint against the U.S. and the New York State Workers' Compensation Board</i>	55
<i>Legislative Fix: Michigan</i>	56
What Can Advocates Do?	56
Conclusion and Recommendations	57

Executive Summary

Immigrant workers, especially those who are undocumented, are under attack from many fronts; from the prospect of local police enforcing immigration laws to new systems of information sharing among federal agencies and the proliferation of Social Security Administration “no-match” letters sent out to employers. The effects of two recent Supreme Court rulings have also made it more difficult for working immigrants to enforce their rights under federal law. In *Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB*,¹ decided in 2002, the Court found that undocumented workers are not entitled to back pay when they are illegally fired after taking part in organizing campaigns. In *Alexander v. Sandoval*,² decided in 2001, the Court held that federal civil rights protections against national origin discrimination could not be asserted by individual immigrants in a complaint directly under federal civil rights statutes. These decisions and changes in federal law, together with the delay in developing a legalization program for undocumented workers, mean that immigrant workers will often need to turn to state-based labor protective laws in order to enforce their rights.

Many of the anti-immigrant proposals, both at the federal and state level, can be summarized as measures intended to make a broad range of entities enforcers of immigration law. This is clearly the case with measures to allow local police to enforce immigration law, but is true to a lesser degree for measures to restrict access to drivers’ licenses, and limits on enforcement and remedies available to the undocumented under labor laws. In this climate, there are many areas in which state and local governments can act to afford better access to work-related benefits and better protections under existing state labor and labor-related laws.

Immigrant workers are showing that they have energy and political strength. In September, 2003 nearly 1000 Freedom Riders, many of them immigrants, traveled on buses through the country in support of immigrant workers’ rights. The Immigrant Worker Freedom Ride (IWFR) ended in a rally attended by over 100,000 immigrants and allies in Flushing Meadows Park in Queens. The energy and enthusiasm generated by the IWFR must now be focused on federal and state campaigns to ensure that immigrant workers are treated fairly.

In the coming years, immigrant worker advocates should focus campaigns to leverage the power of the states to protect the labor rights of immigrant workers. The following are examples of successful state and local campaigns:

- In 2002 and 2003 New York, Seattle, and Minneapolis, all cities with large immigrant populations, passed ordinances prohibiting local police and agencies from inquiring about immigration status of individuals seeking services;
- In Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, New Mexico, and Louisiana, new expansive drivers’ licensing laws passed in 2003, that will promote public safety by allowing more immigrants access to drivers’ licenses;
- In Maryland, a law passed in 2002 provides increased access to public benefits, including unemployment compensation, for limited English proficient individuals;

¹ 535 US 137 (2002).

² 532 U.S. 275 (2001).

- Washington State and California have assured immigrant workers that the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB* will not affect states' efforts to protect undocumented immigrants' employment rights under their own laws. A law is under consideration in Michigan that would insure access to workers' compensation benefits to injured workers regardless of immigration status;
- In Connecticut, a state-level "know your rights" law provides information about labor rights in Spanish and other languages; and
- In California, a law passed in 2002 prohibits "English-only" workplaces.

In **Chapter 1**, the authors discuss laws that provide language access for workers, including the California and Maryland laws, and ordinances passed in San Francisco and Oakland and proposed in New York. Talking points are included that support increased access for limited English proficient (LEP) workers and highlight the Connecticut campaign to provide labor rights information in Spanish. The new California law outlawing "English-only" workplaces is also highlighted.

Around the country, communities are taking a stand against local police cooperation with BICE. Communities understand that to require or allow state agency personnel to turn suspected immigration violators over to BICE increases racial tensions, results in violations of civil rights, hinders state and local agencies from doing their jobs, and undermines the very definition of community. In **Chapter 2**, ordinances aimed at confidentiality protections and non-cooperation with BICE are highlighted, as well as prohibitions on local police enforcement of immigration law.

Chapter 3 focuses on immigrants' access to drivers' licenses. It reports surprisingly good news: in 2003 many states considered expanding access to drivers' licenses, understanding that having licensed drivers on the roads contributes more to public safety than does discriminating against immigrant drivers under the dubious rubric of "anti-terrorism." Five states passed expansive laws that ensure access to drivers' licenses for all drivers in the state..

Chapters 4 and 5 focus on the aftermath of the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB*. Tools are provided to state advocates to ensure the continued availability of state remedies for undocumented immigrants. State agency pronouncements in Washington State and California, and a new law in California, are highlighted.

Introduction: Immigrant Workers in the U.S. Economy and the States' Role in Protecting Their Rights

It is estimated that between 28 and 30 million immigrants live in the United States, slightly more than 10.4% of the U.S. population.³ Ninety percent of these are of working age.⁴ Immigrants, both documented and undocumented, work long hours at the lowest-paid and most dangerous jobs in the U.S. economy. In states with high percentages of immigrants, three out of every four tailors, cooks, and textile workers are immigrants. A majority of taxicab drivers and domestic workers in homes are immigrants. Immigrants are over-represented as waiters, parking lot attendants, and sewing machine operators.⁵

Many immigrants in the U.S. workforce are undocumented. Though war and poverty in many immigrants' home countries make coming to the United States the only avenue to a better life, restrictive U.S. immigration laws mean that only a fraction of immigrants are able to legally enter and remain in the United States.

One need only open the local papers to understand the risks that these workers face in their attempts to come to the United States and make a better life for themselves:

On September 28, 2003, four migrants were killed when the vehicle they were traveling in crashed on westbound highway 78 in Imperial County, California, about 20 miles north of the Mexican border. The Border Patrol was pursuing the vehicle; the driver was injured and is being charged with smuggling.

On the same day, Border Patrol agents found the body of Martin Corral Chaidez in Douglas, Arizona. Corral's 17-year old nephew, who crossed the border with him the night before, led agents to the site.

Data provided by Latin American consulates in Arizona and area medical examiners' offices suggests that at least 181 people may have died in the Tucson sector over the past year; Border Patrol only tracks deaths discovered by its agents or reported by other law enforcement agencies.

According to preliminary Border Patrol figures, 346 people died along the 2,000-mile U.S. border with Mexico over the past fiscal year. The previous year's death toll was 320.⁶

Eight migrants murdered in similar way over eight months in Arizona -- Joe Arpaio, the sheriff of Maricopa County, declared war against the criminals who have carried out the execution-style slayings between March and October, 2002....Arpaio believes that the victims may have been killed by human traffickers when they could not afford to pay for their entry to the U.S.⁷

³ Urban Institute, *Tabulations of 1990 Census and March 1999 Current Population Survey*.

⁴ Current Population Survey (March 2000), PGP-3.

⁵ Panel, *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*, National Academy Press (1997), at 215.

⁶ *Border Deaths hit Record High*, compiled by WEEKLY NEWS UPDATE ON THE AMERICAS, available at <http://www.americas.org/news/nir/20031003_border_deaths_hit_record_high.asp>

⁷ *Eight Migrants Murdered in Similar Way over Eight Months in Arizona*, reprinted from *EL DIARIO (CIUDAD JUAREZ)* (Oct. 19, 2002), available at <http://frontera.nmsu.edu>.

The Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. estimates that there are about eight and a half million immigrants who are undocumented in the United States. About 4.7 million of these, or 55 %, come from Mexico. About 1.9 million come from other nations in Latin America, and 1.1 million come from Asia. A few hundred thousand undocumented immigrants come from Europe, Canada, and Africa.⁸

A recent study by the Pew Hispanic Center finds five million undocumented immigrant workers in the United States economy. The manufacturing sector employs 1.2 million undocumented workers. The services sector employs 1.3 million undocumented workers. One million to 1.4 million undocumented workers labor in the fields. Six hundred thousand more work in construction and seven hundred thousand work in restaurants.⁹

Many of these same industries are known for low wages, dangerous conditions, and frequent violations of labor laws. A Department of Labor (DOL) survey found that in 2000, 100% of all poultry processing plants were non-compliant with federal wage and hour laws.¹⁰ A separate U.S. DOL survey found that in 1996 half of all garment-manufacturing businesses in New York City can be characterized as sweatshops, and a DOL survey in agriculture focused on cucumbers, lettuce, and onions revealed that compliance with labor and employment laws in these industries was unacceptably low.¹¹

Injuries and deaths of Hispanic workers engaged in hazardous employment are extremely high and increasing. A study by the National Academy of Sciences, described in an article for the Washington Post, reports that foreign-born Latino men are now nearly 2 ½ times more likely to be killed on the job than the average U.S. worker.¹² In the year 2000, construction fatalities involving Hispanic workers increased by 24%, while Hispanic employment was up only six percent.¹³ In 2001, farm workers employed in the production of crops accounted for only one percent of the workforce, but represented six percent of the occupational deaths.¹⁴ In that year, there were 49 farm fatalities in the state of California alone.¹⁵ Eighty-one percent of U.S. farm workers are foreign-born, mainly from Mexico.¹⁶ New York has the nation's highest rate of immigrants killed in the workplace, with foreign-born workers accounting for three out of every 10 deaths.¹⁷

Maximizing State Law Protections in an Anti-Immigrant Climate

Prior to September 11, 2001, advocates were working closely with the Bush Administration to develop a legalization program that would allow undocumented workers, at long last, to take part in the civic life of the country. In 2000, labor leaders adopted a pro-legalization resolution that had captured the enthusiasm and

⁸ Michael Fix and Passel, Jeffrey S., *Immigration and Immigrants: Setting the Record Straight*, The Urban Institute (May 1994), available at <http://www.urban.org/pubs/immig/immig.htm>.

⁹ B. Lindsay Lowell and Roberto Suro, *How many undocumented: The numbers behind the U.S.—Mexico Migration Talks*, available at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/site/docs/pdf/howmanyundocumented.pdf>.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Labor, FY 2000 Poultry Processing Compliance Report (2000).

¹¹ *Labor Department: Close to Half of Garment Contractors Violating FLSA*, DAILY LAB. REP. (BNA) 87(May 6, 1996); U.S. Department of Labor, Compliance Highlights, 1,3 (Nov. 1999).

¹² Nurith C. Aisenman, *Harsh Reward for Hard Labor*, THE WASHINGTON POST C01(Dec. 29, 2002).

¹³ Bureau of Labor Statistics, NATIONAL CENSUS OF FATAL OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES IN 2000 (Aug. 14, 2001).

¹⁴ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, NATIONAL CENSUS OF FATAL OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES, 2001, Table 2: Fatal Occupational injuries and employment by industry (Sep. 25, 2002), available at <http://stats.bls.gov/news.release/cfoi.t04.htm>.

¹⁵ Andy Furillo, *Farm death sparks manslaughter charge*, SACRAMENTO BEE (Dec. 18, 2001).

¹⁶ U.S. Department of Labor, FINDINGS FROM THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKERS SURVEY (NAWS) (2000) at 5.

¹⁷ Thomas Maier, *Death on the Job: Immigrants at Risk*, NY NEWSDAY (Dec. 16, 2001).

energy of many immigrant workers.¹⁸ President Bush and Mexican President Fox seemed close to agreement on a legalization program that would have enabled hundreds of thousands of immigrant workers to legalize. After September 11, these hopes died, as the federal government and Congress began concentrating on harsh “anti-terrorism” measures. Congress quickly passed the “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001” (USA PATRIOT Act), and the media reported that immigration enforcement would be stepped up, and directed toward an ever-lengthening list of likely suspects: immigrant students, immigrants who had overstayed their visas, immigrants of Middle Eastern and South Asian origin. More recently, the Justice Department has raised the prospect of local police enforcement of immigration laws.¹⁹

The U.S. Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB*,²⁰ finding that undocumented workers are not entitled to back pay when they are illegally fired after taking part in union organizing campaigns, contributes to the perception that immigrant workers have no enforceable rights in the United States.

As has occurred each time anti-immigrant sentiment has dominated the federal policy scene, states are now required to step into the breach. At the state level, authorities often understand better what immigrant workers mean to a local economy. They often have closer experience with the kinds of abuses immigrants suffer, and a better understanding of the duty of agencies and police authorities to protect all local residents. This paper is intended as a guide to model legislation that states and localities can pass to protect immigrant workers. Background into each subject is provided, along with model legislation and talking points for advocates and legislatures wishing to assure immigrants in their communities that they will not be given second-class treatment under labor and employment laws.

While regulation of immigration itself is a matter of federal concern, there are many areas in which state and local governments can act to afford better access to work-related benefits and better protections under existing state labor and labor-related laws. This report focuses on five of these areas. These are language access to government benefits and services for limited English proficient individuals, confidentiality provisions that protect immigrant workers’ access to public services, drivers’ licensing provisions, equal employment rights and remedies for undocumented workers, and undocumented workers’ access to critical workers’ compensation programs.

This publication provides examples of some of the state and local laws now on the books that protect the most vulnerable of immigrant workers - the undocumented and those that do not speak English well enough to navigate state and federal bureaucracies. The report highlights model bills that have not yet made their way into law. In addition, the report profiles selected campaigns for increased labor protections, and provides talking points to assist in campaigns.

¹⁸ See July 31, 2001 AFL-CIO Executive Council Statement, *available at* <http://www.aflcio.org/publ/estatemnts/jul2001/immigration.htm>.

¹⁹ Patrick J. McDonnell, *Police Want No Part in Enforcing Immigration Law*, LA TIMES (Apr. 8, 2002).

²⁰ 535 U.S. 137, 122 S.Ct. 1275, 152 L.Ed. 271 (, 2002).

Chapter 1: Focus on Civil Rights of Limited English Speakers: Language Access to Government Benefits and Services

Every day, thousands of immigrant workers turn to state and federally funded labor agencies to access critical benefit and enforcement programs, including job training, health and safety protections, anti-discrimination protections, wage and hour protections, unemployment insurance (UI), and workers' compensation. Every day, immigrant workers find the agencies are ill-equipped to assist them in their language.

Even though federal law protects their right of access to public services and benefits, immigrants with limited English proficiency (LEP) face obstacles to enforcing their rights on the federal level. Title VI has never been fully enforced with respect to agencies that receive federal funds. In August 2000, then-President Clinton issued Executive Order 13166, "Improving Access to Services for persons with Limited English Proficiency."²¹ The Executive Order called on federal agencies to develop Guidance for compliance with Title VI, and the U.S. Department of Labor has done so. NELP and many other advocacy groups commented on DOL's Guidance, which retreats in some significant aspects from its interim Guidance issued in January 2001, and from the US Department of Justice Guidance, which is intended as a model for other federal agencies.²² While the Guidance is now final, it is doubtful that the federal Civil Rights Center within DOL will have adequate staff or tools with which to enforce the federal law.

In 2001, the U.S. Supreme Court dealt another blow to immigrant workers seeking to enforce Title VI. In its ruling in *Alexander v. Sandoval*, the Court decided that individuals have no private right of action to sue directly under Title VI. Rather, they would have to wait for the government to take up the cause of enforcing the right to be free from the discriminatory impact of "English only" state administration of benefits and services.²³

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Alexander v. Sandoval* makes it all the more critical that advocates use whatever tools are available at the state and local level to protect immigrant workers' rights to access state services and benefits.²⁴ Though workers may not be able to bring suit directly under Title VI against an agency that discriminates, they may have private rights of action to enforce national origin discrimination laws at the state level. Advocates must pursue these avenues of litigation, but they must also focus on passage of more detailed state statutes that will give agencies clear direction on their obligations to provide access to state benefits and services to limited English-speaking workers.

²¹ See, 68 Fed. Reg. 32290 (May 29, 2003), available at <<http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/lep/DOLrecipientguidancefin.htm>>

²² See, NELP's comments at <http://www.nelp.org/docUploads/DOL%20LEP%20comments%20final%20063003%2Epdf>. U.S. Department of Justice Guidance, was published at 67 Fed. Reg. 41455 (June 18, 2002). US Department of Labor Interim Guidance was published at 66 Fed. Reg. 4595 (Jan. 17, 2001).

²³ *Alexander v. Sandoval*, 532 U.S. 275 (2001).

LEP Access to Work-Related Benefits and Enforcement of Workers' Rights on the State Level

The Court's decision in *Alexander v. Sandoval* and the delays in implementation of Title VI at the federal level make it extremely important that immigrant worker advocates both urge state agencies to comply with Title VI and use whatever state law is available to protect immigrant workers' access to publicly-funded programs.

