



STAFF REPORT

City Council
Meeting Date: 4/18/2017
Staff Report Number: 17-090-CC

Regular Business: **First reading of an Ordinance adding chapter 2.58, Immigration and Sensitive Information; adopting a resolution joining the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative; and authorizing the Mayor to sign a letter in support of SB 54**

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the City Council consider the following:

1. Introduce an ordinance adding Chapter 2.58, Immigration and Sensitive Information, to the Menlo Park Municipal Code to identify the City as a sanctuary city (city of refuge or safe city), prohibit enforcement of federal civil immigration laws, and prohibit use of City resources to gather sensitive information.
2. Adopt a resolution joining the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative.
3. Authorize the Mayor to sign a letter in support of the California Values Act (SB 54) that would make the State of California a sanctuary state.

Policy Issues

The central policy issues for the City Council to consider are the extent to which it wishes to codify its position relative to immigration and sensitive information and whether to specifically use the word “sanctuary” in light of the potential to lose federal funding or to use the term “city of refuge” or “safe city”. In considering whether to join the welcoming cities and counties initiative, the City Council should consider the strategic goals that it desires to achieve and the resources it is willing to devote to undertaking such an initiative. Finally, the City Council should consider as a policy matter whether it supports the California Values Act (SB 54) and wishes to send a letter supporting adoption of the Act.

Background

On January 24, 2017, the City Council unanimously approved a resolution affirming Menlo Park’s commitment to a diverse, supportive, inclusive and protective community. The City Council directed staff to return with additional information regarding several items including: (1) Sanctuary City and alternatives, (2) Police Department Policy 428, (3) National Registry, and (4) Welcoming City. Further, given the evolving nature of these issues, the City Council requested a status update on federal, state and local laws and policies related to these issues.

Analysis

In 1996, the U.S. Congress passed two laws that prohibit state and local governments from restricting communication with the federal government regarding the immigration status of any individual—the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act and the Illegal Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act. These laws authorize state and local law enforcement to communicate with federal

immigration authorities regarding the status and presence of unauthorized immigrants within their jurisdictions. Neither of these laws mandate cooperation or information sharing with federal immigration authorities. However, both laws prohibit any restriction on information sharing between the federal government and state or local government entities or officials.

Many state and local jurisdictions have adopted policies or practices that limit cooperation with federal civil immigration enforcement efforts. Examples include the resolution recently adopted by the City of Santa Ana, the policies adopted by the County of Santa Clara, and the ordinance adopted by the City and County of San Francisco. These laws or policies are sometimes referred to as “sanctuary policies” and the jurisdictions themselves referred to as “sanctuary cities.” Even if the term “sanctuary” is not used (and in most of the examples listed below it is not) and the action is a resolution or policy (as opposed to an ordinance codified in the municipal code), the jurisdiction may be considered a “sanctuary jurisdiction” as there is no legal definition of the term.

Potential “Sanctuary Cities”

1. **City of Santa Ana** - resolution declares city a sanctuary; uncodified ordinance adopts related policies
2. **County of Santa Clara** – resolution adopts policy related to civil immigration detainer requests
3. **City and County of San Francisco** – ordinance establishes the city as a place of refuge
4. **City of Palo Alto** – resolution affirming a commitment to a supportive and inclusive community
5. **City of Menlo Park** – resolution affirming a commitment to a supportive and inclusive community
6. **Town of Portola Valley** – resolution affirming a commitment to a supportive and inclusive community
7. **County of San Mateo** – resolution committing to support and include all community members
8. **City of San Mateo** – resolution in support of tolerance and understanding (and sanctuary)
9. **City of San Carlos** – resolution affirming commitment to a diverse and supportive community and declaring it as a “welcoming city”
10. **City of East Palo Alto** - resolution affirming support for comprehensive immigration reform and ordering employees and officers to not cooperate with ICE
11. **City of Daly City** – resolution affirming commitment to support and respect the rights of all community members
12. **City of Oakland** – resolution affirming status as a city of refuge for immigrants
13. **City of Davis** – resolution affirming and promoting city as a city of sanctuary
14. **City of Alameda** – resolution affirming commitment to the values of dignity, inclusivity and respect for all individuals

The resolutions, ordinances and policies adopted by these cities demonstrate a commitment to provide a safe place for all residents who are fearful by assuring them that the city will not use its resources to administer federal immigration law, which is the exclusive authority of the federal government. All of these cities could potentially be deemed “sanctuary cities” by the United States Attorney General. There has been no legal determination as to whether such local laws and policies violate either the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act and/or the Illegal Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act, discussed above.

