

ANDRE VASQUEZ
ALDERPERSON, 40TH WARD
5620 NORTH WESTERN AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60659
PHONE: 773-654-1867
CONTACT US: 40THWARD.ORG/CONTACT



CITY OF CHICAGO
CITY COUNCIL
*
CITY HALL, ROOM 25
121 NORTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602
PHONE: 312-744-6858

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS
IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE RIGHTS
(CHAIRPERSON)
TRANSPORTATION
(VICE-CHAIRPERSON)
BUDGET
COMMITTEES AND RULES
PUBLIC SAFETY
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WAY

**COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE RIGHTS
MONTHLY RULE 45 REPORT
JULY 2026**

Pursuant to Rule 45 of the City of Chicago Rules of Order, the **Committee on Immigrant and Refugee Rights** submits the following Monthly Report for July 2026.

REFERRED MATTERS

REPORTS AND MATERIALS RECEIVED BY THE COMMITTEE

1. July 17 2026 Committee Meeting Notice
2. July 17 2026 Committee Meeting Agenda of Matters
3. IMRR Presentation: City Council Committee on Immigrant and Refugee Rights Hearing, July 17, 2026
4. City Council Committee on Immigrant & Refugee Rights Hearing Presentation, IMRR
5. Street Vendors Association Statement
6. CCPSA Statement
7. Inside ICEAir: Flight Attendants on Deportation Planes Say Disaster Is "Only a Matter of
8. Time," ProPublica
9. ICE Deportation Flights Are Getting Longer and Crueler, Mother Jones
10. OMNI ICE for Chicago Flight Lists
11. Parking meter hearing delayed amid debate over Stonepeak deal, Crains Chicago Business

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT

The Committee received the following public comments:

1. Hello Alderman Vasquez, and the CIRR,

I am writing as a District Councilor from the 17th District where my constituents continue to have concerns about ICE and how they are behaving in our community and that the CPD does not appear to be serving or protecting us.

My community is concerned and disappointed that there has been a delay in the implementation of the Executive Order 2026-01. The CCPSA has communicated that it is still under review but months have passed and we have heard nothing. When there was a recent incident in Albany Park where ICE crashed into a vehicle and an agent dropped a bullet magazine, the investigation was closed and the community does not feel that they got clear answers.

It is reported that the Department will not be at the Committee meeting today to answer our questions. That is disturbing because public safety depends on our community members feeling safe and feeling that if they report crime that the authorities will take action. They feel that they are being targeted and nothing is being done despite living in a Welcoming City. I urge this Committee, the Mayor's office and the CPD to provide the residents of my district and the entire city with answers on how they are holding ICE accountable as the Executive Order requires.

-Beth Rochford, 17th District Council Member

2. Good morning. I am Micaela Cayton Garrido, staff attorney with Ascend Justice, and I am here today to express our profound concern about ICE activity in and around courthouses in Cook County.

The mission of Ascend Justice is to empower people impacted by gender-based violence or the child welfare system. We use the legal system to help people find safety and stability after abuse and trauma. As part of this essential work, we help immigrants who have been victims of crimes, abuse, and trafficking apply for asylum, green cards, visas, and other US immigration status. Through a new initiative, we also provide technical assistance and community outreach about the intersection of immigration and domestic violence to other agencies and community stakeholders.

And at our walk-in clinic at the Cook County Domestic Violence Courthouse, we help people every day get Orders of Protection from their abusers. So we have seen first-hand the chilling impact on the willingness of both victims and witnesses of crimes to come to courthouses where federal agents lie in wait.

We are deeply concerned by ICE activity in and around the courthouses in Cook County. These include not just blatant ICE activities, such as the illegal warrantless arrests last month in the Bridgeview courthouse, but also surreptitious activity of ICE agents intercepting individuals en route to or from the courthouses. ICE agents coming to the courthouse and staying on the premises scares people away, including the very people who need help the most, like Ascend Justice clients.

ICE enforcement is deadly: not just due to the condition in ICE detention centers, but also with ICE activity in communities, as the nation has yet again heartbreakingly witnessed the past week with the deaths of two innocent individuals in Maine and Texas. We need to find a way to prevent ICE's deadly, illegal activity in the city of Chicago. We call upon the City and the Committee to remind law enforcement officials in the courthouse of their responsibility to ensure the courthouses remain safe zones for all, to refrain from aiding and abetting ICE activity, and to keep people going to and from Illinois courts safe.

-Micaela Cayton Garrido, Staff Attorney, Ascend Justice

3. How can we put pressure on the Chicago Police Department to do the right thing and begin charging ICE/the fed government over their behavior during incidents here?

