

**To: Members of the Senate Education Committee**

**From: Brian Schimmel, City Councilor, City of Forest Grove (in my individual capacity)**

**Date: 3/23/26**

**Re: Operational Impact Analysis of HB 4079 on Oregon School Districts**

## Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to provide a practical, on-the-ground analysis of how HB 4079 would function within Oregon school districts during real-time immigration enforcement activity near or adjacent to school property.

This memo does not evaluate the intent of the legislation. Rather, it assesses:

- How the bill integrates with existing school emergency response frameworks
- The operational responsibilities placed on administrators and designees
- The foreseeable interaction between community monitoring and public notification, and verification standards
- The potential impact on student safety, absenteeism, and instructional continuity
- The resource and reporting implications for school districts and local governments

Without structural backing will continually push risk downward — onto cities, schools, frontline workers, and vulnerable residents — without giving them the tools to address fear and *suffering*. Conflating recovery and prevention risk unintended harm, criminalizing educators for noncompliance without operationalized structural backing.

---

**Superintendents have raised practical concerns in the unlikely event that immigration officials access a campus or school building:**

- **Unnecessary fear generation.**
- **Community members incited to action.**
- **A new opt-in process specific only to immigration-related notifications.**
- **Redundancy with existing policies governing interaction with law enforcement and parent notification during safety threats.**

**The omission of structural backing compounds the present threat to communities.**

**Any legislation responding to federal enforcement activity should meet minimum Standards for Enforceable Action: Legally enforceable, tactically resourced, free of liability or unfunded budgetary risk, and operationally realistic.**

## Scenario

The accompanying visual scenario is intended to illustrate how statutory requirements may unfold during a typical school day and to support informed deliberation regarding amendments that align responsibility, authority, and resources.

School perimeter surveillance and tense standoff at school entrance.



Federal immigration enforcement is dehumanizing with extreme prejudice.

## Alternative Public Safety Safeguard

- An unarmed security officer – many universities have already – shows no intention to confront, rather to inquire about credentials and warrant – they serve as a deterrent and verifier only, more credible to both agent and observers.



Act by way of activation of available structures backing – specialized units.

## **1 Real-World Operational Scenario**

### **HB 4079: Real-World Scenario — What Happens on Campus**

- **8:12 AM – Parent posts suspected ICE presence; whistles and alerts begin.**
  - **8:18 AM – Administrator verifies credentials and consults counsel.**
  - **8:25 AM – Notification dilemma: delay vs. escalation.**
  - **8:30 AM – Public notification issued; attendance drops; anxiety spreads.**
  - **10:00 AM – Instruction disrupted; counselors diverted; families disengage**
- 

### **A Tuesday Morning at Cornelius Elementary**

#### **8:12 AM — Off-Campus Alert**

- Parent posts: “Unmarked SUVs. Possible ICE.”
  - Whistles begin. Text chains activate.
  - Legal observers mobilize.
  - No verification yet.
- 

#### **8:18 AM — Administrator Response**

Under HB 4079, the designated administrator must:

- Record time/location
- Verify credentials
- Determine warrant type
- Consult legal counsel (when feasible)

Students observe adults gathering outside. Anxiety spreads before confirmation.

---

#### **8:25 AM — The Reporting Dilemma**

The district must notify:

- Students
- Parents
- The “community of the school”

Unanswered questions:

- What qualifies as “verified”?
- Does off-campus presence trigger reporting?

- Who exactly is the “community”?

Delay = accused concealment

Notify = risk escalation

---

### **8:30 AM — Notification Sent**

District message:

“Federal immigration authorities are present near campus. Classes continue.”

Immediate effects:

- Attendance drops
- Parents pull students
- Social media amplifies
- News inquiries begin

No enforcement has occurred on school property.

---

### **10:00 AM — Educational Disruption**

- Students crying
  - Counselors diverted
  - Instruction paused
  - Families consider staying home tomorrow
- 

### **What Changed?**

- ✓ Documentation completed
  - ✓ Notification issued
  - ✓ Compliance achieved
  - ✗ Fear not prevented
  - ✗ Enforcement not limited
  - ✗ Attendance not protected
  - ✗ No added resources
- 

**Key Legislative Question:** Does HB 4079 prevent fear from entering schools — or does it regulate how schools respond after fear has already entered?

## **2 Scenario Narrative**

Chair and members of the Committee,

Let me walk you through how this would likely unfold in a real Oregon school.

It's 8:12 in the morning. A parent across the street sees unmarked SUVs and posts on social media: "Possible ICE." Whistles begin. Text chains activate. Legal observers head toward campus.

No one has verified anything yet.

At 8:18, under HB 4079, the designated administrator must step outside, record the time and location, verify credentials, determine whether there's a judicial warrant, and consult legal counsel when feasible.

Students see adults gathering. Phones light up. Anxiety spreads before confirmation.

At 8:25, the administrator faces a dilemma. The bill requires notification to students, parents, and the "community of the school." But what qualifies as verified presence? Does staging down the block count? Who is the "community"?

If they delay notification, they're accused of hiding information.

If they notify immediately, they risk escalating panic.

At 8:30, a cautious notification goes out:

"Federal immigration authorities are present near campus. Classes continue."

Within minutes:

Students are pulled from class. Attendance drops. Social media amplifies. News calls begin.

No enforcement has occurred on school property.

By mid-morning, instruction has paused in multiple classrooms. Counselors are responding to distressed students. Families consider keeping children home tomorrow.

By afternoon, administrators are logging documentation for reporting compliance.

- The bill worked procedurally.
- But fear was not prevented.
- Attendance was not protected.
- Resources were not added.

The question is not whether the intent is noble. It is whether this mechanism reduces fear — or simply formalizes how schools must manage it after it has already arrived.

### 3 “Intent vs. Likely Impact” (Side-by-Side Comparison)

#### HB 4079: Intent vs. Likely Impact

Legislative Intent	Likely Operational Impact
Ensure no one is afraid to go to school	Public notifications may amplify fear and accelerate absenteeism
Increase transparency	Real-time alerts during evolving situations can escalate tension
Protect students and staff	Administrators placed at the point of confrontation without protection
Clarify procedures	Creates parallel emergency framework layered over existing plans
Improve accountability	Adds new reporting and monitoring systems without funding
Strengthen trust	Conflicting community surveillance and school verification erodes trust
Enhance safety	Does not limit enforcement activity or add security capacity

---

#### Structural Gap

**Intent:** Prevent fear

**Mechanism:** Notification and documentation

These are not the same.

The omission of state-controlled resources, the stakes for public safety and absenteeism are higher—liability and risk for schools is greater. There is no enforceable effect or proof of protection and safeguards to curb fear.

Critical Task for Legislation:

- Be responsible for conditions.
- Be honest about capacity.
- Be bold about activation.
- Be willing to reallocate resources intelligently.

# Escalation Pathway Flowchart