Many state bureaucracies that administer services are ill-equipped to provide access to immigrant workers with limited English proficiency. Several state unemployment agencies indicate that they simply provide no forms or translated brochures to any immigrants in any language.²⁵ At least two states, Connecticut and Illinois, explicitly (and illegally) require that those immigrants who need interpreters at public hearings on their cases must provide their own.²⁶ In 22 states, more than half of unemployment insurance claims are filed through a telephone system, which makes it even more complicated for LEP workers to negotiate the system.²⁷

Despite the lack of enforcement of these federal rights by federal agencies against the state agencies that receive their funds, some states have provided language access to their state services, most notably public benefits and unemployment insurance, for many years. This paper reviews those state programs that specifically provide for translation of written materials and oral interpretation in their unemployment insurance and other programs.

Model Laws on Access to State Agency Services for LEP Workers

State Language Access Laws

The California Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act of 1973 requires any state agency to distribute non-English language written materials through its local offices or facilities that serve a substantial number of non-English-speaking persons.²⁸ In the 2002 legislature, in SB 987, California revised the Bilingual Services Act's criteria for what constitutes a "substantial number of non-English-speaking people." The new law is the country's most comprehensive. It requires every state agency and state department to establish an effective bilingual services program that develops, implements, coordinates, and monitors a departmental implementation plan, including a procedure for accepting and resolving complaints. The agency or department's survey and plan to provide services to non-English-speaking people must be updated every two years.²⁹

Also in 2002, Maryland enacted SB 265, an access law that requires all state agencies to provide services to individuals with limited English proficiency, and all vital documents offered by state agencies to be translated into any language spoken by three percent of the overall population within a geographic service area. The law also requires all other state entities to regularly review their functions to determine the need to create further access for LEP individuals. Maryland licensing boards must present evidence to the General Assembly within two years regarding whether English should be a bona fide requirement of professional licensing.³⁰

²⁵ Wayne Vroman, *Low Benefit Reciprocity in State Unemployment Insurance Programs* (2001), Table VI-3 Main Methods of Claims Filing, Specialized Claims and Claimants in Special Circumstances.

²⁶ Conn. Agencies Regs § 31-237g.23; 56 Ill.ADC § 2720.210.

²⁷ U.S. Department of Labor, *Initial Claims Filing Methods CY2000*, available at <http://www.workforcesecurity.doleta.gov/unemploy/initclaims.asp>.

²⁸ Cal. Gov. Code § 7290-7299.

²⁹ S.B. 987 (Cal. 2002), available at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov>.

³⁰ S.B. 265 (Md. 2002), available at <http://mlis.state.md.us/2002rs/bills/sb/sb0265e.rf>

Massachusetts unemployment compensation law provides that all notices and materials be available in English, Spanish, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Italian, Portuguese, Vietnamese, Laotian, Khmer, Russian, and any other language that is the primary language of at least 10,000 or .5% of all residents of the commonwealth.³¹ (The Massachusetts law is reprinted in full in the Appendix of this report.)

Florida law requires that educational and instructional materials produced by state agencies to describe their services and benefits be translated.³²

Texas and New Jersey statutes explicitly address bilingual services for Spanish-speaking claimants only.³³

A number of states and localities require, either as a matter of law or policy, interpreters to be provided in administrative hearings. These include Arkansas, District of Columbia, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, and Washington.³⁴

Local Language Access Ordinances

Along with the states mentioned above, some cities have proposed or enacted local language access ordinances that guarantee access to local services. The most comprehensive of these are in San Francisco and Oakland.

San Francisco City and County Ordinance

This ordinance is a local version of California's state language access law.³⁵ The local ordinance requires city departments to offer bilingual services and materials if a substantial or concentrated portion of the public utilizing their services does not speak English effectively because it is not their primary language. In addition, it sets aside a budget for a language bank. LEP communities themselves identified problem agencies through their requests for assistance to the Employment Law Center's language hot line and to Chinese for Affirmative Action. Immigrants in the communities lent their personal stories to the effort and spoke out at hearings and dealings with the press.

The greatest challenge for advocates was in dealing with cost issues. They employed several strategies, including educating agencies about the use and costs of paid translators and about the difficulties in using volunteer translation. The city's purchasing department entered into discussions about negotiating lower rates for the city on a volume basis.

After intensive efforts by advocates over the span of two years, the San Francisco ordinance was passed by the Board of Supervisors on June 4, 2001. Once it passed, Chinese for Affirmative Action hired a staff member to oversee implementation of the new ordinance.

City of Oakland Ordinance

³¹ Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 151A § 62A.

³² Fla. Stat. Ch. 443.151.

³³ N.J. Stat. Ann. § 31:9A-7.2; Tex. Lab. Code § 301.064.

³⁴ Ark. Code Ann. § 25-15-101; D.C. Code Ann. § 31-2702; Ind. Code § 4-21.5-3-16; Maine (statement on agency website at www.janus.state.me.us/labor/uibennys); Minn. Stat. § 15.441; N.Y. Unemp. Law Tit. 12, Ch. 7 § 461.4; Or. Rev. Stat. § 45.275; R.I. (statement on website at www.dlt.state.ri.us/bor); Tex. Lab. Code § 301.064; Wash. RCW 2.43.030.

³⁵ Text of each ordinance available on the web page of the Employment Law Center, at <http://www.las-elc.org/origin.html>.

The city of Oakland “Equal Access to Services” ordinance establishes, over a period of two years, equal access for LEP individuals to city services and programs. The ordinance states that city departments must employ sufficient bilingual employees to provide services to persons speaking languages spoken by 10,000 city residents. All agencies must maintain recorded telephone messages in each language. Agencies must submit a compliance plan to the City Council on an annual basis.³⁶

Proposed Local Language Access Ordinances

New York City

At the writing of this report, the New York City Council is considering a language rights bill, Intro. 38, that affords access to all city services to LEP individuals. It obligates agencies to track the language preference of applicants for services. It affords differing levels of availability of translated documents to different language groups, based on the data gathered. Most notably, it includes a private right of action to sue to enforce individual violations of the law.³⁷

Model State Anti-Discrimination Laws

While some states lack a specific state law provision guaranteeing access to state services and benefits for LEP individuals, some state laws guarantee that state agencies will refrain from national origin discrimination. This means that advocates in such states may be able to negotiate with state agencies, or litigate if necessary, for their failure to provide access to limited English-speaking individuals.

The U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Alexander v. Sandoval*, that affected individuals cannot sue in federal court under Title VI to enforce their rights, makes it all the more critical that advocates use whatever tools are available at the state and local level to protect immigrant workers’ rights to access state services and benefits. Though workers may not be able to bring suit directly under Title VI against an agency that discriminates, they may have private rights of action to enforce national origin discrimination laws at the state level.

A number of states have enacted state anti-discrimination laws that provide for either state agency enforcement or enforcement through private rights of action. These laws often obligate state agencies to refrain from activities that have the effect of discriminating on the basis of national origin. Thus, even where states do not have a specific language access law that is enforceable through a private right of action, these laws can be used by advocates to undercut the ill effects of *Alexander v. Sandoval*.

Connecticut specifically provides for an independent, private right of action against a state agency that engages in discriminatory practices, including discrimination based on national origin.³⁸ (A model state law, adapted from the Connecticut law, is included in the Appendix to this report.)

The state of Kansas provides a private right of action for enforcement of its national origin discrimination law, after filing a complaint with the state Human Rights Commission. The Kansas statute covers practices, such as an “English only” state policy, that have a discriminatory impact on persons of particular races or national origins.³⁹

³⁶ Chap. 2.30.030, Oakland Municipal Code, available at <http://bpc.iserver.net/codes/oakland>.

³⁷ The New York City proposal is reprinted at <http://www.nelp.org>. [Locate exact cite]

³⁸ Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-71 – 76 § 46a-99.

³⁹ Kan. Stat. Ann. § 44-100; KS ADC 21-40-1.

A number of additional states have anti-discrimination laws that cover national origin discrimination by state agencies, but do not specify whether or not private enforcement is possible. These are Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, and Virginia.⁴⁰

State Laws That Offer Special Protections to Non-English Speaking Employees

Some states have enacted legislation that provides certain workplace protections to non-English-speaking employees. These include California's anti-"English only" workplace law and several state laws that deal with issues of language access and migrancy.

Highlighted Campaign: California

California became the only state in the nation to protect employees from "English only" rules in the workplace in September 2001. Governor Davis signed AB 800, an amendment to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act that prohibits employers from requiring employees to speak only in English without a valid business necessity. AB 800 requires employers to provide employees with notice of the policy and consequences for violation.

The bill was enacted after intense work to promote it over a ten-year period, spearheaded by the California American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Employment Law Center's Language Rights Project, and a strong coalition including Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), National Council of La Raza, the California Immigrant Welfare Collaborative, Chinese for Affirmative Action, and others. (The California law is reprinted in the Appendix.)

A number of states have enacted specific laws that provide additional bilingual notices of rights to non-English speakers. Nebraska's law states that an employer who recruits any non-English-speaking persons who reside more than five hundred miles from the worksite, must provide a bilingual employee:

- 1) to explain and respond to questions regarding the terms, conditions, and daily responsibilities of employment; and
- 2) to serve as a referral agent to community services for the non-English-speaking employees.⁴¹

Iowa's law is similar to the Nebraska law and also requires that return transportation to the place of recruitment be provided to the worker under certain circumstances.⁴² (The Iowa law is reprinted in the Appendix.)

Highlighted Campaign: Connecticut

The Connecticut Act to Prohibit the Employment Exploitation of Immigrant Labor that prohibits the exploitation of immigrant labor was signed in July 2001. The Act requires the Commissioner of Labor to produce outreach materials to immigrant workers, in their languages, that explain their workplace rights. The Act "... prevent(s)

⁴⁰ Minn. Stat. § 363.12(4); Mo.Rev. Stat. § 213.070(3); N.D. Cent. Code 14-02.4-15; Va. Const. Art. I, §11.

⁴¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-2402.

⁴² Iowa Code § 91E.3.

illegal advantage being taken of such laborers by reason of their lack of information about their rights, credulity or lack of proficiency in the English language.”⁴³ This LEP program is funded by employer penalties.

After a series of successful actions against employers of undocumented immigrant workers, the New England Council of Carpenters decided they needed a change in state law to educate immigrant workers about their rights under state law. This was an effort by a coalition of immigrant-rights activists to ensure enactment of the law and to build a base for future campaigns. The coalition included the Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission, NELP, SEIU Local 32 B-J, the Connecticut Department of Labor and Waterbury Good Jobs Now.

Highlighted Campaign: New York

New York’s unemployment insurance system typifies the problems that are characteristic around the country, where agency measures to reach LEP individuals have been patchwork at best. In New York, all regular walk-in unemployment offices were closed in 1997, leaving most immigrant workers to file their unemployment claims through an automated telephone that has prompts only in English and Spanish or an English-only internet sight in order to apply and certify for benefits. There are two walk-in centers in the entire city staffed with people who speak Chinese languages only. To access an interpreter, claimants must first navigate a series of automated options given in English. Moreover, people who do not speak English or Spanish are told to bring their own interpreters.

Recognizing that this is a serious problem, particularly since September 11 and the recession have increased the numbers of unemployed immigrants in need of benefits, a group of advocates and community groups, including the Legal Aid Society, the New York Immigration Coalition, NELP, YKASEK, Roza Promotions, NY 911, Korean Community Services, UNITE and others have begun meeting to develop strategies to address this problem. Advocates from the Legal Aid Society and the New York have already initiated negotiations with representatives from the NY Department of Labor to address this issue, and a recent report by the Brennan Center⁴⁴ identifies some of the problems faced by New Yorkers seeking to recover benefits to which they are entitled.

Talking Points on Language Access

- Use data from your own state. State level data on languages spoken at home in each state from the 2000 census are published by Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees.⁴⁵ Substate level data can be obtained directly from the Census Bureau.⁴⁶

⁴³ SHB 6657 (2001). See Appendix., *infra*.

⁴⁴ Annette Bernhardt, REcession AND 9/11: ECONOMIC HARDSHIP AND THE FAILURE OF THE SAFETY NET FOR UNEMPLOYED WORKERS IN NEW YORK CITY, available at, <<http://www.brennancenter.org/programs/ui/index.html>>.

⁴⁵ GCIR, U.S. Immigration Statistics by State, available at http://www.gcir.org/about_immigration/usmap.htm.

⁴⁶ Substate data is at <http://www.census.gov>. Use the “American Factfinder” tool on the website. For help with searching, contact Andrew Stettner at NELP, e-mail astettner@nelp.org.

- Emphasize that language access is already the law, and has been since at least 1974. Under federal law, if an organization receives public funding, it must make its services available to all of the public, including those that cannot speak English.
- Limited English-speakers are not asking for special accommodations or privileges. The issue is equal access to government services. If applicable, emphasize the high number of immigrants/limited English speakers in the relevant area. Immigrants pay taxes, represent a significant portion of the workforce, operate small businesses, and contribute to civic life.
- Use sympathetic stories from your own state of immigrant workers denied access to unemployment insurance, as well as other employment services and complaint mechanisms operated by agencies that receive federal funds. Immigrant workers who do not speak English proficiently are routinely denied the full range of protections and services available to all other workers, due to the absence of specific state policies implementing Title VI.
- Emphasize that providing access to benefits is not necessarily costly: In 2001, California's Department of Social Services spent a total of \$648,312 to staff an internal team of 13 employees to translate documents into Spanish, Chinese, Cambodian, Russian, and Vietnamese, and an average of approximately \$22,000 per year in contracts with outside vendors for translations into other languages. This is a negligible cost for an \$18 billion budget.
- Lack of services in their language keeps workers from applying for unemployment compensation. Some statistics say that 53% of people who do not apply for unemployment compensation do not apply because they do not even know they are covered by unemployment insurance. A simple outreach program can go a long way toward increasing access.⁴⁷
- To counter the argument that immigrants should learn English instead of expecting services in their language: emphasize the length of time it takes to learn English as an adult, characterize limited English speakers as "individuals in the process of learning English" (or if applicable, as elderly) and explain that rights and obligations begin the moment one enters the country.
- Meet with potential opponents individually to address their concerns before the legislation is introduced. Oftentimes, their concerns are either unfounded, or can be addressed by minor modifications to the legislation.
- The most important part of the legislation is implementation and enforcement. The relevant government agencies need to take the legislation seriously from the beginning. Make sure that advocates will monitor implementation and be able to tell whether government agencies are complying (for example, from reports that the agencies are required to submit, not only from anecdotal evidence).

⁴⁷ Washington State has a large Spanish-speaking farm worker population, that is subject to winter layoffs. In winter 1999-2000 the state conducted a simple outreach program by means of a Spanish-language flier and short radio advertisements and ads and articles in Spanish-language newspapers. Unemployment insurance claims among Spanish-speakers rose by 17.7% from fourth quarter 1999 to the fourth quarter of 2000.

What Can Advocates Do?

- √ Publicize sympathetic stories about the consequences to immigrants who have been denied services because of language.
- √ Survey the community about problems encountered in dealing with state agencies. Do immigrants have access to job training programs, unemployment insurance systems, workers' compensation systems, human rights agencies, and agencies that enforce their health and safety and wage and hour laws?
- √ Bring claims under state anti-discrimination statutes or file complaints with the U.S. Department of Labor for state programs that receive federal financial assistance.
- √ Insist that state agencies follow the DOL Guidance, including requesting a specific inventory of forms translated and interpreters provided, a study of local demographics and the input of community groups in developing an LEP plan, and providing the state with model plans.
- √ Work to pass state laws with specific guarantees of access to government benefits, including work-related benefits.
- √ Work for the passage of state laws mandating employers to give language-appropriate notice of workplace rights.

Chapter 2: Focus on Community Health and Safety: Ensuring Immigrant Access to Public Services without Fear of Deportation

Immigrants have come to New York and written their own American success stories by working hard... by playing by the rules... by weaving themselves into the permanent fabric of city life. They are the lifeblood of this city. Their contributions to our history are beyond measure. And they have always been and will always be welcome here. ...