-Ellen Palmer

4. To the Members of the Committee,

Introduction: My name is Michael Bienesntock, and I am a retired teacher. My ancestors immigrated from Poland, Ukraine, and Lithuania in the late 1890s. During World War II, some of my relatives perished in the Holocaust. I am also the author of *Love and Hope Have No Borders: An Interfaith Story* about a Jewish man who falls in love with a Muslim nurse in a Syrian Refugee camp. This book was partly inspired by my father, who attended school in both Israel and Lebanon and served in the U.S. Army in Egypt.

I am writing this letter in support of immigrants. I also offer a comprehensive plan to resolve immigration problems. The scale of global displacement today is unprecedented, and the moral, economic, and historical reasons for welcoming newcomers are clearer than ever.

Introduction

More than **280 million people worldwide** live outside their country of birth, according to the United Nations. The United States remains one of the largest destinations, with **over 46 million foreign-born residents**, making up roughly **14% of the national population**. In Chicago alone, more than **1.7 million residents** are immigrants or the children of immigrants, forming one of the most diverse and economically vital metropolitan communities in the country. These figures are widely reported by organizations such as the UN, Pew Research Center, and the U.S. Census Bureau; I encourage the Committee to confirm them with trusted sources.

It is also important to recognize that the United States is, fundamentally, a nation of immigrants. With the exception of Native Americans, nearly every family in this country traces its roots to migration—whether voluntary or forced. Immigration is not an anomaly in American life; it is the foundation of it.

For refugees and asylum seekers, the stakes are even higher. When we deny entry or forcibly return individuals to their home countries—or redirect them to nations unable to guarantee their safety—we are not simply delaying their hopes. We are effectively condemning them to danger, instability, and in many cases, life-threatening conditions. The principle of non-refoulement exists for this reason: sending people back to harm is incompatible with the values the United States claims to uphold. Today, the government is designating the home country as the problem

rather than looking at the individual who seeks asylum.

Additionally, many undocumented immigrants already living in the United States are deeply woven into the fabric of our communities. They work long hours, contribute billions in taxes, support local economies, raise families, and participate in civic life. Their labor sustains industries ranging from agriculture to construction to hospitality. Their presence is not a burden; it is a source of strength. Creating humane, realistic pathways to legal status would acknowledge the contributions they already make and allow them to participate fully and safely in the society they help build. The United States has always been strongest when it chooses compassion over fear, opportunity over exclusion, and humanity over political convenience. I urge the Committee to expand refugee admissions, streamline asylum processing, and create fair, accessible legal pathways for immigrants who are already contributing to our communities. These actions are not only morally necessary—they are economically and historically aligned with the nation we aspire to be.

A Historical contrast.

Franklin D. Roosevelt is dutifully recognized as playing a major role in defeating the Nazis. Yet people do not often judge him for his stance on immigration of the Jewish people.

His administration did not allow most European Jews to enter the United States during the 1930s and early 1940s because of a combination of political pressure, restrictive immigration laws, widespread antisemitism, economic fears, and national-security anxieties. Historians widely agree that these factors—working together—resulted in the U.S. admitting only a fraction of the people who were desperately trying to escape Nazi persecution. You should confirm details with trusted historical sources such as the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, the National Archives, or major academic historians.

The U.S. immigration system at the time was governed by the 1924 Immigration Act, which set extremely low quotas for immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe—regions where most European Jews lived. These quotas were not increased even as the Nazi threat grew. The State Department often under filled the quotas, adding extra layers of bureaucracy that slowed or blocked applications.

This was not a policy created by FDR, but his administration chose not to challenge it.

Widespread antisemitism and xenophobia in the U.S. (just as there are today)

Public opinion in the 1930s was strongly opposed to admitting refugees, especially Jews. Polls from the era show that **over 60% of Americans** opposed allowing more Jewish immigrants. Antisemitic stereotypes and conspiracy theories were common in newspapers, churches, and political speeches. Many Americans believed Jews would “take jobs” or “change American culture.” FDR was a politician deeply attuned to public opinion, and he rarely took positions that risked major political backlash.

Economic fears during the Great Depression

The U.S. was still recovering from the Depression. Many Americans feared that immigrants would compete for scarce jobs, and Labor unions and some business groups opposed refugee admissions for economic reasons.

FDR's administration worried that opening immigration would trigger political and economic resistance at a fragile moment.

National-security concerns during WWII

After the war began, the State Department—especially officials like Breckinridge Long—argued that refugees might include “enemy agents.” These claims were not supported by evidence, but they were used to justify slowing or blocking visas. Security fears became a convenient political cover for restrictive policies.

