Introduction
On September 30, 2012, California Governor Brown signed “The Reuniting Immigrant Families Act” (SB1064). The legislation became the first in the country to address family separation issues as a consequence of the current immigration enforcement system. The California law prioritizes keeping children with their families and out of the public child welfare system whenever possible and helps separated families receive appropriate care and due process.

This case study describes how the bill was developed borrowing the lessons learned from similar federal efforts and how the diverse coalition of children, immigration and social justice organizations partnered to develop and pass the law. The study concludes by highlighting the efforts of other states to replicate this California bill.

Addressing a Problem
According to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, nearly 205,000 parents of U.S. citizen children were deported in the 26 months between July 1, 2010, and September 31, 2012. As immigration enforcement increased in the United States, reports emerged documenting the increasing number of children entering the foster care system as a result of their parents’ detention or deportation. In the fall of 2011, this growing problem reached mainstream media attention with the publication of the Applied Research Center report titled, “Shattered Families: The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System.” The report estimated that more than 5,100 children were currently in the foster care system as a result of their parents’ detention or deportation. The story received widespread attention from national media outlets including Nightline, CNN and Associated Press articles, the Rachel Maddow show, and Fox News stations. The “Shattered Families” report even prompted a comment by President Obama in a November
2011 press conference where he publicly acknowledged that his administration needed to address the problem of immigration enforcement separating families.4

After reading a “Shattered Families” story in the Los Angeles Times, state legislator Senator Kevin de León Democratic representative for California’s 22nd District, which includes East Los Angeles and Monterey Park, responded by contacting the author of the “Shattered Families” report for policy recommendation. The senator was then referred to the First Focus Campaign for Children. Senator de León was an ideal candidate to sponsor the bill. He was the chair of the Democratic Caucus, and the first Latino Chair of Assembly Appropriations Committee.

About the Bill
California epitomizes the growing diversity of the United States. It has the most foreign-born residents in the nation (11 percent of the total population in 2000), and far more than any other state.5 Children residing with at least one immigrant parent account for about 59.6 percent of the state’s children under age 18 in 2011.6

The goal of SB1064 is to develop uniform, statewide policy and practice that would reduce family reunification barriers for immigrant families involved with the child welfare system. All four components of the bill are based on existing policies and practices.

1. The bill provides an extension of the family reunification period so that child welfare agencies can conduct a more diligent search for detained or deported parents or find a relative placement.

   Rationale: This section was built on an existing 2008 California law, AB2070 (Bass), which allowed the juvenile court to extend reunification services for an incarcerated parent.

2. The bill affirms that immigration status per se is not a disqualifying factor in evaluating placement of a child with a relative, including their own parent.

   Rationale: This policy has been implemented for numerous years in Illinois, New York City, and Los Angeles.7

3. The bill requires that the child welfare agencies screen immigrant children who are undocumented for potential immigration relief options.

   Rationale: This is common practice in child welfare jurisdictions with experience working with immigrants such as Los Angeles, Fresno, and San Diego.8 And, in 2010, a local law requiring screening for immigration relief options for youth in foster care was passed in New York City.9

4. The bill requires the state child welfare agency to provide guidance to the counties to establish memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with foreign consulates.

   Rationale: This is based on Article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations which clearly states that consular officers have the right to assist their nationals in cases of death, guardianship or
trusteeships and that consular post shall be informed without delay. And, over 11 states and counties have already developed MOUs or similar documents with foreign consulates.\textsuperscript{10}

An important component of SB1064 is addressing the bias against placing children with undocumented parents or relatives. Though immigrant relatives may be willing to take custody of a child when their parent is detained or deported, many social workers, judges, and attorneys incorrectly assume that child welfare state or federal laws prohibit children from being placed with appropriate, undocumented relatives. SB1064 requires social workers to consider an appropriate relative for placement, including undocumented immigrants, and allows the county to use the relative’s consular identification card or passport instead of his or her social security number or driver’s license for the criminal background check and LiveScan needed for placement. And California law contains strong confidentiality requirements regarding children and information contained in their case files to address concerns that undocumented relatives who become foster care placements would be at risk of deportation.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{Lessons Borrowed from Federal Efforts}