At its core, Executive Order 41 is a clear and unequivocal invitation to all law-abiding New Yorkers to come forward without fear or apprehension and avail themselves of the services that keep us all healthy, safe, educated, and prosperous. This new executive order is good for our immigrant residents, which means it is good for all New Yorkers.

Comments of New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg on signing Executive Order 41 on September 17, 2003.

Experience shows that many immigrants will not access essential social services if doing so could result in sharing of information related to immigration status with the BICE (formerly INS)⁴⁸ or other federal agencies. This section discusses state and local strategies to encourage immigrant access to social services, as well of aiding and seeking the help of law enforcement.

Advocates around the country have approached this problem in differing ways, such as: through measures protecting confidentiality, through measures limiting the participation of city workers and police in immigration enforcement and through measures opposing federal attempts to require local police to cooperate with immigration law enforcement.

Confidentiality Provisions in State Administered Benefits and Programs

Eligibility for benefits sometimes hinges on an applicant's "lawful presence." Determining whether an individual is "lawfully present" is a complicated process. Often a person's status is dependent on a familial relationship. Sometimes a person may be eligible to adjust his or her status due to certain circumstances such as status as a victim of domestic violence. The complexities and often private nature of the inquiries necessary in determining a person's immigration status call for clear laws that protect the confidentiality of all applicants.

The complex immigrant eligibility requirements for many state administered benefits call for careful consideration of state procedures used to seek, record, and disseminate immigration information. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) includes provisions that prohibit states from placing restrictions on the exchange of information with the INS regarding immigration

⁴⁸ On March 1, 2003 the functions previously performed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) of the Department of Justice (DOJ) transitioned into two offices of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS): U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services (USCIS) and Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (BICE).

status.⁴⁹ Specifically, state agencies are required to report to the INS persons “known to be not lawfully present in the United States.”⁵⁰ The Illegal Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) restricts agency policies that prohibit “maintenance” of immigration status information, but notably does not preclude adopting policies for not recording immigration information at all.⁵¹ The first step in increasing immigrant access to social services and protecting confidentiality is to understand what information is required or can permissibly be sought by state agencies. Second, advocates must discern how this information is recorded, maintained, and shared with other agencies, particularly with the INS.

The complexities and often private nature of the inquiries necessary to determine a person's immigration status call for clear laws that protect the confidentiality of all

Limitations on Inquiry

Recognizing that unnecessarily intrusive inquiries regarding immigration status and social security numbers can deter immigrants from accessing services, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of Human Services, and the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Justice have issued policy guidance detailing when states may inquire into immigration status, citizenship, and social security numbers.⁵² The guidance clarifies that only the immigration status of the “applicant” is relevant. States may not require an applicant to provide information about the citizenship or immigration status of any non-applicant family or household member. States may not deny an eligible applicant benefits because a non-applicant family or household member has not shared her citizenship or immigration status. The guidance reminds states of their obligation to comply with the Privacy Act and other federal laws when inquiring about social security numbers. Unless disclosure of a social security number is required by law, states are prohibited from denying a right, benefit or privilege provided by the law because of an individual’s refusal to provide a social security number. Although a state may not require disclosure of an individual’s social security number, it may request voluntary disclosure.⁵³ The state must inform the individual of whether the disclosure is mandatory or voluntary, by what statutory authority the information is requested and what the information will be used for.⁵⁴ It is important to remember that eligibility requirements for benefit programs vary greatly. Thus, permissible inquiries vary with each program.

⁴⁹ Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act § 434, 8 U.S.C.S § 1644 (2002).

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ Illegal Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act § 642(b)(2), 8 U.S.C.A. § 1373 (2002).

⁵² Olivia Golden, Assistant Secretary Administration for Children and Families, Nancy-Ann Min DeParle, Administrator Health Care Financing Administration, Shirley R. Watkins, Under Secretary Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Thomas Perez, Director Office for Civil Rights, *Policy Guidance Regarding Inquiries Into Citizenship, Immigration Status and Social Security Numbers in state applications for Medicaid, State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and Food Stamp Benefits* (last modified Sept. 21, 2000) available at <http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/immigration/triagency.html>.

⁵³ Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 7 of Pub.L. 93-579.

⁵⁴ *Id.*, at § 7(b).

Limitations on Reporting

The Social Security Administration, the U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Housing and Urban Development clarified PRWORA's reporting requirements in a joint notice in the Federal Register.⁵⁵ The PRWORA established reporting requirements to the following federal programs: the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program or Welfare-to-Work programs under Title VI(A) of the Social Security Act; Supplemental Security Income (SSI); or the Public and Assisted Housing Program provided under the United States Housing Act of 1937, or Section 6 or Section 8 housing assistance programs.⁵⁶ According to the multi-agency notice, the reporting requirements only apply when an agency has officially determined the applicant's immigration status based on formal finding of fact or conclusion of law that is made by the agency as part of a determination of the applicant's eligibility for one of the aforementioned benefits. A formal determination or conclusion of law that the individual is unlawfully present must be supported by a determination by the INS or the Executive Office for Immigration Review. The reporting requirements do not apply if an agency discovers an individual's immigration status outside of the context of an application for one of the specified benefits.

Model Confidentiality Provisions

The following are provisions that should be included in state and local confidentiality laws. Each point is followed by model language:

- **Inquire into immigration status, citizenship, and social security numbers only when required by federal laws and regulations.**

"No agency, officer, or employee shall inquire about the immigration status of any individual applying for or receiving any service of benefit, on behalf of oneself or another, unless immigration status information is specifically required by federal or state law as a condition of receipt of such service or benefit.

- a. Where immigration status information is a condition of receipt of the service or benefit, the agency, officer, or employee shall make only those inquiries necessary to determine whether an applicant or recipient is an immigrant qualified for such service or benefit. Because not all undocumented immigrants are eligible for services and benefits, it is not necessary to ask whether a person is lawfully present in this country, but only whether he or she has the requisite status for benefits or services.
- b. This section shall apply to any application, questionnaire, interview sheet, or other form used in relation to benefits or services provided by the City."⁵⁷

- **Minimize the recording of unnecessary immigration related information.**

⁵⁵ Responsibility of Certain Entities to Notify the Immigration and Naturalization Service of Any Alien Who the Entity "Knows" Is Not Lawfully Present in the United States, 65 Fed. Reg. 58,301(Sep. 28, 2000). See also, National Immigration Law Center, *New Rule Explains Limits of INS Reporting Requirements Under the 1996 Welfare Law*, IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS UPDATE, (Oct. 19, 2000) available online at <http://www.nilc.org/immspbs/vr/verifreptg004.html>.

⁵⁶ Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 § 404(b),(d); 42 U.S.C. A. §§ 611(a), 1423(y) (2002).

⁵⁷ ACLU Immigrants' Rights Project, *Model City Policy to Protect Client Confidentiality*, 1997. Reprinted in the Appendix.

“No agency, officer, or employee shall record information regarding the immigration status of an applicant for or recipient of any service or benefit unless required by federal or state law. Where federal or state law requires the recording of immigration status information, only that information specifically required shall be recorded.”⁵⁸

- **Prohibit sharing of confidential information regarding a person’s immigration status with federal agencies except where mandated by federal law.**

No city personnel shall “request information about or disseminate information regarding, the immigration status of any individual except as required by federal or state statute or regulation.”

Existing Local Confidentiality Laws

San Francisco, CA and Takoma Park, MD⁵⁹ have had ordinances protecting confidential immigration status information for a number of years. In 2003, Portland, ME⁶⁰, Minneapolis, MN⁶¹ and Seattle, WA⁶² all adopted ordinances prohibiting police and other city employees from making inquiries into immigration status except under limited circumstances. San Francisco’s Administrative Code provides for the most comprehensive confidentiality protections for immigrants. Below is a summary of the protections and guidelines provided for in the San Francisco Administrative Code. The relevant sections of the San Francisco Administrative Code are available at <http://www.nelp.org>.

San Francisco Administrative Code

The most comprehensive and protective city policy regarding protection of immigration status, the San Francisco Administrative Code provides for the following:⁶³

- Declares the city and county of San Francisco a City of Refuge.⁶⁴
- Prohibits the use of any city funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration law or to gather or disseminate information regarding the immigration status of individuals in the city and county of San Francisco. Exceptions are made where federal or state statutes, regulations or court decisions which require the city or county to provide such assistance.⁶⁵
- Prohibits city and county officials from assisting or cooperating with any INS investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, relating to alleged civil provisions of the federal immigration law.⁶⁶
- Prohibits inquiries into immigration status, disseminating information regarding immigration status or conditioning the provision of services or benefits of the city and county upon immigration status,

⁵⁸ *Id.*

⁵⁹ Available at <http://www.cityoftakomapark.org/clerk/documents/ordinance1985_63.pdf>. Reaffirmed by city resolution in 2002, <<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=11283&c=207>>.

⁶⁰ Available at << <http://www.ci.portland.me.us/Chapter002.pdf>>>.

⁶¹ Available at, < <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=12291&c=207>>.

⁶² Available at, << <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=11860&c=207>>>

⁶³ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.1 (1989).

⁶⁴ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.2 (1989).

⁶⁵ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.2(a) (1989).

except as required by federal or state laws, court decisions of city and county public assistance criteria.⁶⁷

- Prohibits questions regarding immigration status on any application, questionnaire or interview form used in relation to services or benefits provided by the city and county unless required by federal or state statute, regulation or court decision.⁶⁸
- Allows for identification and reporting of individuals suspected of violating the civil provisions of the immigration laws if they are in custody after being booked for the alleged commission of a felony.⁶⁹
- Prohibits an officer, employee, or law enforcement agency of the city or county from stopping, questioning, arresting, or detaining an individual solely because of her national origin or immigration status.⁷⁰
- Prohibits an officer, employee, or law enforcement agency of the city or county from discriminating among individuals on the basis of their ability to speak English or perceived or actual national origin in deciding whether to report an individual to the INS.⁷¹
- Requires this law to be distributed to all departments, agencies, and commissions in the city and county of San Francisco.⁷²
- Requires each city and county employee to receive written directions for implementation of this chapter.⁷³
- Enables the City Human Rights Commission to review compliance with this law.⁷⁴

Highlighted Campaigns

Seattle, Washington

On January 28th, 2003 the Seattle City Council passed an Ordinance codifying procedures for all City employees, including law enforcement officers, with respect to making inquiries into the immigration status of persons seeking services. The ordinance provides that no city officer or employee should inquire into a person's immigration status of any individual or apprehend individuals for violation of immigration laws. It would apply to city police and to city agencies administering public benefits. Police in Washington State, including the Seattle police chief, are opposed to enforcing immigration law.⁷⁵

New York City

On September 17, 2003, Mayor Michael Bloomberg signed Executive Order 41, which, building on Executive Order 34, signed in May, 2003, created a city-wide confidentiality policy protecting immigrants from arbitrary or unnecessary collection and reporting of immigration status information when seeking city services or interacting with police. For the first time ever, New York City has a policy that places restrictions both on asking about and sharing information regarding immigration status.

⁶⁷ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.2(c) (1989).

⁶⁸ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.2(d) (1989).

⁶⁹ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.2-1 (1989).

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ San.Fran. CA, Admin.Code § 12H.4 (1989).

⁷⁵ Full text of the Seattle ordinance available at, www.nelp.org.

EO41 contains “don’t ask” provisions that specifically prohibit police and other law enforcement officers from asking about the immigration status of crime victims, witnesses, or other persons seeking assistance from the police and states that police officers shall not inquire about a person’s immigration status, unless police are investigating illegal activity other than undocumented status. EO41 also prohibits all other city workers from asking about immigration status unless it is necessary to provide service or they are required by law to do so.

EO41 also contains “don’t tell” provisions that prohibit city workers, including, but not only, the police, from sharing or disclosing confidential information they have obtained, with certain exceptions. Confidential information includes any information relating to immigration status, sexual orientation, status as a victim of domestic violence or sexual assault, status as a crime witness, receipt of public assistance, and income tax records.

The signing of this Executive Order was a major step in a years-long campaign by a number of advocacy, community and labor groups to ensure that all New Yorkers would be able to cooperate with law enforcement and access city services without fear of having their immigration status revealed.

Since the 1980s, New York City workers followed a previous Executive Order, EO124, which prohibited city officers and employees from providing information “respecting any alien to federal immigration authorities” unless it is required by law, written permission has been obtained from the individual, or criminal activity is suspected.⁷⁶ Seeking to continue enforcement of Executive Order No. 124, the Giuliani administration challenged the IIRIRA and PRWORA provisions prohibiting state and local officials from restricting the exchange of information with the INS.⁷⁷

The City lost its facial challenge in both the district court and the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals in 1999, though the Executive Order was not invalidated. However, its status was called into question following the lawsuits, and advocates including the Legal Aid Society, the New York Immigration Coalition, NELP, the Arab American Family Support Center, COPO, Asian Americans for Equality, SEIU 32B-J, and UNITE sought to ensure that confidential information continued to be clearly protected.

On December 4, 2002, City Councilmember Monserrate, along with over 25 other sponsors, introduced Bill Intro. No. 326, which, if enacted would prohibit disclosure of confidential information to anyone except another city officer or employee acting in the scope of her official duties. This bill gained overwhelming support in the City Council. Before it was passed, however, Mayor Bloomberg rescinded EO124 and replaced it with EO34, which provided limitations on the ability of city workers other than police to make enquiries about immigration status and no prohibitions on sharing of information. This was met with outcry from community, advocacy and labor groups who ultimately entered into discussions with the Mayor’s office about how to improve the confidentiality policy. After

There is still work to do: For example, at this time it is unclear what kinds of investigations of illegal activity will subject people to questions about immigration status. Advocates are negotiating with the City and the Police Department to interpret this exception as narrowly as possible.

⁷⁶ 43 RCNY § 3-02 (2001).

⁷⁷ *The City of New York and Rudolph Giuliani v. The United States and Janet Reno*, 179 F.3d 29 at 37 (1999); 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 10940.

Ensuring Immigrants' Access to Law Enforcement by Restricting State and Local Law Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws

Since 1996, the federal agency charged with immigration law enforcement has increased its cooperation with local police and other law enforcement agencies, both formally and informally. Turning local police into immigration agents is a dangerous trend that deters immigrants from accessing or cooperating with the police for fear of immigration consequences. When immigrants are afraid to file claims with administrative agencies, call the police, or go to court, immigrants can not benefit from the protections of law enforcement.

The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) authorize state and local police to enforce the criminal provisions of federal immigration laws. Recently at issue is the power of state and local law enforcement to make arrests or otherwise enforce the civil provisions of the immigration laws.

Turning local police into the INS is a dangerous trend that deters immigrants from accessing or cooperating with the police for fear of immigration consequences.

Current Understanding of State and Local Enforcement of Immigration Law

In 2002, it was leaked to the press that the federal Department of Justice had concluded that state and local police have the inherent authority to enforce civil violations of the immigration law.⁷⁸ The somewhat more limited position of the Bush White House was that state and local police have the authority to arrest and detain persons who are in violation of civil immigration laws and whose names have been placed in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).⁷⁹ The NCIC is a national database maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigations and used by federal, state, and local law enforcement officers to identify those labeled as "high-risk aliens."

Historically, the Department of Justice's position had been that state and local police lack any inherent authority to make arrests for civil infractions of the immigration laws.⁸⁰ This supports the principle that civil immigration enforcement can only occur under circumstances expressly provided for by Congress.⁸¹ This principle flows from the longstanding and near absolute power of the federal government over immigration matters.

State authority to enforce the *criminal* immigration violations rests in explicit provisions in both the INA and in the AEDPA. In contrast, Congress has not granted states a similarly broad power to enforce civil immigration violations. The most relevant sections of the INA are §§103(a)(8) and 237(g).⁸² Both sections

⁷⁸ Eric Schmitt, *Ruling Clears Way to Use State Police in Immigration Duty*, N.Y. TIMES, (April 4, 2002), at A19

⁷⁹ Letter from Alberto Gonzales, Counsel to the President of the United States, to the Migration Policy Institute (Jun. 24, 2002) available at <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/files/whitehouse.pdf>.

