

1 OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL  
2 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
3 JAMES R. WILLIAMS - # 271253  
4 County Counsel  
5 james.williams@cco.sccgov.org  
6 GRETA S. HANSEN - # 251471  
7 DANIELLE L. GOLDSTEIN - # 257486  
8 KAVITA NARAYAN - # 264191  
9 JAVIER SERRANO - # 252266  
10 JULIA B. SPIEGEL - # 292469  
11 ADRIANA L. BENEDICT - # 306936  
12 70 West Hedding Street  
13 East Wing, Ninth Floor  
14 San Jose, CA 95110-1770  
15 Telephone: 408 299-5900  
16 Facsimile: 408 292-7240

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
JOHN W. KEKER - # 49092  
jkeker@kvn.com  
ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065  
rvannest@kvn.com  
DANIEL PURCELL - # 191424  
dpurcell@kvn.com  
CODY S. HARRIS - # 255302  
charris@kvn.com  
NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG - # 273614  
ngoldberg@kvn.com  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: 415 391 5400  
Facsimile: 415 397 7188

Attorneys For Plaintiff COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

14 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the  
18 United States of America, JOHN F. KELLY,  
19 in his official capacity as Secretary of the  
20 United States Department of Homeland  
21 Security, JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS, in his  
22 official capacity as Attorney General of the  
23 United States, JOHN MICHAEL "MICK"  
MULVANEY, in his official capacity as  
Director of the Office of Management and  
Budget, and DOES 1-50,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-00574-WHO

**DECLARATION OF CARL NEUSEL,  
UNDERSHERIFF OF SANTA CLARA  
COUNTY**

Date: April 5, 2017  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 2  
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

Date Filed: February 3, 2017

Trial Date: Not yet set

1 I, CARL NEUSEL, hereby declare:

2 1. I am a resident of the State of California. I have personal knowledge of the facts  
3 set forth in this declaration. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the  
4 matters set forth herein.

5 2. I am the Undersheriff of Santa Clara County (“the County”) and Interim Chief of  
6 Correction. I have served in law enforcement roles in the County for over eighteen years.

7 3. The Sheriff’s Office is responsible for enforcing the law in the unincorporated  
8 regions of Santa Clara County, offering contractual law enforcement services to several cities and  
9 other local agencies; and, in conjunction with the Department of Correction, operating the County  
10 jails. The County jail system is the fifth largest in California and among the 20 largest nationally,  
11 with approximately 48,000 annual bookings and an average daily jail population of more than  
12 3,600 inmates. Some of these inmates are in pretrial custody, while others are serving sentences  
13 in local custody after conviction. On average, inmates stay in the jail for 206 days.

14 4. Prior to October 2011, the Department of Correction and Sheriff’s Office regularly  
15 responded to ICE civil detainer requests and other inquiries from federal immigration officials.  
16 During that time, and solely because of ICE civil detainees, the County jail housed an average of  
17 135 additional inmates each day, at a daily cost of approximately \$159 per person. These  
18 additional inmates strained the jail’s resources and facilities.

19 5. In 2010, the County Board of Supervisors convened a Task Force involving all of  
20 the County’s criminal justice agencies, including the Sheriff’s Office, to review the County’s  
21 history of compliance with ICE detainer requests and the impact of the County’s compliance with  
22 ICE on public safety in the community. The Task Force determined, and the Sheriff’s Office  
23 agreed, that a broad approach of honoring all ICE detainer requests was not the best practice in  
24 order to achieve the goal of protecting public safety throughout the County.

25 6. After considering the Task Force’s recommendations, the County Board of  
26 Supervisors adopted a Civil Detainer Policy in October 2011. Under the policy, the County  
27 honors ICE detainer requests only for individuals with serious or violent felony convictions as  
28 defined under California law, and only if ICE agrees to reimburse the full costs to the County of

1 honoring the requests (which ICE has never done). From November 2011 to the present, the  
2 County has received more than 5,400 civil detainer requests and has honored none of them.

3 7. I am also aware that a 2010 Board resolution states that County employees should  
4 not question, investigate, or arrest members of the public solely because of their immigration  
5 status or an actual or suspected violation of immigration law. The Sheriff agreed with this  
6 resolution, which aligned with the Sheriff's Office's longstanding practices.

7 8. The County's decision to limit its involvement in federal immigration enforcement  
8 was made based on our collective experience and judgment about the best method of protecting  
9 public safety. When our local law enforcement officers are perceived by the community as an  
10 arm of ICE, it is much more difficult for officers to ensure the safety of County residents.  
11 Community trust and engagement are the bedrock of the Sheriff's Office's public safety work.  
12 We rely on individuals in the community to report crimes, serve as witnesses, aid in apprehending  
13 those with arrest warrants, and assist in investigations and prosecutions. But when local law  
14 enforcement officials enforce federal immigration laws, community relations are damaged and  
15 lines of communication are severed, making the community overall less safe.

16 9. Compelling the Sheriff's Office and Department of Correction to comply with ICE  
17 detainer requests also would strain the County's resources for running its jail. ICE detainer  
18 requests ask the County to maintain custody of an individual for an additional 48 hours beyond  
19 his or her release date, which could be a pretrial release date or a scheduled date for release after  
20 serving a sentence. A 48-hour hold alone puts pressure on County jail capacity and  
21 programming. But when pretrial inmates are held on an ICE detainer, they are highly unlikely to  
22 be offered a bail bond to obtain pretrial release from jail. So if the Sheriff's Office and  
23 Department of Correction honored all ICE detainer requests, many inmates who otherwise could  
24 bail out would stay in custody while their cases are being adjudicated.

25 10. Any significant addition to the jail population would appreciably increase the  
26 burden on the County jail's staffing resources and aging jail facilities. Like other inmates, all ICE  
27 detainees would need health care, programs, transportation, security, housing, and food. The cost  
28 of providing these services is significant and has grown substantially in recent years. Moreover,

1 the Sheriff's Office and Department of Correction, like many law enforcement agencies  
2 throughout the region and the State, are experiencing a staffing shortage in its custody operations  
3 that has put additional strain on the jail system's ability to accept more inmates. The jail is also  
4 physically limited in the number of additional inmates it can accept. These space constraints have  
5 been compounded by the County's need to shut down parts of the jail to make significant  
6 improvements and repairs to the aging infrastructure, including a months-long process to upgrade  
7 certain facilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

8 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
9 foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on February 17, 2017  
10 2017 in San Jose, California.

11 C. Neusel #1652  
12 CARL NEUSEL