The California law is based in part on the repeated failure of comprehensive immigration reform to gain political traction in Congress. Until now, the lack of federal leadership on immigration reform has led many states to respond through the passage of their own immigration laws. These immigration related state bills run the gamut, from pro-immigrant state policies allowing in-state rates for college tuition of undocumented immigrants, such as the passage of the Colorado in-state tuition bill in 2013, to punitive anti-immigrant statutes against employers who hired undocumented workers knowingly such as Arizona’s SB1070. The California bill is based, in part, on the lessons learned from other recent federal efforts. The Humane Enforcement and Legal Protections (HELP) for Separated Children Act (S.1399/H.R. 2607), re-introduced in the 112th Congress by Senator Al Franken (D-MN) and former Representative Lynn Woolsey (D-CA), directs U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to implement policies to ensure parents have access to phone calls at the time of apprehension to make child care arrangements and are able to make decisions about their child’s care while in detention and at the time of removal. The HELP Separated Children Act was passed as a bipartisan amendment by the Senate judiciary committee during the immigration reform markup process. The Help Separated Families Act (H.R. 6128), first introduced by Representative Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA) in the 112th Congress, has similar provisions as SB1064 to ensure that child welfare agencies have policies in place to promote family reunification in cases when a child in the system has a parent who has been detained or deported. Representative Roybal-Allard is expected to re-introduce both the HELP Separated Children Act and the Help Separated Families Act in the House of Representatives in 2013.

The Foster Children Opportunity Act (HR 3333) was introduced by former Representative Pete Stark (D-CA) in 2011. HR 3333 requires all children in the public foster care system be screened and identified for eligibility for immigration relief options through technical assistance and resources to court and child welfare staff. The Act also provides recommendations to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Unit of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to strengthen its immigration relief programs through standardize practices, specialized training of their officers, establishment of a dedicated unit, and issuance of policy guidance. The bill also lifts the five-year ban on access to federal benefits and provides federal Title IV-E reimbursement for youth after they receive the Special Immigrant Juvenile Status relief. The bill was re-introduced by Representative Beto O’Rourke (D-TX) in 2013 as H.R. 2036 with over 175 organizations
supporting this effort. First Focus Campaign for Children was a lead agency in the development of these bills. Components of these bills are likely to move into the negotiations regarding comprehensive immigration reform.

On April 17, 2013, the long-awaited federal comprehensive immigration legislation finally arrived with the bipartisan Senate “Gang of 8” introduction of the “Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013.”(S 744) The momentum given to immigration reform is credited to the crushing defeat of the Republican Party in the last presidential election, widely attributed to their lack of minority support, particularly with Latino voters. Hidden in this massive bill are several important modifications impacting state child welfare plans to promote the reunification of detained or removed parents with their children in the child welfare system. Specifically, the bill provides states with the authority to consider a parent’s detention or removal as a compelling reason to delay filing to termination of parental rights (TPR) and require state child welfare agencies to meet certain conditions before filing for TPR in such cases. The bill also includes provisions to ensure that state child welfare agencies place children with relatives whenever appropriate, regardless of their immigration status, and that parents are provide assistances in making arrangements for their child prior to a parent’s removal. These modifications were borrowed from the federal previous bills as well as the California legislation.

A Diverse Coalition

Key partners joining First Focus Campaign for Children in the development and passage of SB1064 included child advocacy, immigration, and social justice organizations. Some examples of the work of the partners include:

- An Equal Justice Fellow, Eliana Kaimowitz, housed at the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation helped draft and review the bill, testified on behalf of the bill, wrote blogs, and helped rally legal organizations to join the effort.

- Retired Santa Clara County child welfare deputy director Ken Borelli helped develop the legislation and testified for the bill. Ken is a well-recognized expert with legislative staff and provided technical expertise on California child welfare regulations. He is the author of the original “Special Immigrant Juvenile Status” national legislation.

- CHIRLA (The Coalition of Human Rights of Los Angeles) made SB1064 a priority for their organization and their advocate, Joseph Villela, joined First Focus Campaign for Children in organizing legislative education meetings in Sacramento.