⁸⁰ Memorandum opinion from Theresa Wynn Roseborough, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, *Office of Legal Counsel*, for the U.S. Atty., for the S.D. Cal. (Feb. 5, 1996) 1996 WL 33101191 (O.L.C.).

⁸¹ See generally Migration Policy Institute, *Authority of State and Local Officers to Arrest Aliens Suspected of Civil Infractions of Immigration Law* (arguing against broad inherent authority of state and local officers to exercise federal immigration authority) available at <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/files/authority.pdf>.

⁸² Immigration and Nationality Act §.103(a)(8), 8 U.S.C. § 1103.(2002).

afford state and local authorities limited power to enforce the civil provisions of the immigration laws under specifically delineated situations, while always under the direction and supervision of the Department of Justice.

Rules implementing INA §103(a)(8) went into effect on August 23, 2002. The authority of state and local law enforcement to exercise federal immigration power under INA §103(a)(8) is proscribed by “contingency agreements” between the Commissioner of the INS and state or local law enforcement officials.⁸³ The contingency agreements authorize state and local officials to exercise immigration authority under specific conditions within geographically defined boundaries.⁸⁴

Contingency agreements do not authorize the state or local officers to perform immigration functions until the Attorney General declares that a “mass influx of aliens” is imminent or occurring, and specifically authorizes such performance.⁸⁵ Among the many things the agreements provide for is a prohibition on state and local officers from performing any functions of the INS pursuant to this rule without undergoing trainings in immigration law, immigration law enforcement fundamentals and procedures, civil rights law, and sensitivity and cultural awareness issues.⁸⁶

IIRIRA added INA § 287(g), which provides for written agreements between the Attorney General and a state to “perform a function of an immigration officer.”⁸⁷ The section goes on to outline the criteria under which state and local officers may enforce immigration laws.⁸⁸ These include written certification of training and knowledge of immigration law and a written agreement with the Attorney General about the specific duties to be performed by the local officers and the duration of the authority of local officers to perform these duties.⁸⁹

Claiming that state and local law enforcement officers have the inherent authority to enforce federal immigration laws wholly contradicts the long-standing principle that immigration matters are a federal concern. By providing specific circumstances for state and local exercise of federal immigration powers in this section, like § 103(a)(8), Congress legislates with the presumption that state and local law enforcement officers may exercise immigration powers only within the scope of limited circumstances defined by the statute. To take the position that state and local law enforcement possess inherent authority to enforce immigration matters would render sections of the INA detailing the conditions for state and local enforcement of immigration laws meaningless.

State Attorney General Opinions

Attorneys General in various states have issued opinions that state and local law enforcement officers are not authorized (or have limited authorization) to enforce civil violations of the immigration law.

⁸³ 28 C.F.R. § 65.83(d).(2002).

⁸⁴ 28 C.F.R. § 65.83(d)(1)(4).(2002).

⁸⁵ 28 C.F.R. § 65.84.(a)(1).(2002).

⁸⁶ 28 C.F.R. § 65.84(a)(3)(iv).(2002).

⁸⁷ *Immigration and Nationality Act* § 287(g), 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(1) (2002).

⁸⁸ 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(2) (2002).

⁸⁹ 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(3) (2002).

Kansas

It is the Kansas State Attorney General's position that the state laws empower a "law enforcement officer" in Kansas to make arrests for the laws of the state or the ordinances of any municipality. Thus, a law enforcement officer in Kansas "does not have the power of arrest for violation of federal immigration laws."⁹⁰

Nevada

The State Attorney General issued an opinion stating that Nevada State police are empowered to arrest persons suspected of "violating federal criminal laws."⁹¹ The opinion advises that this power should be "cautiously exercised" in the context of civil immigration law violations. Specifically, a state or local officer may not detain or arrest a person solely on the basis that the individual may be a "deportable alien."

New York

The New York Attorney General's Office issued an opinion stating that state and local officers may not make arrests based on civil infractions of the INA.⁹²

States Attempting to Enforce Immigration Laws

Colorado

In April of 2002, the Colorado General Assembly passed the Illegal Alien Enforcement Act (HB02-1448), which would have allowed local police to enforce federal civil immigration laws.⁹³ Less than a month after it was introduced, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary postponed it indefinitely.⁹⁴

Florida

Florida became the first state to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Justice to deputize local police officers as INS agents. Pursuant to this agreement, on July 9, 2002, 35 state law enforcement officers began training to enforce civil as well as criminal immigration laws.⁹⁵

Alabama

The Department of Homeland Security took over the Department of Justice's role and negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding with Alabama, authorizing local law enforcement officers to enforce civil violations of the immigration law in October 2003.⁹⁶

Proposed Federal Legislation: The CLEAR Act

Citing the confusion surrounding state and local police authority to enforce civil immigration laws, Congressional representative Charles Norwood (R-GA) introduced the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal

⁹⁰ Kan. Atty. Gen. Op. No. 79-149 (1978).

⁹¹ 1983 Nev. Op. Atty. Gen. 79.

⁹² 2000 Op. Atty Gen. N.Y. (Inf.) 1001.

⁹³ Michael A. De Yoanna, *Colorado Immigrant Enforcement Bill Passes*, UNIVERSITY WIRE (May 2, 2002).

⁹⁴ Illegal Alien Enforcement Act, CO H.B. 1448, 63rd Gen. Assembly (2002). *See also*, Michael A. De Yoanna, *Colorado Immigrant Enforcement Bill Passes*, UNIVERSITY WIRE (May 2, 2002); Deborah Kong, *Immigrants Fear New Proposal That Would Allow Local Police to Enforce Federal Immigration Laws*, ASSOCIATED PRESS (May 23, 2002).

⁹⁵ Mireidy Fernandez, *FDLE Cross-Training 35 Police Officers to Also Serve as INS Agents*, NAPLES DAILY NEWS (Jul. 23, 2002).

⁹⁶ *See, Alabama Troopers Now Enforcing Federal Immigration Laws*, MSNBC NEWS, Oct. 3, 2003, available at, <<
<http://www.msnbc.com/local/wpml/D-8486EB56-EA82-4E5E-A1B7-6C643C0E2E43.asp>>

(CLEAR) Act, (H.R. 2671) in July 2003⁹⁷. Among other things, this bill would require state and local police to enforce federal, civil immigration laws.

Model Language to Prohibit State and Local Enforcement of Immigration Laws

Comprehensive model language would include the points outlined in the Model Confidentiality Provisions in addition to a clear prohibition on the use of state and local resources for immigration enforcement.

Ensure that state and local resources and personnel are not used for immigration enforcement

No city personnel or resources “shall be used to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration law or to gather or disseminate information regarding the immigration status of individuals in the City unless such assistance is required by federal or state statute, regulation or court decision.”⁹⁸

State Laws Limiting Use of Local Resources to Enforce Immigration Law

Oregon

Oregon law prohibits the use of state and local law enforcement funds or personnel to detect or apprehend persons simply because they are in the country in violation of federal immigration laws. However, the statute allows verification of immigration status if the person is arrested for any criminal offense.⁹⁹

Alaska

The Legislature of the state of Alaska passed a nearly unanimous resolution opposing measures of the federal Patriot Act that would violate the rights and liberties guaranteed equally under the state and federal constitutions and providing that State agencies and instrumentalities may not use state resources or institutions for the enforcement of federal immigration laws, which are the responsibility of the federal government.¹⁰⁰

State Anti-Racial Profiling Provisions

Utah

The debate over local police enforcement of immigration laws has been a topic of heated debate in Utah since at least 1998. In 1998, the Salt Lake City Council rejected a proposal to deputize local police to enforce immigration laws. Subsequently in April of 2002, Utah enacted legislation “designed to prohibit unconstitutional racial profiling.”¹⁰¹

Rejecting Enforcement of Immigration Laws on the Local Level

Local Ordinances

⁹⁷ Extensive background information and talking points regarding the CLEAR Act are available from the National Immigration Forum, at << <http://www.immigrationforum.org/currentissues/clear.htm>>>.

⁹⁸ San.Fran. CA, Admin. Code §12H.2.1 et seq. (1989).

⁹⁹ OR. REV. STAT. § 181.850 (2001).

¹⁰⁰ Available at, <<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=12707&c=207>>. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has published

¹⁰¹ Shawn Foster, *S.L. Latinos Swayed Councilman; He Voted Against INS Plan After Foes Packed Meeting*, SALT LAKE TRIBUNE (Sept. 9, 1998).

San Francisco, CA

The San Francisco Administrative Code, discussed above, prohibits city or county departments, agencies, and employees from using city resources to enforce federal immigration laws.¹⁰² The Code also specifically prohibits cooperating with the INS to enforce alleged violations of civil provisions of the immigration laws.¹⁰³

Albuquerque, NM

Section 3-1-11(b)(4) of the Albuquerque Code of Resolutions provides that “no municipal resources shall be used to identify individuals’ immigration status or apprehend persons on the sole basis of immigration status, unless otherwise required by law to do so.”¹⁰⁴

Local Resolutions

Around the country, communities are taking a stand against cooperation with the INS. City and county councils in San Francisco, California; Santa Fe, New Mexico; Austin and Dallas, Texas; Chicago, Illinois and other areas have passed local resolutions declaring an “INS Raid Free Zone,” “City of Refuge,” or area of non-cooperation with the INS. While such resolutions do not offer the level of detail or accountability of a law or administrative regulation, they can be effective organizing tools to raise awareness of the need for public agencies and elected officials to affirm their commitment to increased immigrant access to social services. These resolutions clarify the relationship between the INS and local authorities by stating that city or county programs and personnel will not be used for the purpose of enforcing immigration laws. They also bar discrimination based on immigration status or national origin and establish task forces to monitor immigrant rights.

Marion County, OR

Marion County has adopted administrative policies and procedures regarding the relationship between the county and the INS. The policy states that the INS has the authority to enforce the immigration laws and that county programs are not operated for the “sole or primary purpose of enforcing federal immigration laws.”¹⁰⁵ The policy also provides that county law enforcement entities will not use resources or personnel to “detect or apprehend persons solely for violations of immigration laws.”

City of Salem, OR

Salem has also adopted policy guidelines and procedures clarifying the relationship between the city and the INS. The Salem provisions mirror the Oregon State policy.¹⁰⁶

Police Department Orders

A number of police departments around the country have adopted orders preventing local police from enforcing civil violations of the immigration law. These include the police of sheriff’s departments of Fresno and Sonoma County, CA; the District of Columbia; Cicero, IL; Marion County, OR; Philadelphia, PA; and Houston, TX.

¹⁰² San. Fran. Admin. Code § 12H.2 (1989).

¹⁰³ San. Fran. Admin. Code § 12H.2(a) (1989).

¹⁰⁴ Albuquerque Code of Res. § 3-1-11(b)(4). Full text of the resolution is available at <http://www.nelp.org>.

¹⁰⁵ Marion County Administrative Policies and Procedures as adopted by the Board of Commissioners. Full text available at <http://www.nelp.org>.

¹⁰⁶ Role of City of Salem in relation to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Full text available at <http://www.nelp.org>.

Numerous representatives of local police departments have also criticized the idea of participating in the enforcement of federal immigration laws, including the President of the Dallas Police Association, the Chief of the Houston Police Department, the Los Angeles Police Department, the Chief of Police in Newark, California, the Assistant Chief of Police in El Paso, Texas, police officials in several cities in New Jersey, Sheriff George Epp of Colorado, and chiefs of police in cities throughout Colorado.¹⁰⁷

Chandler, AZ

In the aftermath of “Operation Restoration,” a collaboration between local police and Border Patrol agents that resulted in findings of rampant civil rights violations, Governor Jane Hull remains opposed to local enforcement of immigration laws. An investigation into “Operation Restoration” by the State Attorney General’s office concluded “without a doubt that residents of Chandler, Arizona were stopped, detained, and interrogated by officers...purely because of the color of their skin.” Furthermore, the roundups “greatly harmed the trust relationship between the Chandler Police and many of the city’s residents.”¹⁰⁸ In 1999, the Chandler City Council unanimously approved a \$400,000 settlement of a *lawsuit stemming from the police role in the roundups*.¹⁰⁹ The Chandler Police Department adopted a policy that prohibits arrest when the only violation is infraction of immigration law and prohibits INS notification of undocumented persons who are material witnesses of crime are seeking medical treatment, or are involved in family disturbances, minor traffic offenses, or minor misdemeanors

San Diego, CA

The San Diego Police Department has a General Order¹¹⁰ that police are not to look for violations of immigration law and prohibits INS involvement with undocumented persons when they are material witnesses of crime, have family disturbances or minor traffic offenses or week medical treatment David Cohen, San Diego Police spokesman said, “We’ve spent decades establishing trust...with our very diverse immigrant communities. If there is an immigration emergency tied to a criminal activity, of course we’ll assist....But if it is simply an immigration violation we will not be involved.”¹¹¹

Local Opposition to the CLEAR Act and Sections of the USA PATRIOT Act

Recently various entities, from police departments to city and county councils have come out in opposition to the CLEAR Act and its potential impact on the local level.

Local Resolutions

¹⁰⁷ Edward Hegstrom, *Houston Police Department Shuns Taking Role in Tracking Immigrants: Officers Say They Need Foreigners’ Trust*, THE HOUSTON CHRONICLE (May 15, 2002); Edward Hegstrom, *HPD Shuns Taking Role in Tracking Immigrants: Officers Say They Need Foreigners’ Trust*, THE HOUSTON CHRONICLE, (May 15, 2002); Michael A. De Yoanna, *Colorado Immigrant Enforcement Bill Passes*, UNIVERSITY WIRE (May 2, 2002); *Border patrol and local police working together*, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR (May 2, 2002); Eric Schmitt, *Administration Split on Local Role in Terror Fight* NEW YORK TIMES (Apr. 29, 2002); Elizabeth Llorente, *Policing Immigration*, THE RECORD (Apr. 22, 2002); Michael Riley, *Immigration Bill Has Police Uneasy*, DENVER POST (Apr. 22, 2002); Patrick J. McDonnell, *Police Want No Part in Enforcing Immigration Law*, LOS ANGELES TIMES (Apr. 5, 2002); Michelle Mittelstadt and Alfredo Corchado, *U.S. May Let State, Local Authorities Enforce Federal Immigration Laws*, THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS (Apr. 4, 2002).

¹⁰⁸ Karen Brandon, *U.S. Weighs Local Role on Immigration*, CHICAGO TRIBUNE (Apr. 14, 2002).

¹⁰⁹ American Immigration Lawyers Association, *DOJ Opinion on State and Local Police Enforcing Immigration Laws Bodes Ill for Law Enforcement Communities* (Apr. 9, 2002) available at <http://www.aiala.org>.

¹¹⁰ Available at, <<http://www.sdbillofrights.org/>>.

¹¹¹ Kris Axtman, *Police Can Now Be Drafted to Enforce Immigration Law*, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR (Aug. 19, 2002).

Resolutions opposing parts of the USA PATRIOT Act and the CLEAR Act have been passed in 208 communities in 35 states including three state-wide resolutions. The ACLU maintains a list of those communities at <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=11294&c=207>.

Police Department Statements

Police and Sheriff's Departments in Des Moines, IA; El Paso, TX; Santa Cruz County, AZ; Lenexa, KS; Los Angeles County, CA; Newark, CA; North Miami Beach, FL; South Tucson, AZ; and Yuma County AZ, have made statements opposing the CLEAR Act. State Police Associations, such as the California Police Chiefs Association, the El Paso Municipal Police Officers' Association, the Miami-Dade Chiefs Association and the Florida Police Benevolent Association have made similar statements.

