Reported Violations of Oregon's Sanctuary Promise Act

Per House Bill 3265 (2021)

July 1, 2025



Oregon Criminal Justice Commission

Authors: Paige Frye Holcomb, PhD Research Analyst

> Emma Dunn Research Analyst

With assistance from the Oregon Department of Justice

Ryan Keck Interim Executive Director

Table of Contents

1: History of Sanctuary Promise Legislation	4
2: House Bill 3265 (2021) Requirements	4
3: Requests for Cooperation from Federal Immigration Authorities to Public Bodies	5
4: Sanctuary Promise Violations Reported to the Oregon Department of Justice	8
5: Conclusion	10

List Of Tables

Table 3.1. Requests for Cooperation, by Public Body and County	6
Table 3.2. Types of Requests	7
Table 4.1. Nature of Alleged Violations reported to ODOJ	9

1: History of Sanctuary Promise Legislation

The State of Oregon was the first in the nation to become a sanctuary state when it enacted a law in 1987 prohibiting state and local law enforcement agencies as well as state and local government bodies from assisting federal authorities with immigration enforcement. Oregon's sanctuary laws have been updated several times since 1987, including during the 2021 Regular Legislative Session, when the Oregon legislature passed House Bill (HB) 3265 – the "Sanctuary Promise Act" – to further strengthen existing sanctuary laws. HB 3265 focuses on the reporting of and response to violations of Oregon's sanctuary laws, as well as providing trauma-informed, culturally responsive support to community members via a reporting hotline.

On January 20, 2025, The White House issued Executive Order No.14159 that revoked protections established by the prior administration and ordered the expansion and prioritization of national immigration enforcement efforts.³ Section 17 states that the U.S. Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall evaluate and enact lawful actions to ensure that "sanctuary jurisdictions" do not receive access to federal funds, and ordered the aforementioned parties to undertake lawful criminal or civil actions they deem warranted based on a "sanctuary jurisdiction's" practices that are perceived as interfering with the enforcement of federal law. Further directives to identify and penalize "sanctuary jurisdictions" are issued in Executive Order No. 14287, signed on April 28, 2025.⁴ To date, Oregon remains a sanctuary state, and its sanctuary laws have remained in place.

2: House Bill 3265 (2021) Requirements

The Sanctuary Promise Act enumerates prohibited public body⁵ conduct, mandating that they may not inquire into or collect information about an individual's immigration or citizenship status or national origin, and that they must decline to cooperate, support, or provide information or access to federal immigration authorities for the purpose of enforcing federal immigration laws without a judicial order or except as required by state or federal law.⁶ In addition, law enforcement agencies and their personnel,⁷ whether or not they are on duty, are prohibited from aiding in the enforcement of federal immigration laws, denying services or benefits based on immigration status, and using public resources to assist with enforcing federal immigration laws without a judicial order.⁸ Examples of Sanctuary Promise violations include asking about, collecting, or sharing information regarding an individual's immigration status, establishing a traffic perimeter for the purpose of supporting or facilitating immigration enforcement, or granting a federal immigration authority access to an area of a facility not normally open to the public.⁹ The bill focuses on government transparency by requiring the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) and the Oregon Department of Justice (ODOJ) to collect data on reports of Sanctuary Promise violations.

The Sanctuary Promise Act requires the CJC to: 1) develop a reporting mechanism through which the CJC will receive reports of communications or requests from federal agencies that relate to immigration

¹ See House Bill 2314 (1987 Regular Session), codified as former ORS 181.850 (1987), renumbered as ORS 181A.820 (2019), available at https://oregon.public.law/statutes

² See ORS 181A.820-181A.829 and 180.805, available at https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors181a.html

³ See Executive Order No. 14159, available at https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-01-29/pdf/2025-02006.pdf

⁴ See Executive Order No. 14287, available at https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-05-02/pdf/2025-07789.pdf

⁵ See ORS 174.109, available at https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors 174.109

⁶ See ORS 181A.823, available at https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills-laws/ors/ors181a.html

⁷ See ORS 181A.822, available at https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors181a.html