- In addition to CHIRLA, organizations who had lobbyists located in the state capitol testified for the bill at all the hearings and met with legislative staff: the National Association of Social Worker- CA Chapter, the Children’s Defense Fund, MALDEF, Immigrant Legal Resource Center, and many others.

- The National Association of Social Workers California Chapter (NASW-CA) who designated SB1064 as one of three priority support bills for their annual “Lobby Day,” which had participation from over 1,000 NASW-CA members.

- A presentation given to a Social Work/Journalism seminar held at UC Berkeley would eventually generate three newspaper articles from the students in support of SB1064 (See Appendix 3).

- The support of the California Child Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) was critical in securing the governor’s support and avoiding opposition from the state child welfare department and courts. CWDA represents the human service directors for each of California’s 58 counties.
Public endorsement of the bill included letter of supports from the Santa Clara and San Francisco Board of Supervisors. There were also Republican legislators who voted and spoke in support of the bill. Eventually, over 50 organizations would sign on to the bill. There was no organization in opposition of the bill.

**Replicating the California Bill**

In January 2012, a press conference on the “Shattered Families” report was held at the Arizona State University School of Social Work, which received widespread local and state media coverage (print, radio, and TV). The event was organized by long-time Arizona children’s advocate Laurie Melrood with participation and technical assistance by the First Focus Campaign for Children. Melrood engaged the over fifteen organizations who participated in the press conference to discuss potential legislative reforms. And one year later, in February 2013, Arizona introduced Senate Bill 1303 (SB1303), sponsored by state Senator Linda Lopez (D-Tucson), Democratic Minority Whip. The bill provided a six-month extension for incarcerated immigrant parents in foster care trying to reunify with their children. Unfortunately, SB1303 was never assigned a Senate committee, but Senator Lopez has stated her interest in re-introducing the bill in 2014.

On February 27, 2013, Illinois introduced HB 3050, sponsored by state Representative Elizabeth Hernandez (D-Cicero), which replicated the California bill. After discussions with over seven key Illinois immigration and child welfare advocates involved in this bill, the Illinois coalition decided a better tactic would be to drop SB 3050 in favor of developing recommendations on the needs of immigrant families in the child welfare system through the creation of a statewide governor’s Task force. These recommendations could then lead to potential legislation in the next legislative sessions.

Finally, a bill is currently pending before the New York State Legislature, the “New York State Reuniting Families Act,” (S 4185/A 6337). The bill is sponsored by state Senator Kevin Parker (D-Brooklyn) and state Assembly member Ron Kim (D-Flushing), who represents the two most diverse districts in New York state. In addition to the four components of the California bill, the New York bill has implemented two more progressive, pragmatic solutions.

- A state-issued identification card would be created for all foster youth upon their request, including immigrant foster youth. These cards would be helpful in case children come to the attention of law enforcement in hopes that they are referred to child welfare caseworkers instead of automatically shuffled into the juvenile justice system.

- A virtual statewide information system with live help on case consultation would be created to assist court and child welfare staff on cases, utilizing existing organizations and agencies with expertise in working immigration issues.

A key partner in the development and expert consultation of the New York bill has been the students and faculty at Albany Law School. Under the supervision of former Albany Law School Law Clinic professors Sarah Rogerson and Melissa Breger, the law students have assisted in writing op-eds, soliciting letters of support, and meeting with legislative staff on the bill.

**Conclusion**
America now has the opportunity to fix the undocumented immigration problem by passing comprehensive immigration reform. It is important in these discussions that the thousands of children and families who have been adversely impacted by this broken system and involved in the child welfare system are taken into consideration during this rare opportunity of reform. These state and federal legislative models show some concrete and relatively straightforward steps in how the United States can strengthen its federal and state policy and practices to reaffirm its historic commitment to the principle of family unity. The legislation will decrease the upfront costs associated with the placement of children, by providing trainings and guidelines, as well as the longer-term care costs, by keeping children out of the foster care system.