Talking Points Against State and Local Enforcement of Immigration Laws


Talking points from the National Immigration Forum and the American Immigration Lawyers Association are summarized below.¹¹²

- Immigration enforcement by local police officers undermines trust between immigrant communities and the police. Many police departments have spent years nurturing the trust of immigrant communities. Adopting policies that enable local police to act as de facto INS agents seriously erodes community-police relations.
- Immigration laws and determinations of a person's immigration status are extremely complex and constantly changing. There are many ways for people to be lawfully present in the United States, and the INS issues numerous different documents that verify a person's legal presence. Proper understanding and enforcement of these laws requires intensive training. Without structured guidance, local law enforcement officials add nothing meaningful to immigration enforcement efforts.
- Asking local law enforcement agencies to enforce federal immigration law will drain these agencies of scarce dollars and limited resources and lead to problems in enforcement. In many communities, scarce law enforcement resources already result in dangerously slow 911-response times and limited efforts to investigate certain crimes. Diverting local resources to perform federal immigration duties is a disservice to the local community.
- Past attempts by local law enforcement agencies to enforce immigration law have led to false arrests or detention of people who look or sound foreign but are legally in the country and civil rights violations. (See above section on Arizona.)
- Local officials from across the country have come out in opposition to turning their police into INS agents. These officials include but are not limited to mayors in New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chicago. Police departments from San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, CA and Houston and San Antonio, TX have all taken firm stances against local enforcement of immigration laws.

¹¹² American Immigration Lawyers Association, *DOJ Opinion on State and Local Police Enforcing Immigration Laws Bodes Ill for Law Enforcement and Communities* (April 9, 2002) available at <http://www.aila.org>.

- Legal authority the Department of Justice reportedly cites to support the opinion for state and local authorities enforcing immigration law is questionable at best.

What Can Advocates Do?

- √ Find out your state's human services' office and local police department's position regarding confidentiality protections for immigrants. Learn about agency and police practices pertaining to: inquiries about immigration status, maintenance of records relating to immigration status, and sharing immigration information with other state and federal agencies.
 - √ Advocate for state, municipal, and administrative agency policies that protect the confidentiality of immigrants.
 - √ Work for adoption of a formal policy of non-cooperation with the INS by your City Council, Governor, human services office, and your police force.
 - √ Push for statements from law enforcement officials speaking out against using local police resources for immigration enforcement.
- 

Chapter 3: Focus on Public Safety: Immigrants' Access to Drivers' Licenses¹¹³

There are an estimated seven to eight million undocumented immigrants in the United States; most have to drive, whether or not they can get a drivers' license.¹¹⁴ Like everyone else, immigrant workers often depend on state-issued drivers' licenses to get to work, bring their children to school, shop, and go to the doctor. They may work at night or early in the morning, when public transportation is unavailable, or in areas that are poorly served. Or they may work in occupational sectors, such as construction or agriculture, where driving is an essential part of the job. Like their U.S. citizen and permanent resident counterparts, they use their drivers' licenses to cash their paychecks when the day is done.

The states are free to establish their own procedures for verifying identity in order to issue drivers' licenses, and the requirements have historically varied from extremely flexible (allowing use of notations in a family bible to prove identity in Utah) to extremely strict (social security numbers, verification of the SSN, and proof of lawful residency in the United States formerly required in California).

Drivers' License Proposals: Background

Prior to September 11, 2001, many states were considering legislation to make drivers' licenses more accessible to their residents. At least thirteen states were considering changes to their drivers' license laws to allow applicants who lacked social security numbers to use other identity documents to get a driver's license.

- Four states – Utah, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia – had liberalized their rules to be clear that either the IRS-issued Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN) or foreign documents would be acceptable documentation.
- At least 13 states – Alaska, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington – both did not require a social security number for those who did not have one, and allowed a person to use proof of identity that is available to undocumented people, like rent receipts, school transcripts, marriage licenses, or certain accepted foreign documents to prove identity.
- About half of the states had no formal requirement that an applicant prove she was lawfully present in the United States in order to obtain a license. About 20 states issued drivers' licenses only to those who could show that they had a social security number.

Only five states, plus the District of Columbia, required both a social security number and that an applicant proves she was lawfully present in the United States in order to issue a drivers' license.

September 11, Drivers' Licenses and National Security

¹¹³NELP would like to acknowledge the valuable contributions made to this report by the work of Tyler Moran at the National Immigration Law Center and Michele Waslin at the National Council of La Raza on immigrant drivers' license issues. Much of the research presented in this section of the paper is a result of their work.

¹¹⁴Passel, Jeffrey, *New Estimates of the Undocumented Population in the United States 2*, MIGRATION POLICY INSTITUTE (2002), available at <<http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=19>>

September 11, 2001 began a reversal of efforts to broaden access to drivers' licenses. Early reports of the tragedy stated that several of the terrorists had U.S. state-issued drivers' licenses that allowed them to rent cars, board airplanes, and blend into society more easily. These reports spawned an avalanche of drivers' licensing proposals, many of them regressive.

Many states initially responded to the illogical argument that we are somehow safer as a nation when we deny drivers' licenses to large segments of our population. The 2002 state legislatures saw 24 states considering 61 separate pieces of legislation affecting drivers' licenses.¹¹⁵ In 2003, the National Immigration Law Center reports that approximately 117 bills were considered that affect immigrants' ability to obtain drivers' licenses. There is mounting pressure on state drivers' licensing agencies to institute stringent documentation requirements and costly verification procedures with two federal agencies, the Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security. Thus far, many states have considered that national security is best served when the drivers on our roads are licensed and have motor vehicle insurance. At least six states, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana and New Mexico, passed legislation in 2003 that expands immigrants' access to drivers' licenses (though California's law was later repealed. – see box).

Review of State Activities 2002-2003

Restrictive Proposals passed in 2002-2003.

In 2002 and 2003, ten states passed restrictive drivers' license proposals. These are Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Iowa, Louisiana, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Virginia, and West Virginia. Maryland created a task force in 2003 to study drivers' license documentation and other related fraud, terrorism, and technology data. In addition, some states enacted restrictive policies by administrative rule. These are Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Tennessee.

These new policies generally require that an immigrant show "lawful presence" in the United States in order to procure a driver's license. Most provide that immigrants' drivers' licenses must expire when a visa expires. Florida now requires that immigrants must renew their drivers' licenses in person, unlike U.S. citizens. Florida also requires that biometric identifiers be used to establish identification.¹¹⁶

Many of the new restrictive measures face legal, fiscal, practical, and political obstacles. Connecticut's Attorney General issued an opinion that its provision eliminating employment authorization documents as a form of ID violated the U.S. Constitution. The Kentucky provision was submitted to U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft for his review, and the Indiana and Minnesota proposals were challenged in court.

In Minnesota, after a legislative proposal failed, the Commissioner of Public Safety attempted to pass restrictive policies through emergency rulemaking procedures. The new rules required lawful presence in order for an immigrant to obtain a drivers' license, and required full frontal pictures with a person's head uncovered, even if a person opposed photographing on religious grounds. The Minnesota Court of Appeals recently declared the rules invalid because they were adopted in violation of normal rule-making procedures.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ National Immigration Law Center, *2001-2002 Drivers' License Proposals*, available at <<http://www.nilc.org/immspbs>> and <<http://www.nelp.org/docUploads/pub173%2Epdf?CFID=190522&CFTOKEN=90696137>>

¹¹⁶ *Id.*, *2001-2002 Drivers' License Proposals*.

¹¹⁷ *Jewish Community Action v. Commissioner of Public Safety*, 657 N.W.2d 604 (Minn. App. 2003).

In Iowa, the Department of Transportation issued a policy requiring that non-citizens' licenses be stamped with the legend, "Nonrenewable – Documentation Required." The policy was withdrawn after pressure from advocates and threat of litigation in September 2002.

Restrictive rules in the states have also started to give rise to media reports of immigrant drivers unlawfully harassed and even arrested when state agency workers mistakenly believe they have presented forged documents.

Restrictive rules in the states have also started to give rise to media reports of immigrant drivers unlawfully harassed and even arrested when state agency workers mistakenly believe they have presented forged documents.¹¹⁸ In addition, the Director of the California Department of Motor Vehicles has complained that the system for verifying Social Security numbers is outdated, causing 800,000 people to be told that their names do not match the SSN they provided.¹¹⁹

Expansive Proposals in 2002-2003.

Of the fifteen expansive proposals before legislatures in 2002, two became law, (in New Mexico and South Carolina). In 2003, fourteen states considered broadening access to drivers' licenses, and California, New Mexico and Kansas passed laws that formally recognize the ITIN as an acceptable identifier for drivers' licenses. At least six states, Kansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, New Mexico, Rhode Island and Utah, now expressly recognize the ITIN as an identifier for drivers' licensing purposes. Other states that both allow alternatives to SSNs and do not have a lawful presence requirement may also accept the ITIN or the Mexican consular identification. Charts of current state laws and the proposals in the 2003 legislatures are available on both the NILC and NELP websites.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Lourdes Medrano Leslie, *Immigrant's Treatment at License Office Prompts Complaint, Questions*, MINNEAPOLIS STAR TRIBUNE (Aug. 16, 2002); Bob Braun, *Treated Like a Criminal, and No One's Sorry* (NEWARK NJ) STAR LEDGER (Aug. 14, 2002); Yilu Zhao, *A nervous State Looks to Limit Licenses*, NY TIMES (Apr. 6, 2003).

¹¹⁹ Sharon Bernstein, *Tried to renew your driver's license lately?*, TIMES (Aug. 21, 2003)

¹²⁰ See, *Summary of State Drivers' License Requirements for Immigrants*, <<http://www.nelp.org/docUploads/pub179%2Epdf?CFID=190522&CFTOKEN=90696137>>

The Tale of California 2002-2003

In California, a state with one of the most restrictive drivers' licensing laws, an expansive proposal was vetoed by Governor Davis in 2002. The bill, AB 60, would have allowed persons who have applications for lawful immigration status pending to get a driver's license. Immigrants' rights groups waged a hard-fought campaign for access. Latino activists and other community leaders pressured the governor for his signature by engaging in letter-writing campaigns, days-long vigils, and demonstrations in Southern California and Sacramento.¹²¹

Senator Gil Cedillo, the author of the vetoed bill, reintroduced the bill in the 2003 legislature. The 2003 bill was broader than the 2002 bill, specifically allowing use of an ITIN as an identifier for drivers' licenses.¹²² The bill was signed in the waning days of the Gray Davis administration and was closely identified with the recall campaign. Although the bill was nearly identical to expansive bills passed in other states in recent years, it created an immediate firestorm of protest from immigration restrictionists. Incoming Governor Schwarzenegger made repeal of the law a top priority for his administration, and discussion of an initiative campaign to reverse the law made compromise on licensing an immediate issue. In late November 2003, the California Legislature repealed the law. Governor Schwarzenegger has indicated that he is willing to compromise on a bill that would allow greater access to driver's licenses for immigrants, but that would include some security measures.¹²³

Federal Drivers' License Legislation 2003

U.S. Senator Richard J. Durbin (D-IL) advocates the use of national standards for state-issued drivers' licenses. His measure would set federal rules for granting licenses, build in high-tech anti-counterfeiting measures, and provide funding for states to make changes within three to five years. The idea is that such standardization would permit rapid data sharing among government agencies.

While Congressman Durbin has announced that he has no intention of harming immigrant workers, the measure he supports could set standards that the undocumented would be unable to meet, and deny licenses to millions of undocumented drivers. It was introduced on October 10, 2002 as the Driver's License Fraud Prevention Act, but was not re-introduced this session of Congress.

At the same time, Congressman Jeff Flake of Arizona re-introduced a bill that would require special rules for persons with temporary "nonimmigrant" visas such as student visas and tourist visas and would require that a driver's license issued to a nonimmigrant expire no later than the nonimmigrant visa.¹²⁴ While the bill is not an absolute mandate to the states, it offers strong incentives because drivers' licenses from states that do not comply would not be accepted by federal agencies. The bill's passage and acceptance of drivers' licenses from those states punishes all residents of those states who would use their licenses as proof of identity.

The *matricula consular*, issued by the Mexican government, is now accepted as identification by 66 banks and 801 police agencies nationwide.

¹²¹ Minerva Canto and Hanh Kim Quach, *Migrant drivers' licenses urged*, ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER (Aug. 10, 2002).

¹²² Available at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_60_bill_20030306_amended_sen.pdf>

¹²³ Jack Chang, *Gov.-elect divided on immigrants*, CONTRA COSTA TIMES (Oct. 13, 2003)

¹²⁴ H.R. 655, available at <<http://thomas.loc.gov>>

An additional restrictive proposal was put forth in the 2003 session of Congress, by Representative Cantor (R-VA), HR 1121. The Cantor bill would provide that drivers' licenses expire with the expiration of a non-immigrant visa.

Which forms of ID are most reliable?

It is useful in many campaigns to educate legislators on the reliability and integrity of various forms of identification that immigrants may have. Many legislators may feel, wrongly, that the social security number is the only reliable form of identification. The source documents for a social security number are remarkably similar to those used for ITINs and consular identification:

In order to obtain a social security number, a person needs to show the Social Security Administration two forms of identification that show age, identity, and U.S. citizen, or lawful alien status. These include:

- **to show age**, a birth certificate or hospital record of birth or passport;
- **to show identity**, a photo identification including drivers' license, marriage or divorce records, military records, employer identification cards, adoption records, life insurance policies, school identification; and
- **to show citizenship**, documents that show birth in the United States, plus various INS cards and certificates of citizenship.¹²⁵

In order to obtain an ITIN, a person must show the Internal Revenue Service:

- **documents that prove both identity and foreign status, including:** a passport, drivers' license, INS document, foreign military identification card, foreign voter registration card, birth, marriage or baptismal certificate, or school records.¹²⁶

In order to obtain a consular ID, a person must show the consulate:

- **her original birth certificate,**
- **an official Mexican ID**, such as a foreign military identification card, school certificates, voter registration card, or Mexican driver's license.¹²⁷

Mexican consulates are now offering a new theft-proof version of its *matricula consular* identification cards. The holographic cards are now available at consulates across the country.

Talking Points on Immigrant Access to Drivers' Licenses

These talking points are offered to support the ongoing campaigns, either in response to restrictive proposals or as affirmative proposals. These points have been adapted from talking points developed by NELP, and by the National Council of La Raza (NCLR). NCLR's talking points are available on NCLR's website.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ Social Security Administration, *How to Apply for a Social Security Card*, available at <http://www.ssa.gov/replace_sscard.html>

¹²⁶ Internal Revenue Service, *Application for an IRS Individual Taxpayer Identification Number*, available at <<http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/fw7.pdf>>

¹²⁷ Consulate of Mexico at Seattle, *Consular Identification*, available at <http://www.sre.gob.mx/seattle/ing_ser_matriculas.htm>

Restricting drivers' licenses does nothing to increase community safety; in fact, it may encourage unlicensed driving. It also results in a proliferation of false documents, erodes public safety, and leads to higher insurance premiums for all licensed drivers. If states enact restrictive measures, unlicensed drivers will constitute a true underground, completely unknown to law enforcement authorities. Instead, states should consider expanding access to drivers' licenses for immigrants who can prove their identity via reliable forms of identification, such as the IRS Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN), or the Mexican government-issued *matricula consular*.

In the 2003 legislative sessions, the cost and lost revenue to states of restricting drivers' licenses has become an issue. Two-thirds of the states were compelled to reduce their budgets by nearly \$26 billion before June 30, 2003 to account for budget gaps. States already had addressed a \$49.1 billion shortfall as they crafted their fiscal year 2003 budgets.¹²⁹ States use license fees to supplement the state general fund, help pay for emergency medical services, for driver training and motorcycle safety programs, and for construction and maintenance of public roads.¹³⁰ Apart from the discriminatory effect of restrictive licensing laws on immigrants and their communities, states can simply not afford to pay the price of restricting access to drivers' licenses.

Safety on the Road

- **Licensed drivers have been tested; unlicensed drivers have not.**

People who need to drive to earn a living will do so illegally if they have to. By denying individuals who lack social security numbers (SSNs) legal access to licenses, we forgo the opportunity to ensure compliance with safety standards. Allowing individuals without SSNs access to drivers' licenses would ensure that many more drivers know and are trained in the proper driving techniques and laws of the state, making our roads safer.

Restricting Access to Licenses has an Unfair Impact on Legal Immigrants

- **Requiring a Social Security number or proof of "lawful presence" penalizes legal immigrants.**

Certain categories of legal immigrants, such as political asylum applicants and beneficiaries of certain family-based petitions, are not eligible for SSNs. In addition, many immigrants in the legalization process do not yet have documentation from the BCIS.