President Trump expressed his opposition to “sanctuary policies” and “sanctuary cities” throughout his campaign. During his campaign, he also indicated an interest in creating a national registry based on sensitive information such as religion (e.g. a Muslim registry). Since taking office, President Trump issued an Executive Order entitled “Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States” (generally referred

to herein as “Executive Order”). President Trump has not taken steps to establish a registry based on sensitive information.

President Trump issued the Executive Order on January 25th, the day after the City Council adopted the supportive community resolution. In the Executive Order, President Trump states that sanctuary jurisdictions across the United States willfully violate federal law to shield aliens from removal from the United States and that those jurisdictions have caused immeasurable harm to the American people. The purpose of the Executive Order is to direct agencies to employ all lawful means to enforce the immigration laws of the United States. The policy of the executive branch is to ensure that local agencies comply with 8 U.S.C. Section 1373, which provides that no local entity or official may prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any individual. Jurisdictions that fail to comply with all applicable federal laws are not eligible to receive federal grants, except as needed necessary for law enforcement purposes.

In response to the Executive Order, San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties separately filed lawsuits alleging that the Executive Order violates the Tenth Amendment, which is invoked in favor of “states’ rights” as it prohibits the federal government from “conscripting” the states into assistance in enforcing federal programs. The lawsuits also challenge that sanctuary cities do not violate 8 U.S.C. Section 1373 in that the policies do not prohibit communication. At the core, these lawsuits stand for the principle that complying with civil detainer requests undermines community trust of law enforcement, instills fear in immigrant communities (which undermines the goal of local government to provide public services) and uses limited local resources. The City of Menlo Park is a signatory to an amicus brief filed by 34 cities and counties across the country asking that the court halt President Trump’s executive order threatening the withdrawal of federal funds from so-called “sanctuary jurisdictions.” The hearing on the amicus briefs is currently scheduled to take place on Friday April 14, 2017.

Notably, all sanctuary cities comply with federal criminal warrants as compliance is legally required. Sanctuary cities do not comply with civil detainer requests, which are distinct from criminal warrants. A civil detainer request is not issued by a judge and is not based on a finding of probable cause. It is a request by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) to hold individuals after their release date to provide ICE agents extra time to decide whether to take those individuals into federal custody and then deport them. Compliance with civil detainer requests is voluntary. The Trust Act (Government Code Sections 7252 and 7282.5) states that local law enforcement may comply with ICE detainer requests only if continued detention would not violate any law or local policy or if the individual has met certain criteria, such as having been convicted of a serious or violent felony. Accordingly, if a local jurisdiction has a policy against compliance with civil detainer requests, compliance would be a violation of not only local policy, but state law as well. Furthermore, a local agency may face potential liability for compliance with a civil detainer request because it does not meet Fourth Amendment requirements.

Until there is resolution to the legal challenges to the Executive Order, sanctuary cities risk losing federal funding. The City of Menlo Park receives federal grant funding. For the 2016-2017 fiscal year, that amount totaled \$1,184,554 with federal funds in the amount of \$413,371 for Community Services, \$701,183 for Public Works and \$70,000 for the Police Department. The City has averaged approximately \$665,000 per fiscal year in federal fund expenditures. In any single fiscal year, the City’s spending ranges from a low of \$511,000 to a high of \$919,000. Sanctuary city status would also put funding for the following future projects in jeopardy: (1) Ravenswood Avenue/Caltrain Railroad Crossing Grade Separation; (2) Dumbarton Corridor Improvements; (3) Middle Avenue Bicycle Pedestrian Crossing; (4) US 101 Managed Lanes; (5) Caltrain Modernization and Electrification (\$674 Million); Resurfacing Santa Cruz, Middle (pending grant request of \$619,000); and (6) San Franciscquito Creek Upstream of 101 Project (\$11.7 Million).