⁸ See ORS 181A.823 and 181A.826, available at https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors181a.html

⁹ See ORS 181A.826, available at https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors181a.html

enforcement and reports of Sanctuary Promise violations from public bodies; 2) publish and continually update a website with the data received from such requests (excluding personally identifiable information); 3) coordinate with the ODOJ in the development of a standardized intake process for reports made through the ODOJ Sanctuary Promise Hotline or online reporting system; and 4) share data with the ODOJ as requested for investigation purposes. The CJC is also required to issue an annual report no later than July 1 each year to the Governor, the Legislative Assembly, Oregon district attorneys, the Department of State Police, each Oregon law enforcement agency, and the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training that summarizes the information reported to the CJC. This report covers the fourth year of data collected by the CJC and the ODOJ, including a summary of the information reported by public bodies from June 1, 2024, through May 31, 2025. Section 3 addresses data from reports made by public bodies to the CJC. Section 4 addresses data on reported Sanctuary Promise Hotline complaints that the ODOJ has shared with the CJC.

The ODOJ established the Sanctuary Promise Hotline in April 2022, which is dedicated to assisting victims, witnesses, and other reporters of sanctuary law violations. ¹¹ The Hotline is staffed by bi-lingual and multi-lingual Hotline Advocates who provide trauma-informed, culturally responsive services, and interpretation is available in more than 240 languages. The Hotline Advocates also connect callers to resources, and support them, their families, and any witnesses through an ODOJ inquiry into the reported violation. In addition to the phone Hotline, reports are also received via an online reporting form on the ODOJ Sanctuary Promise webpage, which is readily available in nine languages. ¹² Hotline staff continue to connect with culturally specific organizations around the state to promote and offer the Hotline as a point of support for targeted individuals and their families, as well as provide professional and community presentations regarding Oregon sanctuary law. In 2024, Hotline staff held or attended 256 community or training events, completed 545 hours of outreach, and provided information and training to over 87,442 community members on the protections and limitations of Oregon's sanctuary laws. Since November 1, 2024, Hotline staff have conducted 76 information sessions and community presentations in multiple languages specifically on Oregon's sanctuary laws and the Sanctuary Promise Hotline, reaching 21,663 attendees.

The ODOJ is committed to supporting individuals targeted in violations of Oregon's sanctuary laws, as such targeting can result in the silencing and erasure of community members, the systematic removal of people from this country, dividing families, depriving people of safety and access to important state and local government programs and support, and undercutting opportunity and education. The impact of lost community members and distrust in government causes ripples throughout communities for generations, and the harm is intense, deep, and lasting.

3: Requests for Cooperation from Federal Immigration Authorities to Public Bodies

The CJC utilizes a webform for public bodies to report data on communications and/or requests for cooperation from federal immigration authorities. The fourth year of data in its entirety, submitted June 1, 2024, through May 31, 2025, can be found on the CJC's Sanctuary Promise Dashboard. ¹³

During the reporting period of June 1, 2024, to May 31, 2025, the CJC received a total of 104 submissions from public bodies detailing requests and/or communications from federal immigration

5

¹⁰ See ORS 181A.826(4)(d), available at https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors181a.html

¹¹ The Hotline is accessible in any language at 1-844-924-STAY (1-844-924-7829) as well as a direct line for Spanish speakers at 1-844-6-AMPARO (1-844-626-7276).

¹² See Oregon Department of Justice Sanctuary Promise Reporting Hotline webpage at Sanctuary Promise. Oregon.gov or Promesa Santuario. Oregon.gov (June 21, 2024)

¹³ See CJC Sanctuary Promise Dashboard

agencies. Nine of these 104 reports included communications or requests that occurred prior to the reporting timeframe but were submitted to the CJC during the current reporting period. The 95 requests that took place within the fourth reporting year are included in the tables and statistics below and represent a 265% increase in reported communications/requests from federal agencies since the previous reporting period (June 1, 2023, to May 31, 2024). Statistics for all reports, regardless of the initial request date, can be found on the agency dashboard.