Difficult to Determine Immigration Status

- **Licensing agencies cannot reliably determine immigration status.**

BCIS (INS) documentation and immigration law are extremely complex and subject to frequent changes. State drivers' licensing agencies do not have the expertise to navigate through the variety of immigration status documents. States often do not understand that verifying legal presence can also be very costly. California taxpayers pay \$1.8 million a year to have Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) staff persons check the legal status of applicants. The state of Virginia estimated that it would cost \$47,000 per year to verify immigrant status.

¹²⁸ Michele Waslin, *Safe Roads, Safe Communities: Immigrants and State Drivers' License Requirements*, National Council of La Raza (2002), available at <http://www.nclr.org/policy/briefs/drivers_license_issue_brief_6.pdf>.

¹²⁹ *State Budget Gaps Growing at an Alarming Rate*, National Conference of State Legislatures (Feb. 4, 2003), available at: <<http://www.ncsl.org/programs/press/2003/pr030204.htm>>

¹³⁰ *Provisions Governing the Disposition of State Motor-vehicle and Motor-carrier receipts*, National Conference of State Legislatures (January 1, 2001).

INS' (now BCIS') database has frequently been criticized for being slow, inaccurate and out of date. A pilot project in Virginia found that in about 11 percent of cases, Department of Motor Vehicle personnel could not determine status, and that in some cases, verification took several days to several weeks to complete.

The extent to which this money is ill-spent is highlighted by the recent revelation that a manager of INS' immigration processing center in Laguna Niguel, Calif., was charged with illegally shredding as many as 90,000 immigration documents.¹³¹

Costs to States' Budgets of Restrictive Drivers' Licensing Proposals

A Virginia study calculated that the cost of imposing a "lawful presence" requirement would be 5.5 million dollars, on a recurring basis. Virginia found that 148 additional staff would have to be hired, for a total of 5.2 million dollars annually, and that training costs would be \$200,000.00.¹³²

- **Negative economic impact where licenses expire with visas.**

A state budget estimate for a restrictive drivers' license bill in Washington State concluded that it would cost almost a million dollars over the next five years to make immigrants' drivers' licenses expire with their visas. The state estimated it would need two new full-time employees to process applications, and that it would cost \$ 200,000 to reprogram computers to handle licenses that expire at various times. The state of Texas calculated that the two year net impact of reprogramming computers and of producing a new drivers' license card would be nearly \$350,000.00.¹³³ In North Carolina, the calculation was that the state would spend \$94,000 per year to renew immigrant visas more frequently.¹³⁴

- **An increase in drivers' license applicants would increase state revenue.**

In order to obtain a driver's license, applicants must pay a fee. In Tennessee, enactment of the statute enabling individuals of legal age who do not possess a social security number to obtain a driver's license if they can prove their identity and residency in the state and pass required tests resulted in additional state revenues totaling more than \$716,800.00 in the period June 2001 through January 2003. North Carolina estimated a net LOSS in revenues to the state of \$350,000 to \$475,000 annually, if restrictive measures were adopted.¹³⁵ Tennessee estimated a loss in revenue of over \$150,000 per year if licenses are restricted.¹³⁶

- **Unlicensed drivers raise insurance rates and losses because they often cannot obtain auto insurance**

Individuals who are ineligible for a drivers' license may not legally insure their cars in most states. Denying licenses to immigrants and others increases insurance premiums for licensed drivers. Nationally, uninsured

¹³¹ John Broder, *I.N.S. Shredder Ended Work Backlog, U.S. Says*, NEW YORK TIMES, (Jan. 31, 2003).

¹³² *A Report by the Commissioner of the Department of Motor Vehicles to: The Chairman of the Transportation Committee of the Virginia Senate, et.al.*, Virginia DMV (Dec. 2002).

¹³³ See, Legislative Budget Board, Fiscal Note, 78th Legislative Regular Session, available at <[¹³⁴ North Carolina General Assembly Legislative Fiscal Note \(Mar. 2003\), available at <\[¹³⁵ See Fiscal Note, *supra*, n. 12.\]\(http://www.ncleg.net/html2003/bills/FiscalInfo/Senate/SFN0263.pdf.></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=\)](http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/cgi-bin/tlo/textframe.cmd?LEG=78&SESS=R&CHAMBER=H&BILLTYPE=B&BILLSUFFIX=01845&VERSION=1&TYPE=F.></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

¹³⁶ Fiscal Note, SB 1188 – HB 1790, Tennessee Legislature (Mar. 24, 2003) available at <

motorists cause over \$4.1 billion in insurance losses per year.¹³⁷ An average of 14% of all accidents are caused by uninsured drivers. One in five drivers in fatal crashes is unlicensed. Nationally, the percentage of motorists driving without a license is 13.5%.¹³⁸

State Drivers' Agencies are working at cross-purposes with police and banks.

- **800 police Agencies can't be wrong about acceptance of alternative identification.**

At the same time that states are being pushed to make their drivers' license laws more restrictive, smart banks and police agencies are beginning to accept alternative forms of identification such as the matricula and the ITIN. The Mexican Foreign Ministry reports that 800 police departments, including those in some of the largest cities in the country such as Los Angeles, Chicago and Houston, accept the matricula as identification. The Foreign Ministry says that 66 banks, including Wells Fargo, Bank of America, Citibank, and others also accept alternative forms of identification.¹³⁹ The U.S. Department of Treasury recently adopted regulations pursuant to the USA PATRIOT Act that would allow banks to continue to use identification such as the ITIN and the matricula to identify bank customers.¹⁴⁰

Prevention of Terrorism

- **Requiring that drivers' license applicants possess a social security number does not prevent terrorism.**

All of the 9/11 terrorists possessed social security numbers. It is not necessary to possess a U.S. driver's license to board an airplane. Sophisticated terrorists with substantial financial resources are likely to have the ability to obtain drivers' licenses and other documents when they find them necessary.

Federal Child Support Funding

Eliminating the social security number requirement would not affect federal child support funding. Although the federal Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998 requires states to have a database available to the federal government which contains SSNs, the Department of Health and Human Services has interpreted this requirement to apply only to individuals who actually possess a SSN. The Commissioner of the DHHS's Office of Child Support Enforcement has stated that the law "does not require that an individual have a social security number as a condition of receiving a license."¹⁴¹ Therefore, states need not require all individuals to have a social security number in order to get a license.

What Can Advocates Do?

√ Use the chart of Drivers' License Requirements to locate the current policy in your state, and look up the 2001-2002 proposals. These are available on both the NILC and NELP on the websites, at <http://www.nilc.org/immspbs/DLs/index.htm> and <http://www.nelp.org/pub136.pdf>.


¹³⁷ Insurance Research Council, *Uninsured Motorists 2000 Edition*, Malvern, PA (2001).

¹³⁸ AAA, *Unlicensed to Kill, The Sequel*, (Jan. 2003), available at <http://www.aaafoundation.org/pdf/UnlicensedToKill2.pdf>.

¹³⁹ Secretaria de Relaciones Extranjeras, *La SRE ha emitido 740 mil matriculas consulares a Mexicanos en el extranjero*, Oct. 13, 2002, (on file with authors) Mary Beth Sheridan, *An Entry Card for Immigrants*, WASHINGTON POST (Jul. 26, 2002).

¹⁴⁰ Proposed regulation: Customer Identification Programs for Banks, Savings Associations, and Credit Unions, 67 Fed. Reg. 48290 (proposed Jul. 23, 2002). Press Release available at <http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/js743.htm>; final regulations 68 Fed. Reg. 55335 (Sep. 25, 2003), 31 CFR Part 103.

¹⁴¹ David Gray Ross, Commissioner, Office of Child Support Enforcement, *Inclusion of Social Security Numbers on License Applications and Other Documents*, PIQ-99-05 (July 14, 1999). The memo issued by DHHS is available at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cse/pol/piq-9905.html>.

- √ Calculate the costs. Find out what your state budgets for drivers' services and how it spends the money that it receives for license fees. In some states, license fees may be a source of revenue to the state. Advocates can calculate, at least roughly, the raw costs of denying licenses to immigrants in general and/or to undocumented immigrants. The organization Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees has an interactive map on its website that gives data from the 2000 Census on immigrants in each state.¹⁴² The BCIS (former INS) has recently issued a report on estimates of the undocumented population in each state.¹⁴³ Most states list the cost of drivers' licenses on their websites. A calculation of the adult population times the cost of drivers' licenses will give a rough idea of income lost to a state from denying licenses to immigrants.
 - √ Take a look at the number of unlicensed drivers in your state: The Insurance Research Council estimates the number of unlicensed drivers in each state.¹⁴⁴
 - √ Work on passage of a state policy or law that increases access to drivers' licenses, using the model legislation and talking points outlined here.
 - √ Make sure your Congressional representatives know how you feel about the federal proposals.
 - √ Publicize abuses and hardships for immigrants, both documented and undocumented, from a harsh state policy.
- 

¹⁴² Available at: < http://www.gcir.org/about_immigration/usmap.htm.>

¹⁴³ Available at: < http://www.immigration.gov/graphics/aboutus/statistics/III_Report_1211.pdf.>

¹⁴⁴ These estimates (dated February 2001) are available at <<http://www.ircweb.org/news/newsreleases/2001-02-01.htm>.>

Chapter 4: Focus on Enforcing the Labor Rights of all Workers: Post Hoffman Plastics Issues

The U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB

In March 2002, the U.S. Supreme Court decided a case called Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB¹⁴⁵ that has generated concern among immigrant workers, communities, and advocates. In Hoffman, the Supreme Court held that a worker who is undocumented could not recover the remedy of back pay under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

The case involved a worker named José Castro who was working in a factory in California. Mr. Castro was fired in clear violation of the NLRA for his organizing activities. The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) ordered the employer to cease and desist, to put up a posting that it had violated the law, and to reinstate Castro and provide him with back pay for the time he was out of work because of the illegal discharge.

During an NLRB hearing, it came out that Castro had used false documents to establish work authorization and that he was actually undocumented. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals rejected the employer's argument that Mr. Castro should not receive back pay because he is undocumented and held that back pay can be tolled to the date when the employer obtained "after-acquired" evidence of a worker's undocumented status. However, the Supreme Court held that Mr. Castro could not be awarded back pay because he is undocumented.

There is a strong argument that, whatever the outcome of these issues at the federal level, states are free to make their own policy choices under their own state laws regarding what remedies are available to the undocumented.

This decision has raised concern about whether courts will extend its application to other federal worker protections. Prior to the Supreme Court's decision in *Hoffman*, various lower federal courts had addressed the question of what relief undocumented workers may seek for discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act,¹⁴⁶ as well as wage and overtime violations under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA),¹⁴⁷ and violations of the National Labor Relations Act.

Effect of Hoffman Ruling on Workers

Availability of remedies under NLRA and federal anti-discrimination laws

Federal case law as well as federal agency guidances regarding eligibility of undocumented workers for relief leave concern about the ability of undocumented workers to adequately enforce their rights under the NLRA and the federal anti-discrimination laws. As discussed above, in *Hoffman*, the Supreme Court held that an undocumented worker is not eligible for back pay if he or she is unlawfully discharged under the NLRA.

¹⁴⁵ 535 U.S. 137; 122 S.Ct. 1275 (2002).

¹⁴⁶ See, e.g., *Rios v. Local 638*, 860 F.2d 1168, 1173 (2d Cir. 1988); *E.E.O.C. v. Hacienda Hotel*, 881 F.2d 1504 (9th Cir. 1989).

¹⁴⁷ See, *Patel v. Quality Inn South*, 846 F.2d 700 (11th Cir. 1988).

National Labor Relations Act

Following the *Hoffman* decision, employers have claimed, in a number of cases, that workers are not entitled to certain remedies under the NLRA. The *Tuv Tamm* case is instructive. In that case, a group of workers were engaged in organizing in a wholesale food distribution facility in Brooklyn. The workers were subjected to surveillance, videotaping, interrogation, wage reductions and threats – all clearly violations of their rights under the NLRA. The employer violated a settlement agreement reached the day before *Hoffman* was decided. In the NLRB proceedings, the employer claimed that it was not required to provide back pay to some of the workers, because it had received a Social Security no-match letter. The employer claimed that the letter proved “immigration fraud” on the part of the workers. The Board held that the no-match letter was not sufficient proof of illegal status, and that status issues could not be raised in the liability phase of the Board’s consideration of the matter. *Tuv Taam*, 30 NLRB No. 86, 2003 WL 22295361 (2003).

Federal Anti-Discrimination Law

While the Supreme Court has not spoken on whether undocumented workers are eligible for back pay under the federal anti-discrimination laws, it is possible that courts following *Hoffman* will conclude that they are not. Prior to *Hoffman*, one circuit, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, had already held that an undocumented job applicant was not covered by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, because he was not eligible to be employed in the United States;¹⁴⁸ the same court had held that a Mexican national applying for a job through the H-2A guestworker program was not protected by the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.¹⁴⁹

Following *Hoffman*, the EEOC rescinded its guidance on remedies available to undocumented workers.¹⁵⁰ However, it issued a statement reaffirming its commitment to protecting undocumented workers from discrimination.¹⁵¹ Shortly after this, the EEOC settled an action for sexual harassment and discrimination on behalf of a group of immigrant workers, some of whom were undocumented, making it clear that undocumented workers continue to be eligible for at least some types of monetary remedies following *Hoffman*.¹⁵²

At the time of this writing, it is still uncertain what courts will decide with regard to undocumented workers’ eligibility for back pay under the federal anti-discrimination laws. However, it seems likely that, following the lead of the EEOC, that most federal courts will continue to hold that workers are eligible for compensatory and punitive remedies regardless of immigration status.

Availability of Remedies Under Federal Minimum Wage and Overtime Law

Of least concern is the effect of *Hoffman* on undocumented workers’ rights to recover “back pay” for work actually performed under the FLSA. “Back pay” under FLSA is different from back pay under the NLRA and the anti-discrimination laws. Under the other laws, back pay is payment of wages that the worker would have earned if not for the unlawful termination or other discrimination. Under FLSA, “back pay” is payment of wages the worker

¹⁴⁸ *Egbuna v. Time Life*, 153 F.3d 184 (4th Cir. 1998).

¹⁴⁹ *Reyes Gaona v. NCGA* 250 F.3d 861 (4th Cir. 2001).

¹⁵⁰ U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *Rescission of Enforcement Guidance on Remedies Available to Undocumented Workers Under Federal Employment Discrimination Laws* (June 27, 2002), available at <http://www.eeoc.gov/docs/undoc-rescind.html> (rescinding E.E.O.C. Enf. Guidance 915.002).

¹⁵¹ U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Press Release, *EEOC Reaffirms Commitment to Protecting Undocumented Workers From Discrimination* (June 28, 2002), available at << <http://www.eeoc.gov/press/6-28-02.html>>>.

¹⁵² U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Press Release, *Eeoc And Decoster Farms Settle Complaint For \$1,525,000*, (Sept. 30, 2002) available at, <<http://www.eeoc.gov/press/9-30-02-b.html>>.

actually earned but was not paid.¹⁵³ Following the Supreme Court's decision in *Hoffman*, federal courts have held that *Hoffman* is not relevant to back pay under the FLSA, and have made rulings favoring plaintiffs.¹⁵⁴

The U.S. Department of Labor has stated that the Department will fully and vigorously enforce the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), the FLSA, the Migrant and Seasonal Worker Protection Act (AWPA), and the Mine Safety and Health Act without regard to whether an employee is documented or undocumented.¹⁵⁵ The DOL statement leaves open the issue of back pay for undocumented workers who suffer retaliation on the job.¹⁵⁶

Concerns About Discovery of Workers' Immigration Status

Statements by the NLRB General Counsel and the EEOC following the *Hoffman* decision suggest that a worker's immigration status may be relevant in determining remedies under the NLRA and the federal anti-discrimination laws. The NLRB General Counsel, in a guidance memorandum dated July 19, 2002, has stated that immigration status may become relevant in determining remedies.¹⁵⁷ However, it also stated that immigration status is not at issue in determining liability.¹⁵⁸

The EEOC has stated that it will not consider an individual's immigration status when examining the underlying merits of a charge.¹⁵⁹ However, with regard to the availability of remedies, EEOC stated that "[t]he Commission will evaluate the effect *Hoffman* may have on the availability of monetary remedies to undocumented workers under the federal employment discrimination statutes."¹⁶⁰

Moreover, at least one court following *Hoffman* has suggested that *Hoffman* has made the issue of immigration status relevant to a worker's standing to sue for relief under the anti-discrimination laws. In denying a defendant's motion to dismiss in *Lopez v. Superflex, Ltd.*,¹⁶¹ a judge in the Southern District of New York remarked:

If *Hoffman* Plastics does deny undocumented workers the relief sought by plaintiff, then he would lack standing. As that issue is not ripe for decision, we decline to rule on it at this time. However, if plaintiff were to admit to being in the United States illegally, or were to refuse to answer questions regarding his

¹⁵³ There is one form of back pay under the FLSA that resembles back pay under the NLRA and the anti-discrimination laws. This form of back pay appears in the anti-retaliation provision of the FLSA – and is payment of wages that the worker would have earned if not for his or her unlawful termination by the employer in retaliation for having initiated a complaint under the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 215(a)(3).