---
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10 This estimate is based on an interview by the author with Laura Radel, Office of Human Services Policy, Health and Human Services in January 2013 regarding their research for an upcoming policy brief titled “Emerging Child Welfare Practice Regarding Immigrant Children in Foster Care: Collaborations with Foreign Consulates” Sample MOUs with the Mexican consulate are available on the Migration and Child Welfare National Network website at
http://research.jacsw.uic.edu/icwnn/state-specific-resources/.


12 Over seven print, television, and radio stories were generated from this press conference held at Arizona State University School of Social Work in Tucson, Arizona. Some examples, include this article from Tucson Sentinel published on January 17, 2012, “American kids often left behind when parents deported – Thousands in foster care when detention, deportation splits families.”
Senator Bill No. 1064
CHAPTER 845

An act to amend Section 3040 of the Family Code, to amend Sections 1510 and 1514 of the Probate Code, and to amend Sections 309, 361, 361.2, 361.3, 361.4, 361.5, 366.21, 366.215, 366.22, 366.25, 366.27, 388, and 16501.1 of, and to add Sections 10609.95 and 10609.97 to, the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to child custody.

[Approved by Governor September 30, 2012. Filed with Secretary of State September 30, 2012.]

Legislative Counsel’s Digest


(1) Under existing law, a child who is removed from the physical custody of his or her parent or parents in dissolution, dependency, or probate guardianship proceedings may be placed with a parent, relative, legal guardian, or other specified persons or in specified placement homes or facilities. When a child is placed with his or her relative during dependency proceedings and the relative is not a licensed or certified foster parent, existing law requires a county social worker to visit the relative’s home, prior to placing the child in that home, to ascertain the appropriateness of the placement. Existing law also requires the court or county social worker to initiate a state and federal criminal records check of the relative through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System as part of the assessment.

This bill would permit a court to place a child in any of those proceedings with a parent, legal guardian, or relative regardless of the immigration status of the parent, legal guardian, or relative. This bill would also permit a relative’s foreign consular identification card or foreign passport to be used for initiating the criminal records and fingerprint clearance checks. To the extent this bill would impose additional duties on county welfare departments, this bill would create a state-mandated local program.

(2) Existing law sets forth the procedure for terminating the parental rights of a dependent child, including regular review hearings before a court may order a hearing to terminate parental rights. Under existing law, a court may continue these review hearings if it finds that there is a substantial probability that the child will be returned to the physical custody of his or her parent or legal guardian and safely maintained in the home within the extended period of time or that reasonable services have not been provided to the parent or legal guardian. This bill would authorize a court to extend the review hearing periods following consideration of the parent’s circumstances if a parent has been arrested and issued an immigration hold, detained by the United States Department of Homeland Security, or deported to his or her country of origin, and, under these circumstances would authorize a court to continue the case only if the court finds that there is a substantial probability, as defined, that the child will be returned to the physical custody of his or her parent and safely maintained in the home within the extended time period or that reasonable services have not been provided to the parent or guardian.

(3) Existing law establishes the State Department of Social Services, which oversees the administration of county public social services, including child welfare services. This bill would require the State Department of Social Services to provide guidance on best practices and to facilitate an exchange of information and best
practices among counties on an annual basis, beginning no later than January 1, 2014, on establishing memoranda of understanding with foreign consulates in juvenile court cases, including procedures for contacting a consulate, accessing a child’s documentation, locating a detained parent, assisting in family reunification after a parent has been deported, aiding the safe transfer of a child to the parent’s country of origin, and communicating with relevant departments and services in a parent’s country of origin, and procedures to assist children in juvenile court cases who are eligible for special immigrant juvenile status and other specified visas.

(4) The bill would change references in the above-described provisions from the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement to the United States Department of Homeland Security, and would make other technical, nonsubstantive changes.

(5) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Section 3040 of the Family Code proposed by SB 1476 that would become operative only if SB 1476 and this bill are both chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is chaptered last.

(6) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Section 361 of the Welfare and Institutions Code proposed by AB 1712 and AB 2060 that would become operative only if either or both of those bills are chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is chaptered last.

(7) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Section 361.2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code proposed by AB 2209 that would become operative only if AB 2209 and this bill are both chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is chaptered last.