In response to the Executive Order, California state legislators advanced Senate Bill 54 (SB 54), the "California Values Act", which would make the entire state a sanctuary for undocumented immigrants. The proposed law would prohibit state and local law enforcement agencies from spending money to enforce federal immigration laws. The bill would also ban immigration enforcement in public schools, public libraries, health facilities and courthouses. SB 54 continues to go through the legislative process. It was amended on March 6, 2017 to more explicitly indicate that state and local law enforcement shall not detain an individual on the basis of a hold request. On March 29, 2017, SB 54 was amended such that it is no longer an urgency measure and rather than going into effect upon the Governor's signature, would go into effect on January 1 of next year. The bill passed the Senate in a 27-12 vote and heads to the State Assembly. If approved, the state law would be applicable to local agencies and effectively all cities would become sanctuary cities.

Menlo Park provides basic city services to all individuals regardless of immigration status, religious belief, gender, etc. As discussed in more detail at the January 24, 2017 Council meeting, the City of Menlo Park Police Department has a number of policies in place relative to anti-discrimination, immigration and enforcement and essentially operates as a sanctuary city. For example, Policy 422 provides police officers shall not stop or detain a person solely for determining immigration status. Notwithstanding, of concern at the last Council meeting was Policy 428.3.7 which stated: "Whenever an officer has reason to believe that any person arrested for any offense listed in Health & Safety Code Section 11369 or any other felony may not be a citizen of the United States and the individual is not going to be booked into County jail, the arresting officer shall cause ICE to be notified for consideration of an immigration hold." The word of concern in that sentence was "shall" as it was the only policy not in line with the "sanctuary policies" of the City. Since that time, the Police Department has reviewed the Transparent Review of Unjust Transfers and Holds or "Truth" Act which went into effect at the beginning of this year relative to law enforcement's legally required level of cooperation with ICE and has revised the policy to use the word "may" among other revisions to be consistent with the Act. Final changes are not yet fully completed and the revised policy is not available for attachment to this staff report.

Immigration and Sensitive Information Ordinance

Per the City Council's request at the meeting in January, staff has brought back a "sanctuary city" ordinance. This ordinance builds on the supportive and inclusive community resolution that the Council unanimously adopted and codifies the City's position stating specifically that Menlo Park is a sanctuary for all. The ordinance also includes in parenthesis alternative terms such as "city of refuge" or "safe city" that the Council could choose to use. However, as discussed above, because there is no legal definition of a "sanctuary city," a policy, resolution, ordinance or other action that limits compliance with federal immigration law, even if it does not include the word "sanctuary," could be deemed a sanctuary city by the Attorney General for the purposes of the Executive Order.

The ordinance provides that the City will not comply with an ICE civil detainer request, unless there are certain specified conditions. Those conditions include for example that the individual has been convicted of certain offenses, including but not limited to murder, rape, attempted murder, assault with intent to commit rape or robbery, assault with a deadly weapon on a peace officer, arson and kidnapping. The City will, however, comply with valid federal criminal warrants as compliance is legally required (as opposed to compliance with federal civil detainer requests which is voluntary).

The ordinance also provides that the City will not request, maintain or disclose sensitive information, including a person's citizenship or immigration status, religion or religious beliefs, race, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender or gender identity for the purposes of providing information to a national registry or database. This concept comes from the draft registry ordinance presented at the January meeting that City resources will not be used to gather information that could be used in a national registry of individuals based solely on the basis of their religious beliefs, race, or nation of descent. Notably, on March 21st, the

City and County of San Francisco adopted the “Non-Cooperation with Identity Based Registry Ordinance” to codify this same concept. San Francisco’s ordinance acknowledged that the United States is a nation founded on principles of religious freedom. While there is currently no registry based on sensitive information, San Francisco’s ordinance was forward looking and the action was taken out of an abundance of caution.

Finally, the ordinance will be transmitted to all City departments. Employees will be required to comply with the ordinance and could face disciplinary measures for failure to do so. The ordinance is not intended to create a private right of action.