¹⁵⁴ See, *Flores v. Albertson's, Inc.*, 2002 WL 11623 (CD Cal 2002); *Liu v. Donna Karan International, Inc.*, 2002 WL 1300260 (SD NY 2002).

¹⁵⁵ U.S. Department of Labor, *HOFFMAN PLASTIC COMPOUND, INC, v NLRB, QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS*

¹⁵⁶ See also, U.S. Department of Labor, *Fact Sheet #48: Application of U.S. Labor Laws to Immigrant Workers: Effect of Hoffman Plastics decision on laws enforced by the Wage and Hour Division (2002)* available at <http://www.dol.gov/esa/regs/compliance/whd/whdfs48.htm>.

¹⁵⁷ NLRB General Counsel, *Procedures and Remedies for Discriminatees Who may be Unauthorized Aliens after Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc.* (Jul. 19, 2002) available at <http://www.nlr.gov/gcmemo/gc02-06.html> (pointing out that "Regions have no obligation to investigate an employee's immigration status unless a respondent affirmatively establishes the existence of a substantial immigration issue.... A substantial immigration issue is lodged when an employer establishes that it knows or has reason to know that a discriminatee is undocumented." At this point, the Region is to "investigate the claim by asking the Union, the charging party and/or the discriminatee to respond to the employer's evidence.... a mere assertion is not a sufficient basis to trigger such an investigation.")

¹⁵⁸ *Id.*

¹⁵⁹ *Id.*

¹⁶⁰ *Id.*

¹⁶¹ 01 Civ. 10010, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15538 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 21, 2002).

status on the grounds that it is not relevant, then the issue of his standing would properly be before us, and we would address the issue of whether Hoffman Plastics applies to ADA claims for compensatory and punitive damages brought by undocumented aliens.¹⁶²

The Court goes on to observe in a footnote: “If we do ultimately reach this issue, it could result in a judicial finding that plaintiff is illegally residing in the United States and therefore is subject to deportation.”¹⁶³

In addition to concern about whether undocumented workers continue to be covered by the labor and employment laws and eligible for the same relief as other workers, this raises questions about what happens to a worker whose undocumented status is revealed in the course of proceedings. Determination that immigration status is relevant to determination of remedies or even standing to sue would mean that undocumented workers could no longer invoke protective orders to keep their immigration status out of the proceedings. As observed by the Court in *Lopez*, there could result a judicial finding that the worker is undocumented and subject to deportation. Such a possibility would have a severe chilling effect on workers seeking to enforce their rights.

Given the pessimistic outlook for obtaining some forms of relief under some federal laws, it becomes increasingly important, to the extent possible, to look to the states to enforce workers’ rights.

State Enforcement of Workers’ Rights

Regardless of the outcome of issues regarding back pay and other forms of damages in the federal courts, there is a strong argument that states are free to make their own policy choices under their own state laws regarding what remedies are available to undocumented workers. Of the cases litigated thus far, none has squarely addressed the issue of the continuing availability of back pay under state law.

State Agency Enforcement

A useful action that advocates can urge on the state level is for state agencies to develop pro-worker policies for enforcing labor and employment laws as well as providing benefits, such as workers’ compensation. Such a policy would reaffirm a commitment to performing its duties without regard to the immigration status of workers who come before it. Shortly after the *Hoffman* decision, state agencies in California and Washington delivered such statements.

The *California Department of Industrial Relations* recently posted a statement on its website clarifying that it will “Investigate retaliation complaints and file court actions to collect back pay owed to any worker who was the victim of retaliation for having complained about wages or workplace safety and health, without regard to the worker’s immigration status.”¹⁶⁴

The Director of the *Washington State Department of Labor and Industries* has issued a statement that undocumented immigrants continue to be entitled to both time loss and wage replacement after the *Hoffman* decision:

¹⁶² *Id.*, slip op. at 6-7.

¹⁶³ *Id.*, at n.4.

¹⁶⁴ CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, “All California workers are entitled to workplace protection,” available at <http://www.dir.ca.gov>.

The 1972 law that revamped Washington's workers' compensation system is explicit: All workers must have coverage. Both employers and workers contribute to the insurance fund. The Department of Labor and Industries is responsible for ... providing workers with medical care and wage replacement when an injury or an occupation disease prevents them from doing their job. The agency has and will continue to do all that without regard to the worker's immigration status.¹⁶⁵

Following *Hoffman*, there is still a great deal state agencies can do to continue to enforce the labor and employment rights of all workers, regardless of immigration status. Below is a model policy state agencies should be encouraged to adopt and publicize.

Model State Labor Agency Statement

Anti-discrimination laws: State agencies responsible for enforcing anti-discrimination laws may adopt the following policy:

All workers, regardless of immigration status, are covered by state anti-discrimination employment laws, and are eligible for all remedies under the law unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.

- 1) The [Agency Name] will:
 - a. Investigate complaints of violations of the anti-discrimination in employment laws and file court actions to seek and collect back pay, compensatory and punitive damages, and all other appropriate remedies, including equitable relief. This shall be done without regard to the worker's immigration status, unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.
 - b. Investigate retaliation complaints and file court actions to collect back pay owed to any worker who was the victim of retaliation for having complained about unlawful discrimination, without regard to the worker's immigration status, unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.¹⁶⁶
- 2) The [Agency Name] will not ask a complainant or witness for their social security number (SSN) or other information that might lead to disclosing an individual's immigration status, will not ask workers about their immigration status and will not maintain information regarding workers' immigration status in their files.
- 3) During the course of court proceedings, the [Agency Name] will oppose efforts of any party to discover a complainant's or witnesses' immigration status by seeking a protective order or other similar relief.
- 4) In the rare occasion that [Agency Name] must know the complainant's immigration status, it will keep that status confidential, and will have a policy of nondisclosure to third parties (including to other state or federal agencies), unless otherwise required by federal law.

¹⁶⁵ Statement dated May 21, 2002 by Gary Moore, Director, available at <http://www.nelp.org>.

¹⁶⁶ Based on California Dept. of Industrial Relations, *All California workers are entitled to workplace protection*, available at www.dir.ca.gov.

- 5) If a party raises the issue of an employee's immigration status in the course of proceedings, the party must show that the evidence is more probative than prejudicial, and that it obtained such evidence in compliance to 8 CFR § 274a.2(b)(1)(vii).
- 6) [Agency Name] will train its staff (including intake officers, investigators, attorneys, and other relevant staff) on this policy and will work closely with community-based organizations to conduct this training.
- 7) [Agency Name] will make reasonable efforts to work closely with community-based organizations to conduct outreach and education to the immigrant community on this policy.

Wage and hour laws: State agencies responsible for enforcing wage and hour laws may adopt the same policy, except the first paragraph should read:

All workers, regardless of immigration status, are covered by state wage and hour laws, and are eligible for all remedies under the law unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.

- 1) The [Agency Name] will:
 - a. Investigate complaints of violations of the wage and hour laws and file court actions to seek and collect unpaid wages and all other remedies authorized under state law without regard to the worker's immigration status, unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.
 - b. Investigate retaliation complaints and file court actions to collect back pay owed to any worker who was the victim of retaliation for having complained about unpaid wages, without regard to the worker's immigration status unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.

Occupational safety and health laws: State agencies responsible for enforcing occupational safety and health laws may also adopt the same policy, except the first paragraph should read:

All workers, regardless of immigration status, are covered by state occupational safety and health, and are eligible for all remedies under the law unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.

- 1) The [Agency Name] will:
 - a. Investigate complaints of violations of the occupational safety and health laws and file court actions to enforce the law without regard to the worker's immigration status unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.
 - b. Investigate retaliation complaints [if state law includes an anti-retaliation provision] and file court actions to collect back pay owed to any worker who was the victim of retaliation for having complained about unpaid wages without regard to the worker's immigration status unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.

Workers' compensation: State agencies responsible for enforcing workers' compensation laws should adopt the following policy:

The [Agency Name] is responsible for providing workers with medical care and wage replacement when an injury or an occupational disease prevents them from doing their job. The agency has and will continue to do all that without regard to the worker's immigration status.¹⁶⁷

- 1) The [Agency Name] will provide medical expenses, wage replacement and all other benefits and remedies authorized under state law to all workers regardless of immigration status unless explicitly prohibited by federal law.
- 2) The [Agency Name] will not ask injured workers or their witnesses for their social security number (SSN) or other information that might lead to disclosing an individual's immigration status, and will not ask injured workers or their witnesses about their immigration status and will not maintain information regarding immigration status in their files.
- 3) Worker's immigration status is not relevant to determine eligibility for medical expenses or wage replacement.¹⁶⁸
- 4) During the course of court proceedings, the [Agency Name] will oppose efforts of any party to discover an injured worker's or witnesses' immigration status by seeking a protective order or other similar relief.
- 5) In the rare occasion that [Agency Name] must know the injured worker's or witnesses' immigration status, it will keep that status confidential, and will have a policy of nondisclosure to third parties (including to other state or federal agencies), unless otherwise required by federal law.
- 6) If a party raises the issue of an injured worker's or witnesses' immigration status in the course of proceedings, the party must show that the evidence is more probative than prejudicial, and that it obtained such evidence in compliance to 8 CFR § 274a.2(b)(1)(vii).
- 7) [Agency Name] will train its staff (including intake officers, investigators, attorneys, and other relevant staff) on this policy and will work closely with community-based organizations to conduct this training.
- 8) [Agency Name] will make reasonable efforts to work closely with community-based organizations to conduct outreach and education to the immigrant community on this policy.

State Legislative Action

Another approach to ensuring undocumented workers that their rights will be protected after *Hoffman* focuses on state legislation. The California legislature has become the first in the country to adopt an affirmative state law post-*Hoffman*.

¹⁶⁷ Based on Statement dated May 21, 2002 by Gary Moore, Director of Washington State Department of Labor and Industries.

¹⁶⁸ However, immigration status may be relevant to determine employer's obligation to provide vocational rehabilitation. See *Tarango v. State Industrial Insurance System*, 25 P.3d 175 (Nev. 2001); *Foodmaker v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board*, 78 Cal. Rptr.2d 767 (Cal Ct. Apps, Div 2 1999).

Highlighted State Legislation: California Law

The bill, SB 1818, which was signed into law by California Governor Gray Davis on September 29, 2002, was introduced in the California legislature on February 22, 2002, as a means of protecting the employment rights of workers, regardless of immigration status, under state law. The law amends the Civil, Government, Health and Safety and Labor Codes and makes declarations of existing law. It reaffirms that “[a]ll protections, rights, and remedies available under state law, except any reinstatement remedy prohibited by federal law, are available to all individuals regardless of immigration status who have applied for employment who are or who have been employed, in this state.”¹⁶⁹ It also reaffirms that:

For purposes of enforcing state labor, employment, civil rights, and employee housing laws, a person’s immigration status is irrelevant to the issue of liability, and in proceedings or discovery undertaken to enforce those state laws no inquiry shall be permitted into a person’s immigration status except where the person seeking to make this inquiry has shown by clear and convincing evidence that this inquiry is necessary in order to comply with federal immigration law.¹⁷⁰

What Can Advocates Do?

- √ Help educate undocumented workers about their rights.¹⁷¹
- √ Continue to encourage undocumented workers to assert their labor rights. Assist them in filing claims and protect the confidentiality of their status.
- √ If you can do it safely for the workers involved, publicize stories of unscrupulous employers who take advantage of immigrant workers.
- √ Work to get your state labor agency and/or legislature to reaffirm undocumented immigrant workers’ rights and to publicize their will to protect the undocumented.

¹⁶⁹ See CAL. CIV. CODE § 3339 (2002); CAL. GOV’T CODE § 7285, *et seq.* (2002); CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 24000, *et seq.* (2002); CAL. LAB. CODE § 1171.5 (2002).

¹⁷⁰ *Id.* The full text of California’s law is reprinted in the Appendix.

¹⁷¹ Use the NELP fact sheets for workers and advocates, published at <http://www.nelp.org/publications/immigrant>

Chapter 5: Focus on Worker Health and Safety: Equal Access to Workers' Compensation Benefits

Immigrant workers toil in some of the most hazardous employment in this country. Injuries and deaths of Hispanic workers engaged in hazardous employment are extremely high and increasing. The numbers of fatal work injuries among white and black workers were lower in the year 2000, but in that year, there was a 24 % jump in construction fatalities involving Hispanic workers. Total Hispanic employment was up only six percent in 2000.¹⁷²

In California in 2001, 49 agricultural workers were killed on the job. A recent death of a farm worker in California resulted in a manslaughter charge against the farm owner for an egregious violation of the health and safety code.¹⁷³ Agriculture is second only to construction and mining in accident rates. Construction is also an industry hiring large numbers of immigrant workers.

New York has the nation's highest rate of immigrants killed on the job, with foreign-born workers accounting for three of every ten deaths.

New York has the nation's highest rate of immigrants killed in the workplace, with foreign-born workers accounting for three of every 10 deaths. In a most recent accident, five immigrant workers were killed and 14 workers injured in an accident in Manhattan in October 2001.¹⁷⁴

Economist Paul Leigh has quantified the overall costs of occupational injuries and deaths.¹⁷⁵ Leigh's findings include that the occupations in which immigrants are overrepresented, including heavy truck drivers, non-construction laborers, machine operators, janitors, nursing orderlies, construction laborers, assemblers, retail sales workers (not elsewhere specified), miscellaneous machine operators, and carpenters, are also those that contribute the most to total costs.

State Workers' Compensation Laws

All 50 states have state laws that give workers' compensation benefits to workers who are injured on the job.

Workers' compensation legislation arose out of conditions produced by the modern industrial workplace and the inability of common-law remedies to address injuries suffered by workers. Under workers' compensation, workers give up the right to sue their employers for workplace injuries. In return, they get the swift and sure, if smaller, remedy of medical coverage and some compensation, in the form of time loss benefits, permanent partial disability awards, and pensions. The basic test of workers' compensation liability is work connection, rather than

¹⁷² U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, NATIONAL CENSUS OF FATAL OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES IN 2000 (Aug. 14, 2001).

¹⁷³ Andy Furillo, *Farm death sparks manslaughter charge*, SACRAMENTO BEE (Dec. 18, 2001).

¹⁷⁴ Thomas Maier, *Death on the Job: Immigrants at Risk*, NEWSDAY (Dec. 16, 2001).

¹⁷⁵ J. P. Leigh, and Miller, T. R., *Ranking occupations based upon the costs of job-related injuries and diseases*, J OCCUP. ENVIRON. MED (1997). 39:(12)1170-1182.

fault, and liability is imposed as an incident of the employment relationship, a cost to be borne by the business enterprise.

Workers' compensation programs vary from state to state. The programs are typically financed through payroll taxes. Workers' compensation generally covers an injured worker's medical costs, and provides some portion of wage replacement for periods that a worker is unable to perform his or her job duties. Finally, they provide for compensation for disabilities and fatalities on the job. They provide benefits to the individual worker and his family, and the overall community similar to other social insurance programs.