Table 3.1. Requests for Cooperation, by Public Body and County

Public Body	County	Number of Requests
Corvallis Police Department	Benton	1
Clackamas County Jail	Clackamas	4
Clackamas County Sheriff's Office	Clackamas	2
Clatsop County Jail	Clatsop	1
Department of Community Justice	Multnomah	1
Deschutes County Jail	Deschutes	1
Jackson County Jail	Jackson	9
Josephine County Sheriff's Office	Josephine	1
Josephine County Jail	Josephine	2
Lane County Jail	Lane	9
Lincoln County Jail	Lincoln	5
Linn County Jail	Linn	3
Linn County Sheriff's Office	Linn	1
Marion County Jail	Marion	13
Marion County Sheriff's Office	Marion	25
Oregon Department of Justice	Unknown	5
Oregon State Police	Unknown	3
Polk County Jail	Polk	2
Springfield Municipal Jail	Lane	2
Washington County District Attorney's Office	Washington	1
Washington County Jail	Washington	3
Yamhill County Jail	Yamhill	1
Total		95

As shown in Table 3.1., the CJC received data from 22 public bodies in at least 15 counties regarding communications and/or requests for cooperation by a federal immigration authority. ¹⁴ Most reports were submitted by county jails, with 55 total requests for information from Oregon county or local jails. Thirteen separate jails reported requests for cooperation, some submitting reports for multiple requests. There were 32 total reports submitted to the CJC by five different law enforcement agencies. Marion County Sheriff's Office submitted data on 25 requests. Additionally, Marion County Jail submitted data

¹⁴ Requests for cooperation or issuances of communication reported by certain state agencies, for example Oregon State Police, did not include a designation of a specific county.

on 13 requests, making Marion County the county with the greatest number of requests for cooperation, receiving a total of 38 requests.

The majority of reports included requests for cooperation from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Seventy-four requests were from ICE, sixteen were from an office in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) other than ICE, three were from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), one was from the Canada Border Services, one was from the U.S. Department of Justice, and one was from the U.S. Marshals Service.

Fifty-seven of the 95 requests from federal immigration authorities involved an immigration detainer. Twenty-eight of the requests were for various types of information, such as a specific individual's immigration status, jail release time(s), or arrest details. Ten requests were for other types of cooperation including warrant for arrest, investigation or interrogation, or documents such as copies of police reports. Three reports were of communication without a formal request. One report was submitted as a request for cooperation from a federal immigration authority but was later determined to be unrelated to immigration enforcement. Of the 95 documented requests and/or communications, two public bodies reported their agency fulfilled the federal authority's request, one of which was the instance determined to be unrelated to immigration enforcement. The other report of cooperation included providing information that would assist in detaining an individual, specifically the jail release date of the individual. The release dates of adults in custody are considered public information in Oregon; however, if released to an immigration authority, the information must be available under the same terms and conditions as the information is available to the general public. ¹⁵ A full breakdown of the types of requests reported to the CJC by Oregon public bodies may be found in Table 3.2. below.

Table 3.2. Types of Requests

Request Type*	Number of Requests
Immigration Detainer	57
Information	28
Request for Cooperation	4
Communication without a request	3
Warrant for arrest	3
Investigate or Interrogate	2
Copies of police reports	1
Unrelated to immigration enforcement	1

^{*}Some requests included more than one request type, meaning the sum total of request types may be higher than the sum total of received reports.

Beginning with the third year of data collection, the CJC and the ODOJ included an option for violation reporters to indicate how many individuals were targeted by a particular incident or inquiry as an additional data point to better illustrate the scope of people affected by reported violations. ¹⁶ Among

¹⁵ See information on the Oregon Public Records Law and information sharing between state and federal authorities, available at oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/ors/ors192.html and https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2025R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB0277/Enrolled

¹⁶ The option to add information regarding number of targeted individuals became available in the third reporting year and will continue to be a component of data collection moving forward. Additionally, the number of targeted individuals is retroactively available for all existing ODOJ reports and is available via the CJC Sanctuary Promise Dashboard.

public body reports to the CJC, 78 requests for cooperation involved one targeted individual. Fifteen requests for cooperation targeted more than one individual (with 6 of these 15 reports targeting two individuals; 4 reports targeting three individuals; 3 reports targeting four individuals; and 2 reports targeting more than one individual with the exact number unknown). Two reports did not specify the number of individuals targeted in the request.