The draft ordinance has been reviewed by the Command Staff of the Police Department.

Welcoming City and Counties Initiative Resolution

Larger cities and counties like Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Jose are welcoming cities that have adopted robust plans to meet the needs the immigrants in their communities. As an example, the City of San Jose developed and adopted a Welcoming San Jose Plan to address the immediate needs of immigrants and to coordinate with Santa Clara County Office of Immigrant Relations. The plan included: (1) identifying linguistic and cultural barriers to inclusion in city services for immigrant residents and developing and implementing a plan to mitigate the barriers; (2) expanding access to information and resources about the naturalization and voter registration process; (3) expanding opportunities for linguistic integration and education for children and adults; (4) facilitating stronger relationships between public safety departments and immigrant residents; and (5) developing access points for immigrant residents to gain information and services that will contribute to greater community, family and personal health. The plan also included coordinating legal advocacy efforts with other municipalities nationwide.

Smaller communities can also develop plans to welcome the immigrant community. The City of Redwood City recently adopted a resolution joining the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative. This program offers resources to help cities become more welcoming, including learning exchanges and access to toolkits and guides to creating immigrant-friendly communities. Adopting the welcoming city resolution is the starting point. The Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative provides resources, but it is up to the City of Menlo Park to take action. If the City Council votes to join the initiative, the next step would be for the City to develop a plan—identify the goals, the target audience, the work plan, the methods for communication and the resources that will be devoted to achieving the plan.

Letter Supporting SB 54

Finally, the City Council could authorize the Mayor to send a letter to the state assembly in support of the California Values Act. Recently, prior to the passage of the bill by the state senate, the Town of Portola Valley sent such a letter in the hopes that affirmatively indicating support would help the bill continue to progress toward final adoption.

Impact on City Resources

The ordinance adding Chapter 2.58, Immigration and Sensitive Information, to the Menlo Park Municipal Code prohibits the use of City funds for certain purposes. Therefore, there would be no direct expense of City resources to implement the ordinance. However, given that the ordinance specifically identifies the City as a sanctuary city (and even if it does not and designates the city as a city of refuge or safe city, the city may be deemed a sanctuary city), there may be a loss of federal funding as a result of the implementation of the Executive Order. This may impact the City’s choice to undertake specific projects, such as transportation projects. It may also impact ongoing community programs like the Belle Haven Childcare Center. Finally, in case of emergency, it may prevent the City’s receipt of Federal Emergency Management

Agency (FEMA) funds. At this time, we do not believe that the Executive Order would impact or apply to tax credit financing of affordable housing, but further research/analysis is needed. The City will continue to monitor efforts by the federal government to rescind, withhold or withdraw federal funding as a result of local actions.

If the City adopts the resolution joining the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative there would need to be an allocation of City resources (budget, personnel, etc.) to create a vision for and implement the initiative in the City.

Environmental Review

This subject is not deemed a project under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park Adding a New Chapter 2.58 [Immigration and Sensitive Information] to Title 2 [Administration and Personnel] of the Menlo Park Municipal Code
- B. Resolution of the City Council of the City of Menlo Park Proclaiming the City of Menlo Park a Welcoming City and Joining the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative

Report prepared by:
Leigh F. Prince, City Attorney's Office

ORDINANCE NO. 1034

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MENLO PARK ADDING CHAPTER 2.58 [IMMIGRATION AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION] TO TITLE 2 [ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL] OF THE MENLO PARK MUNICIPAL CODE

The City Council of the City Menlo Park does hereby ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS.

- A. The City of Menlo Park has long embraced and welcomed individuals of all racial, ethnic, religious and national backgrounds.
- B. The City of Menlo Park welcomes, honors and respects all members of the community regardless of religion, ancestry, ethnicity, disability, gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity.
- C. Fostering a relationship of trust, respect and open communication between City officials and the community is essential to the City's mission of delivering public services.
- D. Immigration enforcement is a federal responsibility.
- E. The City has limited resources and those resources should be expended to provide local public services, not aid in the enforcement of federal immigration laws.
- F. On January 24, 2017, the City Council of the City of Menlo Park adopted a resolution affirming Menlo Park's commitment to a diverse, supportive, inclusive and protective community.
- G. The City now wishes to enact an ordinance to designate the City as a sanctuary **(city of refuge/safe city)** to create a community free from fear in which individuals are assured that they can access the full range of city services, including law enforcement services, without the fear that information gained by City officials will be used to pursue compliance with federal civil immigration detainer requests or to create a registry.