The majority of the states' workers' compensation laws include "aliens" in the definition of covered employees.¹⁷⁶ Entitlement to lost wages under state workers' compensation laws turns on state statutes and their definition of "worker" or "employee." State courts in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas have specifically held that undocumented workers are covered under their state workers' compensation laws.¹⁷⁷

Model State Legislation

In 1999, the Supreme Court of Virginia held that an undocumented immigrant was not entitled to workers' compensation benefits.¹⁷⁸ Virginia is the only state in which a court has reached this conclusion in the absence of a clear statutory mandate to exclude undocumented immigrants from its worker compensation system. Virginia employers soon realized that the prospect of being sued in tort for workplace injuries was much less appealing than paying workers' compensation premiums. Employers, concerned about facing huge judgments in tort litigation, went back to the legislature to amend state law so that it specifically includes, "Every person, including aliens and minors, in the service of another under any contract of hire or apprenticeship, written or implied,

¹⁷⁶ See, ARIZ. REV. STAT. § 23-901(5)(b) (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); CAL. LAB. CODE § 3351(a) (Deering, LEXIS); FLA. STAT. ch. 440.02(14)(a) (LEXIS); IL COMP. STAT. 820/305(1) b (West 2002); KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § 342-0011(21) (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); MICH. STAT. ANN. § 17.237(161)(1)(l) (Michie, LEXIS); MINN. STAT. § 176.011 subd.9(1) (LEXIS); MISS. CODE ANN. § 71-3-27 (LEXIS); MONT. CODE ANN. § 39-71-118(1)(a) (LEXIS); NEB. REV. STAT. §§ 48-115(2), 48-144 (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); NEV. REV. STAT. ANN. § 616A.105 (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); N.M. STAT. ANN. 52-3-3 (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); N.C. GEN. STAT. 97-2(2) (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); N.D. CENT. CODE § 65-01-02(17)(a)(2) (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); OHIO REV. CODE ANN. 4123.01(A)(1)(b) (Anderson, LEXIS); S.C. CODE ANN. § 42-1-130 (LEXIS); TEX. LAB. CODE §§ 401.011, 406.092 (LEXIS); UTAH CODE ANN. § 34A-2-104(1)(b) (Matthew Bender, LEXIS); VA. CODE ANN. 65.2-101 (Matthew Bender, LEXIS).

¹⁷⁷ See, *Champion Auto Body v. Gallegos*, 950 P.2d 671 (Colo. Ct. App. 1997); *Gene's Harvesting v. Rodriguez*, 421 So.2d 701, 701 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1982); *Pablo D. Artiga v. M.A. Patout and Son*, 671 So.2d 1138, 1139 (La. Ct. App. 1996); *Lang v. Landeros*, 1996 Ok Civ. App. 4; 918 P.2d 404 (Okla. Ct. App. 1996); *Gayton v. Gage Carolina Metals Inc.*, 560 S.E.2d 870 (N.C. Ct. App. 2002); *Ruiz v. Belk Masonry Co.*, 559 S.E.2d 249 (N.C. Ct. App. 2002); *Rivera v. Trapp*, 519 S.E.2d 777 (N.C. Ct. App. 1999); *Mendoza v. Monmoth Recycling Corp.*, 672 A.2d 221 (N.J. Super. Ct. 1996); *The Reinforced Earth Company v. Workers' Compensation Appeal Board*, 749 A.2d 1036, 1038 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2000); *Dowling v. Slotnik*, 712 A.2d 396, 403 (Conn. 1998); *Dynasty Sample Company v. Beltrain*, 224 479 S.E.2d 773 (Ga. 1996); *Commercial Standard Fire and Marine Co. v. Galindo*, 484 S.W.2d 635, 637 (Tex. Civ. App. 1972); *Fernandez-Lopez v. Jose Cervino, Inc.*, 288 N.J. Super 14, 20; 671 A.D.2d 1051, 1054 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 1996). See, also, *Iowa Erosion Control v. Sanchez*, 599 N.W.2d 711 (Iowa, 1999) ("The employer has furnished no authority to support its view that, on grounds of policy or morality, [decendent worker's surviving mother's] immigration status has any bearing on her entitlement to benefits." *Id.*, at 715); *Del Taco v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board*, 79 Cal. App. 4th 1437 (Cal. Ct. App. 2000) (Holding that the California workers' compensation laws apply to aliens but do not "expressly authorize vocational rehabilitation benefits for an 'illegal worker'" who is not otherwise "medically eligible." *Id.*, at 1439-1442).

¹⁷⁸ *Granados v. Windson Dev. Corp.*, 509 SE2d 290 (1999).

whether lawfully or unlawfully employed.¹⁷⁹ When the governor vetoed the inclusive legislation, the bill had enough support in the legislature to override the veto. Surprisingly, Virginia has thus become one of the model states to cover immigrant workers under its workers' compensation system. (Its statute is reprinted in the Appendix.)

Twelve state courts have specifically held that undocumented workers are covered under their state workers' compensation laws.

Like Virginia, a number of other states also explicitly provide for workers' compensation benefits for "lawfully or unlawfully employed" employees. They are: Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Montana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Utah.¹⁸⁰ There is only one state, Wyoming, which has a statute specifically limiting coverage to documented "aliens."¹⁸¹

The workers' compensation laws in most states have special provisions for nonresident alien dependents, with some expressly including them on equal terms with other dependents, some excluding them from benefits altogether, some providing for reduced benefits or the commutation of benefits to a lump sum on a reduced basis, and many restricting the classes of beneficiaries. In 1993, a Kansas court held that a statute that limited workers' compensation nonresident alien dependents' death benefits to \$750, while all other dependents, including resident alien dependents, were entitled to compensation benefits of up to \$200,000, was unconstitutional.¹⁸²

Undocumented Workers and Vocational Rehabilitation

Vocational rehabilitation benefits are paid during retraining of an injured worker. They generally include payment for retraining so the worker can perform a new job. Courts in two states, California and Nevada, have found that undocumented workers are not entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits under certain circumstances. In both cases, state law established a hierarchy of benefits to be offered to an injured worker, which focused first on return to the prior job, then other employment that would accommodate the injury or limitations of the worker, then the more expensive training. In both cases, the employer had innocently discovered the worker's status and could not rehire the worker because to do so would violate the immigration laws. In both cases, the courts found that the workers' compensation system should not have to provide more expensive vocational rehabilitation benefits to a worker who does not qualify for the other, less expensive remedies, only by reason of his immigration status.¹⁸³

Undocumented Workers and Time Loss after *Hoffman*

Since *Hoffman*, two state courts have placed limitations on the availability of time loss recovery for injured workers based on immigration status. A worker in Pennsylvania was rendered unconscious after being

¹⁷⁹ VA. CODE ANN. 65.2-101 (Matthew Bender, LEXIS).

¹⁸⁰ ARIZ. REV. STAT. § 23-901; CAL LAB CODE § 3351 (2001); C.R.S. 8-40-202; FLA. STAT. § 440.02; MONT. CODE ANNO., § 39-71-118; N.C. GEN. STAT. § 97-2; S.C. CODE ANN. § 42-1-130 (2001); UTAH CODE ANN. § 34A-2-104; VA. CODE ANN. § 65.2-101

¹⁸¹ WYO. STAT. ANN. § 27-14-102 (a)(vii) (LEXIS).

¹⁸² *Jurado v Popejoy Constr. Co.*, 853 P.2d 669 (Kan. Sup. Ct. 1993).

¹⁸³ See *Tarango v. State Industrial Insurance System*, 25 P.3d 175 (Nev. Sup. Ct. 2001); *Foodmaker v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board*, 78 Cal. Rptr.2d 767 (Cal Ct. Apps, Div 2 1999).

struck with a steel beam in the head, neck and back, and sustained a concussion, head injury and back strain and sprain. He was ill for many months before being terminated by his employer. Apparently after the injury, the employer verified with the INS that he was unlawfully in the United States. It claimed that he was not entitled to workers' compensation. Although the Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that the worker is entitled to medical benefits, it found that illegal immigration status would justify terminating benefits for temporary total disability.¹⁸⁴ In a second case, decided January 7, 2003, the Michigan Court of Appeals held that wage loss compensation could be suspended for an undocumented worker from the date that the employer "discovered" that the worker did not have authorization to be employed, under a specific state law that allows suspension of wage loss benefits if a worker commits a "crime" that prevents him or her from working or obtaining work.¹⁸⁵ In neither case did the court engage in a meaningful discussion of the prime cause of the workers' inability to work: the injury, rather than the use of false documents to obtain a job in the first place.

There have also been state court decisions going the other way. In Arizona, an employer of an undocumented worker who sustained an eye injury while working as a mechanic argued that the worker was not entitled to workers' compensation because he was not documented. The Court of Appeals held that disqualifying undocumented workers from workers' compensation benefits would create an incentive for a business to hire them, "knowing that it would not be responsible for their injuries."¹⁸⁶ In Minnesota, a worker injured his back lifting heavy boxes in his work producing and packaging meats and gifts. This injury required surgery and therapy. The employer turned the worker in to the INS and argued that he was not entitled to wage loss benefits because of his undocumented status. The Minnesota Supreme Court disagreed, holding that the IRCA was not intended to preclude the authority of states to award workers' compensation benefits to undocumented workers.¹⁸⁷ In Florida, the Court of Appeals held that "[t]he Florida legislature's right to enact workers' compensation benefits for illegal [sic] aliens is not preempted by federal action,"¹⁸⁸ and therefore that an injured undocumented worker was eligible for benefits under Florida's workers' compensation system.

It is likely that other cases will come up around the country as employers learn that hiring an undocumented worker could mean that if the worker is injured, the employer gets a "free pass" on the time loss portion of her bill, yet faces no tort liability. (See Discussion of *Hoffman* in Chapter 4, *supra*.) However, *Hoffman* does not stand for the proposition that undocumented workers have no right to time loss benefits under workers' compensation statutes. There are many reasons to distinguish the discretionary federal NLRA remedy of back pay from a mandatory payout of insurance under state law. It is important in the first instance to resist discovery requests aimed at an injured workers' immigration status, and to resist any argument that undocumented workers' compensation rights are diminished by *Hoffman*.

Highlighted Campaign: New York: workers file NAFTA complaint against the U.S. and the New York State Workers' Compensation Board

¹⁸⁴ *The Reinforced Earth Company v. Workers' Compensation Appeal Board*, 2002 WL 31476901, ___A. 2d ___ (Pa, 2002).

¹⁸⁵ *Vazquez v. Eagle Alloy*, 2003 WL 57544, ___N.W.2d ___ (Mich. Ct. Apps. 2003).

¹⁸⁶ *Tiger Transmissions v. Industrial Commission of Arizona*, No. 1 CA-IC 02-0100 (May 29, 2003).

¹⁸⁷ *Correa v. Waymouth Farms, Inc.*, 664 N.W.2d 324 (2003).

¹⁸⁸ *Safeharbor Employer Services I, Inc. v. Juan Cinto Valazquez*, No. 1D02-3380, 2003 Fla. App. LEXIS 15281, at *4 (October 13, 2003).

In October, 2001, injured and concerned workers leading the National Mobilization Against Sweatshops' "It's About TIME!" Campaign for Workers' Health and Safety exposed to the world New York State's violations of workers' human rights by filing a complaint based on the labor rights agreement of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). A delegation went to Mexico City to initiate the NAFTA complaint against the United States and the New York State Workers' Compensation Board.

The NAFTA complaint charges that the New York State Workers' Compensation violates workers' rights by allowing endless delays to injured workers' cases, forcing injured workers into poverty and worsened health, and permitting insurance companies to profit from millions of dollars of unpaid benefits. Additionally, the complaint holds New York State guilty of not protecting the health and safety of all working people. Under the labor side agreement to NAFTA, called the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC), the Mexican government must review the complaint and make recommendations for its resolution.

The failure of the workers' compensation system to protect immigrant farm workers is also the subject of a pending NAALC complaint in Washington State. This complaint is at the level of consultations between the Mexican Labor Department and the United States Department of Labor. Advocates are considering whether to push the complaint to the next level of review, provided under the NAALC, in particular because of the state's failure to address issues surrounding the workers' compensation system.

Legislative Fix: Michigan

On November 5, 2003, Representative Steve Tobocman introduced legislation to remedy the effect of the *Eagle Alloy* decision. The proposed legislation would amend the existing workers' compensation statute to provide that: "[a]s used in this subsection, "commission of a crime" does not include an alien's working without employment authorization or an alien's use of false documents to obtain employment or to seek work."¹⁸⁹ If enacted, this legislation would prevent a court from coming to the conclusion that an undocumented workers was ineligible for wage replacement benefits under workers' compensation simply because of his or her immigration status. This is a unique type of fix, specific to the Michigan law, which has an unusual provision limiting availability of wage replacement benefits for people who are unable to work because of "commission of a crime."

What Can Advocates Do?

- √ Make sure that undocumented workers are entitled to workers' compensation in your state.
- √ Make sure that undocumented workers continue to have workers' compensation protection after *Hoffman* by getting state agencies to adopt policies such as those outlined in Chapter 5.
- √ Make sure that LEP workers have access to translations and interpretations.
- √ Study the efficiency of your workers' compensation system and consider filing legal claims, including additional NAFTA claims.

¹⁸⁹ H.B. No. 5256 (MI 2003)

Conclusion and Recommendations

This report seeks to advise advocates on the steps they can take to ensure that all immigrant workers have equal access to work-related benefits and the services of state agencies who would protect their rights. Unless state laws clearly protect undocumented immigrant workers, unless state agencies understand that they must enforce the laws for the benefit of these workers, and unless they can be served in their own language, immigrant workers, and especially the undocumented, will continue to suffer the most egregious forms of workplace abuse without recourse.

The five areas for advocacy selected in this report have several things in common: they are each the subject of ongoing advocacy from which advocates can learn. They each concentrate on changes that can be made at the state, rather than federal, level. Finally, each involves protection of a fundamental workplace right or a right central to a worker's ability to continue at a job. The authors urge advocates across the country to learn from each other and use this report as a tool to continue their advocacy.

This section summarizes our conclusions and recommendations:

1) Language access state agency services, including enacting state anti-discrimination laws that protect immigrant workers and enacting anti-English only workplace rules.

Advocates should work to ensure that their state law contains express provisions for language access to vital work-related benefits and services, such as unemployment compensation, workers' compensation, and the assistance of state labor agencies. Advocates should also review the practices of state agencies that are assigned the task of protecting the labor rights of all workers, to make certain that they are accessible to the limited English proficient. Advocates should consider specific state and local legislation, and litigation under state statutes that protect language access or, more broadly, guard against national origin discrimination by state agencies. In particular, states should provide in-person access to interpreters in locations with large immigrant populations. Advocates should also consider specialized laws that require employers and state agencies to communicate information about labor rights in a workers' primary language.

2) State and local amnesty and sanctuary or confidentiality rules concerning police enforcement of immigration laws.

Advocates should review the practices of their state and local government entities, including social services and policy agencies, to be certain that they assist immigrants regardless of their legal status, and that they make no reports regarding status to the DHS. Using the models outlined here, advocates can work for better assurances from these agencies, and help them to publicize their policies in immigrant communities, for the safety of all our communities.

3) State rules expanding access to drivers' licenses.

Using the all-state charts referenced here, advocates should make certain that their state does not discriminate against immigrants based on their lack of social security numbers, legal status, or the length of their visa in its provision of drivers' licenses. State laws expanding access to drivers' licenses make us all safer. Advocates should join together to defeat restrictionist licensing policies and to expand access to licenses, using reliable

alternative forms of identification, such as the Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN), and the *matricula consular*.

4) Post-Hoffman – looking to states to enforce labor rights.

Using the model language here, advocates should work with labor agencies to adopt policies protecting the labor rights of all workers, including those who may be undocumented. Advocates should stress with state labor agencies that, in order to protect the most vulnerable workers, they must have a firewall between their agencies and the INS, and they must publicize their policies in immigrant communities.

5) Access for immigrant workers to workers' compensation.

Advocates can work to ensure that undocumented immigrants retain their right to be compensated for injuries sustained on the job by either working for a specific state policy on the issue or an amendment to state law. Should undocumented workers be left uncovered by certain aspects of the workers' compensation system, employers will have a powerful incentive to hire only the undocumented. Such an approach would also create a perverse incentive for employers to be more negligent with respect to workplace safety. Employers will be encouraged to hire undocumented workers, neglect their workplace safety needs, and take a "free pass" on workers' compensation when these workers are injured on the job.