(8) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Sections 361.5 and 16501.1 of the Welfare and Institutions Code proposed by AB 1712 and SB 1521 that would become operative only if either or both of these bills are chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is chaptered last.

(9) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Sections 366.21,366.22, and 366.25 of the Welfare and Institutions Code proposed by AB 1712 and AB 2292 that would become operative only if either or both of these bills are chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is chaptered last.

(10) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Section 388 of the Welfare and Institutions Code proposed by AB 1712 that would become operative only if AB 1712 and this bill are both chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is chaptered last.

(11) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.
Appendix 2: SB1064 Organizational Supporters (as of 9/13/12)

All Saints Church Foster Care Project
Alternative Family Services
American Civil Liberties Union of California
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Applied Research Center
Asian Americans for Civil Rights & Equality
Asian Law Alliance
ASISTA Immigration Assistance
CAST - The Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking
California Catholic Conference, Inc.
California Child Welfare Directors Association
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
California Partnership
California United for a Responsible Budget
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California Youth Connection
Center for Community Alternatives
Central American Resource Center (CARECEN)
Children's Defense Fund – CA
Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice, Los Angeles
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA)
Community Works West
Congregation of the Sisters of the Holy Cross
First Focus Campaign for Children
Franciscan Action Network
Friends Committee on Legislation on California
Guam Communications Network
Iglesia de la Comunidad, Presbyterian Church USA
Immigrant Legal Resource Center Justice Now
Latino Policy Coalition
Legal Services for Children
Legal Services for Children
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
Lutheran Office of Public Policy California Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
MomsRising.org
Mujeres Unidas y Activas
National Association of Social Workers – California Chapter
Restoration Project, Tucson/Arizona
Public Counsel
Safe Passages
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Santa Clara Board of Supervisors
Services, Immigrant Rights & Education Network
Street Level Health Project
Tongan Community Service Center
Tucson Samaritans
The Young Center for Immigrant Children's Rights
9to5 National Association of Working Women
Appendix 3: Media Coverage of SB1064

Immigrant Family Reunification Bill Signed into Law by Governor
(Press Release, Office of Senator Kevin de León, Oct 1, 2012)

California Governor Signs Landmark Legislation Addressing Shattered Families
(by Yali Lincroft, First Focus Campaign for Children, Oct 1, 2012)

California passes groundbreaking legislation to prevent shattered families
(by Yali Lincroft, Immigration Impacts, Oct 2012)

Helping Shattered Families - California Legislation Needs Governor's Signature to Become Law
(by Yali Lincroft, First Focus Campaign for Children, Aug 30, 2012)

As thousands of parents are deported, U.S. citizen kids face fallout
(by Helen O'Neill, AP Reporter, Newser, Aug 25, 2012)

Immigration and Keeping Families Intact
(Los Angeles Times Editorial, July 31, 2012)

Children Bearing Brunt of Deportation
(by Viveka Garza-Gómez, Latino Fox News, Jul 20, 2012)

Mother who sold tamales outside Walmart faces deportation
(by Stephen Magagnini, Sacramento Bee, July 19, 2012)

Immigrant Mom Loses Effort to Regain Son Given to US Parents
(by Brian Ross and Angela M. Hill, ABC News, July 18, 2012)

Pesadilla de hijos de padres deportados
(by Maria Elena Salinas, Univision - video and story, May 19, 2012)

California Senate Moves to Protect Immigrant Families in Deportation
(by Seth Freed Wessler, Colorlines, Mar 28, 2012)

In California, an attempt to keep some deportee's children out of foster care
(by Leslie Berestein Rojas, 89.3 KPCC, National Public Radio, Mar 28, 2012)

What about the kids - what can happen when parents are deported
(by Leslie Berestein Rojas, 89.3 KPCC, National Public Radio - Southern California, Feb 3, 2012)

ON PARENTAL RIGHTS - Detained immigrants losing Kids
(Op Ed by Professor Kurt C. Organista, UC Berkeley School of Social Work, SFGate.com, Aug 27, 2012)
Imigrants Losing Their Kids