SECTION 2. ADDITION OF CODE. Chapter 2.58 [Immigration and Sensitive Information] is hereby added to Title 2 [Administration & Personnel] of the Menlo Park Municipal Code to read as follows:

Chapter: 2.58 IMMIGRATION AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION

2.58.010 Sanctuary City (City of Refuge/Safe City)

- 2.58.020 Federal Civil Immigration Detainer Requests**
- 2.58.030 Prohibitions Regarding Sensitive Information for Registry**
- 2.58.040 Use of City Funds Prohibited**
- 2.58.050 Compliance; No Private Right of Action**

2.58.010 Sanctuary City (City of Refuge/Safe City)

- A. The City of Menlo Park is an ethnically, racially and religiously diverse city. The City has long derived its strength and prosperity from its diverse community. Cooperation with all members of the City's diverse community is essential to advancing the City's mission, vision and guiding principles, including community safety, support for youth and education, economic development and financial stability.
- B. The City of Menlo Park is a sanctuary (**refuge/safe city**) for all, regardless of immigration status, religion, race, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender or gender identity.
- C. City of Menlo Park officials, including its law enforcement officers, shall not administer federal immigration law, which is the exclusive authority of the federal government and shall not take any direct action against an individual solely because of their immigration status, unless legally required to do so pursuant to a valid federal criminal warrant.
- D. With respect to law enforcement activities, no employee of the City of Menlo Park shall inquire about the immigration status of an individual, including but not limited to a crime victim, witness or person who calls or approaches law enforcement personnel seeking assistance, unless necessary to investigate criminal activity by that individual or it is an element of the crime being reported.

2.58.20 Federal Civil Immigration Detainer Requests

- A. The City of Menlo Park is legally required to cooperate with federal criminal warrants. Federal criminal warrants are distinct from civil detainer requests. Unlike a warrant, a civil detainer request is not issued by a judge and is not based on a finding of probable cause.
- B. The City of Menlo Park shall not cooperate with any request by Immigration Customs and Enforcement (ICE) to detain an individual for suspected violations of federal civil immigration law. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City may cooperate with an ICE civil detainer request if one or more of the following apply:
 - 1. The individual has been convicted of a serious or violent felony offense for which the individual is currently in custody. For purposes of this

Chapter, a serious felony is any felony listed in subdivision (c) of Section 1192.7 of the Penal Code and a violent felony is any felony listed in subdivision (c) of Section 667.5 of the Penal Code.

2. The individual has been convicted of a serious or violent felony within 10 years of the request or was released after having served a sentence for a serious or violent felony within five years of the request.
3. The individual has been convicted of a homicide.
4. The City is aware either directly or through a criminal justice database that the individual has been convicted of a serious or violent offense, which if committed in California would have been punishable as a serious or violent felony.

- C. Except as otherwise required in this chapter or unless City officials have a legitimate law enforcement purpose that is not solely related to the enforcement of civil immigration laws, the City shall not give ICE agents access to individuals.

2.58.030 Prohibitions Regarding Sensitive Information for Registry

No City agency, department, officer or employee shall request, maintain or disclose sensitive information about any person for the purposes of providing information to a national registry or national database specifically used to identify individuals solely on the basis of sensitive information. For purposes of this chapter, "sensitive information" includes any information that may be considered sensitive or personal in nature, including but not limited to a person's citizenship or immigration status, religion or religious beliefs, race, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender or gender identity.