4: Sanctuary Promise Violations Reported to the Oregon Department of Justice

The ODOJ shared data with the CJC regarding 128 Sanctuary Promise Hotline contacts from June 1, 2024, through May 31, 2025. This represents a 276% increase in reporting from the previous reporting period of June 1, 2023, to May 31, 2024. ODOJ data includes complaints received via their Hotline or online reporting form, as well as information discovered or learned in the course of a Civil Rights Unit (CRU) staff member's work that would indicate an Oregon law enforcement agency or public body's actions, policies, or practices may be in violation of Oregon sanctuary law. The complete data can be found on the CJC's Sanctuary Promise Dashboard.

Thirty of the 128 reports received by the ODOJ were of state public resources being used to investigate, apprehend, arrest, detain, or hold individuals for immigration enforcement. Fourteen reports were regarding inquiries about or sharing of country of birth, national origin, or immigration or citizenship status information. Eleven of the 128 reports alleged an agreement, contract, MOU, or other arrangement that either authorized detention or holds for federal immigration enforcement or authorized exercising federal immigration enforcement powers. Six reports were regarding a civil arrest without a judicial warrant or court order. An additional six reports were regarding a failure to document a federal request relating to immigration enforcement or a failure to submit documentation of a request to CJC. Five reports were regarding an investigation or interrogation of an individual for immigration enforcement purposes, five reports were regarding the storage of country of birth, national origin, or immigration or citizenship status information, and three reports alleged that a federal agency was granted access to an area not normally open to the public. One report was about the establishment of a traffic perimeter for immigration enforcement purposes. ODOJ was unable to determine the nature of the alleged violation for seven reports, and the nature of violation for two reports was unknown.

Ninety-four of the 128 reports received by the ODOJ reporting mechanisms did not constitute reports of sanctuary law violations (what the statute refers to as "complaints," 17) or did not include enough information for the ODOJ to open an inquiry on behalf of the state. Inquiries can be conducted when a) there is a complaint that Oregon sanctuary law has been violated by a public body or law enforcement agency, and b) when the targeted individual and/or complainant consents to the inquiry. Examples of nonqualifying reports may be calls to the hotline requesting information about sanctuary law, requesting immigration-related resources and referrals, requesting presentations or brochures on sanctuary law, community members experiencing a mental health crisis, reports of ICE activity or ICE impersonators, reports of a loved one's detainment with no connection to a state or local law enforcement agency or public body, or callers perpetrating anti-immigrant bias. In Table 4.1., those reports show the nature of alleged violations as "None", "Unable to determine", or "Unknown." Of actual sanctuary law complaints received on the Hotline, some may be considered non-actionable because the complainant does not give consent for inquiry/investigation, or the complaint does not meet inquiry/investigative criteria because it is not Oregon-specific or is not an actual violation of sanctuary law. An example of a report that does not meet inquiry/investigative criteria may be a report of a public body discussing the potential release of information that would violate sanctuary law but ultimately not releasing the information.

-

¹⁷ See ORS 181A.827(3)

Table 4.1. Nature of Alleged Violations reported to ODOJ

Nature of Alleged Violation*	Number of Reports
None	85
Unable to determine	7
Unknown	2
Used state public resources	30
Inquired or shared information	14
Agreement, contract, MOU, or other arrangement	11
Civil arrest without warrant	6
Fail to document and/or submit request to CJC	6
Investigate or interrogate individuals	5
Stored information	5
Granted access to area(s) not open to the public	3
Established traffic perimeter	1

^{*}Some complaints alleged more than one type of violation, meaning the sum total of violation types in this table may be higher than the sum total of received reports.