OPEN FORUM on Parental Rights

By Kent C. Pedersen
Appendix 4: Research and Policy Reports

Shattered Families - The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System (Applied Research Center)
http://www.arc.org/shatteredfamilies

Caught Between Systems – The Intersection of Immigration and Child Welfare (First Focus)

Disappearing Parents: A Report on Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System (University of Arizona, Bacon Immigration Law and Policy Program)
http://www.law.arizona.edu/depts/bacon_program/disappearing_parents_report.cfm

Torn Apart by Immigration Enforcement: Parental Rights and Immigration Detention (Women's Refugee Commission)
http://womensrefugeecommission.org/programs/detention/parental-rights
Appendix 5: Letter of Support from the California Child Welfare Directors Association

July 10, 2012

The Honorable Kevin DeLeon
Room 5108, State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator DeLeon:

RE: SB 1084 (De Leon) As Amended April 16, 2012
SUPPORT

The County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA) has taken a position of SUPPORT on your SB 1084 by Senator De Leon. This bill would support and enhance family reunification efforts in the child welfare system for immigrant families.

As a result of increased collaboration between U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and local law enforcement through programs that depurate law enforcement as immigration agents, the number of detained parents is rising substantially. Unfortunately, these parents also are at risk of losing custody of their children in the process. Currently there are at least 5,100 children nationwide in the child welfare system because their parents are under immigration custody or have been deported, and this number is expected to grow in the next five years. The majority of these children are United States citizens.

When children enter the child welfare system due to abuse or neglect, social workers prioritize family reunification when in the best interest of the child. However, many immigrant families have a limited opportunity for family reunification because of detention or deportation. A parent accused of a non-serious crime would normally be released from custody and thus would be able to follow through with the family reunification process. In contrast, non-citizen parents are frequently unable to access services and meet requirements set out by dependency courts to regain custody of their children. This is further complicated by a parent's deportation because of the difficulty in making arrangements in the country of origin. Because immigrant relatives may be willing to take custody of a child when a parent is detained or deported, it is critical to ensure that the courts and social workers understand that children can be placed with parents and relatives even if they are undocumented.

Many counties, such as Los Angeles, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and Fresno, have policies in place that make family reunification or relative placement feasible for those families, including alternative ways of identifying relatives for background checks and partnerships with foreign consulates. Systemic policies that specifically address these issues for the entire state, as SB 1084 would provide, will help to ensure that children whose parents are placed in stable environments.

Given California's fiscal woes, promoting relative placement and family reunification for immigrant families has the potential to decrease costs in the child welfare system.
welfare system, as fewer children will be placed into care in the first place and fewer will be kept in foster care unnecessarily. For these reasons CWDA has taken a position of SUPPORT on your SB 1060.

Sincerely,

Cathy Sanderling-McDonald
Deputy Executive Director
March 28, 2012

The Honorable Noreen Evans
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee
State Capitol Building, Room 2187
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 1064 (De León) As Amended March 19, 2012 – SUPPORT

Dear Chairperson Evans:

The Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors is pleased to support SB 1064 (De León), a measure to eliminate family reunification barriers that immigrant families experience in the child welfare system.

Currently, there are at least 5,100 children nationwide in the child welfare system because their parents are under immigration custody or have been deported, and this number is expected to increase dramatically in the next five years. The majority of these children are United States citizens. When searching for a placement for these children, close family members may be unintentionally excluded from consideration because of their own immigration status.

SB 1064 would address this problem by allowing children to be placed with relatives, regardless of the relatives’ immigration status. This measure would provide for greater security for vulnerable children, and we respectfully request your support for it when it is heard by your Senate Judiciary Committee.

Sincerely,

George Shirakawa
President, Board of Supervisors

cc: Members, Senate Judiciary Committee
    Senator Kevin De León
    Santa Clara County Legislative Delegation
    Board of Supervisors
    Jeffrey V. Smith, County Executive
    Michael Rattigan, Legislative Representative
Appendix 7: Reuniting Families Act Website

[Image of the Reuniting Families Act website, including sections on the goal of the act, why it is necessary, and basic components.]