2.58.040 Use of City Funds Prohibited

- A. No City agency, department, officer or employee shall use City funds, resources, facilities, property, equipment or personnel to:
1. Compel an individual to identify, investigate, disseminate or otherwise gather information regarding an individual's religious belief, race, or nation of descent for the purpose of providing information to a national registry or national database specifically used to identify individuals solely on the basis of their religious beliefs, race, or nation of descent.
 2. Detaining, relocating or interning any individual based upon their religious beliefs, race, or nation of descent.
 3. Identifying, investigating, arresting, detaining or continuing to detain a person in the absence of a valid criminal warrant solely on the belief that the person is not present legally in the United States or that the person has committed a violation of immigration law.
 4. Assisting or participating in any immigration enforcement operation or joint operation or patrol that is focused solely on the enforcement of

federal immigration laws.

5. Arresting, detaining or continuing to detain a person in the absence of a valid criminal warrant based solely on any civil immigration detainer request.
6. Notifying federal authorities about the release or pending release of any person for immigration purposes.
7. Providing federal authorities with non-public information about any person for immigration purposes.

B. No City agency, department, officer or employee shall use City funds, resources, facilities, property, equipment or personnel unless such assistance is required by a valid and enforceable federal or state law or is contractually obligated. Nothing shall prevent the City, including any agency, department, officer or employee from lawfully discharging his/her duties in compliance with a lawfully issued judicial warrant, subpoena or court decision.

2.58.050 Compliance; No Private Right of Action

- A. The Clerk of the City of Menlo Park shall send copies of this ordinance, including any future amendments, to every department of the City of Menlo Park. Any employee who willfully and intentionally violates the prohibitions in this chapter may face department discipline up to and including termination.
- B. In undertaking the adoption and enforcement of this Chapter, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. This chapter does not create or form the basis of liability on the part of the City, its agents, departments, officers or employees. It is not intended to create any new rights for breach of which the City or any of its employees are liable for money or any other damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused injury. The exclusive remedy for violation of this Chapter shall be through the City's disciplinary procedures for employees.

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY. If any section of this ordinance, or part hereof, is held by a court of competent jurisdiction in a final judicial action to be void, voidable or unenforceable, such section, or part hereof, shall be deemed severable from the remaining sections of this ordinance and shall in no way affect the validity of the remaining sections hereof.

SECTION 4. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT DETERMINATION. The City Council hereby finds that this ordinance is not subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") because the activity is not a project as defined by Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines. The ordinance has no potential for resulting in physical change to the environment either directly or indirectly.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE AND PUBLISHING. This ordinance shall take effect 30 days after adoption. The City Clerk shall cause publication of the ordinance within 15

days after passage in a newspaper of general circulation published and circulated in the city or, if none, the posted in at least three public places in the city. Within 15 days after the adoption of the ordinance amendment, a summary of the amendment shall be published with the names of the council members voting for and against the amendment.

INTRODUCED on the eighteenth day of April, 2017.

PASSED AND ADOPTED as an ordinance of the City of Menlo Park at a regular meeting of said Council on the eighteenth day of April, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

APPROVED:

Mayor

ATTEST:

Pamela Aguilar, City Clerk

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

RESOLUTION NO.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MENLO PARK
PROCLAIMING THE CITY OF MENLO PARK A WELCOMING CITY AND
JOINING THE WELCOMING CITIES AND COUNTIES INITIATIVE**

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park is committed to building a neighborly community that is inclusive, hospitable and welcoming; and

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park seeks to help people, families and institutions thrive and to value the contributions of all members of the community, including newcomers and immigrants; and

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park is a diverse multi-ethnic community that celebrates and embraces its many cultures; and

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park is committed to continue enhancing its cultural fabric, economic success, global competitiveness and overall prosperity for all those who choose to make their home in the City; and

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park is pleased to join the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative to help unite the community and ensure all are welcome.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Menlo Park, acting by and through its City Council, having considered and been fully advised in the matter and good cause appearing therefore does hereby proclaim Menlo Park as a Welcoming City and joins the Welcoming Cities and Counties Initiative.

I, Pamela Aguilar, City Clerk of Menlo Park, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing Council Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted at a meeting by said Council on the eighteenth day of April, 2017, by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Official Seal of said City on this eighteenth day of April, 2017.

Pamela Aguilar, CMC
City Clerk

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK