



Dear neighbors and community,

Earlier today, Governor Hochul [announced an expanded proposal](#) to limit the role of local law enforcement and detention facilities in federal civil immigration enforcement. This announcement builds on protections she previously proposed in her State of the State and Executive Budget, and comes amid growing concern about the real and documented harms associated with federal civil immigration enforcement, including family separations, wrongful detention, due process violations, and instances in which ICE actions have resulted in serious injury and the deaths of innocent civilians. I appreciate the Governor's continued engagement on this issue and her efforts to strengthen protections for New Yorkers while maintaining public safety. Because there has been understandable interest in how today's announcement relates to existing legislation, I have outlined a comparison of the Governor's proposal with the [New York For All Act](#).

Based on the Governor's January 30, 2026, announcement, the "**Local Cops, Local Crimes Act**" is framed around stopping ICE from co-opting local law enforcement, chiefly by ending 287(g) deputization, and preventing local jails from being used for civil immigration enforcement, mass raids, or detainee transportation. These proposals build on policy measures included in the Governor's Executive Budget to establish a state-law right of action for constitutional violations and to require judicial warrants for civil immigration enforcement in sensitive locations, including homes, schools, hospitals, and houses of worship.

The Governor's collective proposal, as described in her January 30, 2026, release, does not include the broader government-wide set of rules in the **New York for All Act**. These additional safeguards are designed to prevent immigration enforcement from happening through routine questioning, recordkeeping, database practices, probation operations, and behind-the-scenes information sharing. The NY for All Act is built as a cross-agency civil liberties framework reaching beyond deputization agreements and detention-facility use.

The following outlines the core differences between the N.Y. for All Act and the Governor's Local Cops, Local Crimes Act as it has been presented:

- The NY for All Act establishes a broad “don’t ask” rule across many parts of government. It prohibits police officers, peace officers, school resource officers, probation agencies, state entities and employees, and municipal corporations from questioning people about citizenship or immigration status except in narrow circumstances, for example when required by law or needed for a public program or benefit. The Governor’s announcement does not describe this kind of statewide restriction on questioning and discovery of immigration status across so many categories of officials.
- The NY for All Act contains detailed restrictions on disclosure and day-to-day cooperation that can function like immigration enforcement even when there is no formal agreement. It regulates when and how immigration-status information and related personal data can be shared, and it places guardrails around routine communications that can facilitate civil immigration enforcement. Today’s release by the Governor focuses on structural endpoints like 287(g) and jail use; it does not lay out comparable operational rules governing everyday information sharing across agencies.
- The NY for All Act extends notably into the day-to-day function of probation. It creates a dedicated set of duties and limits for local probation departments, including limits on asking about immigration status, limits on communications with immigration authorities about people under supervision, and limits on assisting federal immigration enforcement through probation processes except where legally required. The Governor’s proposal, as described in today’s release, does not include a probation-specific framework.
- The NY for All Act includes explicit database and recordkeeping protections that are meant to stop immigration enforcement from happening through data trails. Specifically, it restricts when immigration status can be collected, recorded, and placed into government databases, and it directs a more protective posture around information systems so that immigration enforcement cannot be enabled simply by searching state and local records. The Governor’s release does not describe limits on database entry, internal record fields, or similar data-governance requirements.
- The NY for All Act is intentionally not limited to policing and jail operations. It covers state entities and employees and municipal corporations as part of a unified rule about questioning, disclosure, and the use of government resources, so that immigration enforcement is not shifted from police to other parts of government. The Governor’s proposal, as described today, is centered on local law enforcement

collaboration and detention-facility use; it does not present the same across-government structure.

- The NY for All Act includes specific procedural protections around federal immigration access in certain contexts, including limits related to interviews and safeguards such as not using immigration agents as interpreters. Those concrete, on-the-ground protections are part of how the bill tries to reduce coercion and confusion during encounters. They are not described in the Governor's announcement.
- The NY for All Act includes oversight and implementation infrastructure, including directions to the Attorney General to issue guidance, and mechanisms aimed at receiving and addressing complaints about violations. It also protects public employees from being punished or sued for following the law. None of this implementation language is described in the Governor's proposal released today.

The Governor's proposal reflects a clear focus on preventing formal deputization and the use of local detention infrastructure for civil immigration enforcement. The New York For All Act is designed to complement that approach by also addressing quieter pathways, including routine questioning, recordkeeping, disclosures, probation practices, and cross-agency data sharing, which can still draw people into immigration enforcement even without 287(g) agreements. Taken together, these efforts are aimed at ensuring New Yorkers are protected from the kinds of harm and abuse that have occurred in other states, while reinforcing a clear and consistent framework for how immigration enforcement is handled in New York.

In good health,



Anna Kelles, Ph.D.

Assemblymember, 125th A.D.

ALBANY OFFICE CORTLAND OFFICE ITHACA OFFICE

LOB 538	83 Main St	130 East State Street
Albany, NY 12248	PO Box 5026	Ithaca, NY 14850
518-455-5444	Cortland, NY 13045	607-277-8030

607-208-2024