Since the first report published on July 1, 2022, the ODOJ hired an investigator to conduct inquiries on behalf of the State regarding allegations of suspected sanctuary law violations. As is explained to each caller on the Hotline, ODOJ does not have the authority to compel law enforcement agencies or public bodies to respond to inquiries or take action in response to an allegation; ODOJ is not a "person" and cannot file the civil private right of action outlined in Oregon sanctuary law to seek injunctive relief; and ODOJ itself cannot make a finding of a sanctuary law violation. Currently, the State has sent 30 inquiries to law enforcement agencies and public bodies, and received responses to 23 inquiries, which are published in the ODOJ Hotline data. ¹⁸ Four public bodies and law enforcement agencies did not respond to the inquiry. Three agencies across six inquiries acknowledged receiving the inquiry but declined to provide the information ODOJ requested. One agency requested and was granted an extension related to two inquiries. Twelve additional inquiries are pending, with eleven that are new from this reporting period, and nine from the final quarter of this reporting period.

Eighty-six of the 128 total reports to the Hotline did not refer to a public body or state/local agency. There were 32 reports to the ODOJ in which a type of public body was referenced. Fifteen reports referenced law enforcement participation, making this the most common type of public body involved with alleged violations. Five reports referenced a county board of commissioners, four reports referenced a jail, and two reports referenced a circuit court. Six complaints referenced a public body other than those aforementioned (such as a District Attorney's Office, school board, or other local or state agency). In ten reports, the public body involved was unknown, unable to be determined, or not reported.

Seventy-one of the reports to the ODOJ had the number of targeted individuals listed as zero. Twenty-three reports involved the targeting of one individual; two reports involved the targeting of two individuals, and two involved the targeting of four individuals. Fourteen reports did not involve a specific targeted individual but referenced the potential to impact many individuals. Three reports involved one

¹⁸ See Oregon Department of Justice Sanctuary Promise Hotline Data, available at <u>Sanctuary Promise Violations Hotline - Oregon Department of Justice</u>

targeted individuals but with the potential to impact many other individuals. Seven reports involved multiple or many individuals, with the exact number unknown. In six reports, the number of targeted individuals is unknown.

Seventy-one of the reports to the ODOJ did not identify an involved federal immigration authority. When a federal immigration authority was referenced in the complaint, most of the reports (39 out of 128) concerned activity by ICE. Six reports involved other federal immigration authorities (such as U.S. Marshals, U.S. Census Bureau, or U.S. Department of Homeland Security). Six reports stated that the federal immigration authority was not reported, and in an additional six reports the federal immigration authority involved was unknown.

Oregon's Sanctuary Promise Act provides that "any person may bring a civil action against a law enforcement agency or public body that violates" Oregon's sanctuary laws. ¹⁹ At the time of publication of this report, the State is aware of one such now-resolved civil action, *Rural Organizing Project, Community Alliance of Lane County vs. City of Cottage Grove, Cottage Grove Police Department,* 23CV07691. ²⁰ The case was filed on February 21, 2023, and after preliminary rulings by the court, was scheduled for trial on January 31, 2024. On January 24, 2024, and later corrected February 2, 2024, Judge Jay A. McAlpin signed a *Corrected General Judgment, Permanent Injunction*.

5: Conclusion

This fourth annual report includes data collected by both the CJC and the ODOJ on a total of 232 reports related to Oregon's Sanctuary Promise Act between June 1, 2024, and May 31, 2025. HB 3265 contains no sunset clause, and the CJC will continue to summarize this data annually and submit a report to the Governor, the Legislative Assembly, Oregon district attorneys, the Department of State Police, each Oregon law enforcement agency, and the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training no later than July 1 each year.

¹⁹ See ORS 181A.820(6), 181A.823(4), 181A.826(5), 181A.828(3), 181A.829(4), 180.805(6), https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills-laws/ors/ors181a.html (June 18, 2025)

²⁰ See Rural Organizing Project, Community Alliance of Lane County vs. City of Cottage Grove, Cottage Grove Police Department, 23CV07691, available at https://www.doj.state.or.us/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2024-Cottage-Grove-injunction.pdf (June 21, 2024)