Bureaucratic obstruction inside the State Department

Historians have documented that certain officials intentionally made the process harder. They added paperwork requirements, delayed approvals. And instructed consulates to “postpone” or “suspend” visa processing.

This meant that even people who technically qualified under the quota system were often denied.

FDR’s political calculations

FDR did take some actions to help refugees—such as allowing some temporary visas and supporting limited rescue efforts—but he **never pushed Congress** to expand quotas or create a large-scale refugee program.

Most historians conclude that: He feared political backlash, prioritized domestic stability and wartime unity, and did not see refugee rescue as a central wartime objective.

A tragic example: The MS *St. Louis*

In 1939, the MS *St. Louis*, carrying more than 900 Jewish refugees, was denied entry to the U.S. after Cuba refused them.

The ship was forced back to Europe.

Many passengers later died in the Holocaust.

This event has become a symbol of U.S. inaction.

Partly, as a result of these actions, 9 million people were killed by the nazis which included six million Jews. Sednign some immigrants back to their home or other country will surely result in their deaths.

All of this parallels what is happening today with immigrants regardless of the country they come from.

A Comprehensive Plan.

A Plan for Illinois and Chicago.

Illinois and Chicago have been on the front lines of America’s immigration story. From the buses arriving from the southern border to the shelters stretched beyond capacity, our state and city have seen both the human need and the logistical strain up close. We’ve responded with compassion—expanding shelter beds, coordinating services, and building new systems to support new arrivals and longtime residents experiencing homelessness.

But compassion alone is not enough. We need **structure**. We need a model that is fair, lawful, and sustainable—one that helps migrants become contributing members of our communities instead of leaving them stuck in limbo.

Illinois and Chicago are uniquely positioned to pioneer such a model: **state–city integration campuses** that provide temporary housing, legal orientation, and employment pathways on repurposed state or federal properties, including portions of underused military or training facilities. This would not be a detention system. It would be a **transition and training system**—a bridge from arrival to full participation in civic and economic life. This plan could also be done at the federal level.

Building on what Illinois and Chicago already started

In recent years, the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago have worked together to unify shelter systems and better serve both new arrivals and residents experiencing homelessness. That collaboration shows something important: when state and city leaders

coordinate, we can create systems that are more equitable, efficient, and humane. Integration campuses would be the next step in that evolution. Instead of scattering services across dozens of sites, Illinois and Chicago could create **purpose-built campuses** where migrants:

- Live in safe, supervised housing
- Receive medical and mental health care
- Learn English and basic U.S. law
- Understand their rights and responsibilities
- Prepare for work in local industries

This is not about separating migrants from the rest of society. It's about **preparing them** to join it successfully.

Partnering with Illinois employers to fill real workforce needs

Illinois has deep roots in manufacturing, logistics, food processing, health care, and emerging tech. Many employers struggle to find enough workers. Integration campuses could become **talent pipelines** for these industries.

Companies could partner with the state and city to:

- Offer paid training and apprenticeships on or near the campuses
- Teach job-specific skills—welding, HVAC, logistics, food service, coding, and more
- Hire successful participants into long-term positions once they transition into the community

Workers would be protected by Illinois and federal labor laws, paid fair wages, and supported by case managers and social workers. Employers would gain reliable, trained employees. Communities would gain new neighbors who arrive with skills, structure, and support.

Respecting Chicago's Welcoming City values while restoring order

Chicago's Welcoming City policies are built on a simple principle: people should not live in fear of seeking services or calling the police because of their immigration status. Integration campuses would honor that principle while adding something we urgently need—**predictable pathways and clear expectations**.

Participants would:

- Be informed of their legal options and obligations
- Receive help navigating asylum, humanitarian parole, or other lawful pathways
- Be evaluated on engagement, behavior, and progress
- Move forward toward more stable status if they meet the standards

Those who commit serious violent acts would face due process under existing law. No one would be deported by administrative whim. The rule of law would apply, as it should, to everyone. **A state-city model that makes fiscal sense**

Illinois and Chicago have already spent hundreds of millions responding to emergency migration. Much of that money has gone to short-term fixes: temporary shelters, emergency services, and crisis management.

Integration campuses would be **planned investments** rather than emergency expenditures. By consolidating housing, services, and training in a few well-designed sites, the state and city could:

- Reduce duplication of services
- Improve coordination among agencies and nonprofits
- Create clearer timelines for shelter stays and transitions
- Generate long-term economic benefits through workforce participation

This is not about spending more; it's about spending **smarter**.

A chance for Illinois and Chicago to lead the nation

Illinois and Chicago have a long history of welcoming newcomers—from European immigrants

in the early 20th century to today's arrivals from Latin America, Africa, Asia, and beyond. We know how to build communities out of diversity. We know how to turn struggle into opportunity. By creating integration campuses, Illinois and Chicago could offer the country a new model: one that is **firm but fair**, **structured but compassionate**, and deeply rooted in our shared belief that people can grow, learn, and contribute when given a real chance.

They often say that Chicago is a city of neighborhoods, and Illinois is a state of communities. The question before us is whether we will invite new arrivals into those communities with intention and clarity—or leave them to navigate chaos on their own.

A campus-based integration system would send a powerful message:

Next I present a Federal plan

Program overview

Name: Federal Integration Campus Program (FICP) **Purpose:** Repurpose selected, non-critical portions of U.S. military installations into civilian-run integration campuses that provide: The Federal Integration Campus Program (FICP) establishes a lawful, humane, and economically productive system for managing migrant intake by repurposing selected, non-critical portions of U.S. military installations into civilian-run integration campuses. These campuses provide temporary housing, legal orientation, employment training, and structured pathways toward lawful permanent residency and eventual citizenship. The program is designed to enhance national security, reduce strain on local jurisdictions, and support workforce development while upholding constitutional protections and due process.

Section 1 — Legislative Authority

Congress shall authorize the FICP through a dedicated statute under the following authorities:

Homeland Security Act of 2002 (expanded authority for DHS to manage migrant intake and integration).

Economy Act (31 U.S.C. §1535) enabling interagency support between DoD and DHS.

Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) amendments establishing a new “FICP Conditional Residency Category.”

Appropriations Act establishing annual funding for capital and operational costs.

Labor and Workforce Innovation Act provisions enabling federal–corporate apprenticeship partnerships.

The legislation will provide:

Temporary housing for migrants in legal proceedings

Legal and civic orientation toward lawful status and eventual citizenship

Employment and skills training via corporate and nonprofit partnerships

Continuous, humane evaluation and support

Clear pathways to lawful permanent residency and, later, citizenship

All operations are civilian-led, with the Department of Defense (DoD) acting only as landlord and logistics provider.

Legal and governance framework

Lead agencies

Department of Homeland Security (DHS): Overall program authority; intake, security, and immigration proceedings.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS): Legal status processing, green cards, and naturalization.

Department of Health and Human Services (HHS): Health care, mental health, social services.

Department of Labor (DOL): Labor standards, apprenticeships, workplace protections.

Department of Defense (DoD): Provides land, utilities, and base-adjacent infrastructure; no direct role in migrant supervision.

Key legal pillars

Use of bases: Authorized via interagency agreements (e.g., Economy Act, Defense Support of Civil Authorities).

Due process: No automatic deportation; all removal decisions follow existing immigration law and court processes.

Non-discrimination: Equal treatment regardless of nationality, ethnicity, or religion.

Labor law compliance: All work is paid, taxed, and protected under federal and state labor laws.

Independent oversight: Inspector General reviews, congressional reporting, and civil society advisory boards.

Campus design and operations

Physical layout

Each Integration Campus includes:

Housing units: Dorm-style or modular housing with family sections and single-adult sections.

Health facilities: Clinic, mental health center, and emergency care access.

Education spaces: Classrooms for ESL, civics, and vocational training.

Workspaces: On-site workshops, light manufacturing areas, and office spaces for partner companies.

Community areas: Dining halls, recreation spaces, worship/quiet rooms, and outdoor areas.

Administrative hub: Offices for case managers, social workers, legal aid, and federal staff.

Capacity and scale

Pilot phase: 3–5 campuses, each housing 3,000–5,000 migrants.

Full scale (if successful): Up to 50,000–75,000 total capacity across multiple sites.

Program phases for participants

Phase 1: Intake and stabilization (0–3 months)

Legal intake: Identity verification, background checks, and initial immigration case assessment.

Health screening: Physical and mental health evaluation; urgent care as needed.

Orientation: Explanation of rights, responsibilities, campus rules, and program structure.

Placement: Assignment to housing, ESL level, and initial skills assessment.

Phase 2: Integration and training (3–12 months)

Daily/weekly structure:

ESL classes: 2–3 hours per day.

Civics and law education:

U.S. legal basics (criminal law, civil rights, workplace rules).

Constitution, branches of government, voting, and community norms.

Vocational training and work:

On-site employment with partner companies (manufacturing, logistics, food processing, trades, tech support).

Apprenticeships and certifications (HVAC, welding, electrical, coding, etc.).

Support services:

Social workers, counselors, and case managers.

Conflict resolution and nonviolence training.

Phase 3: Conditional residency pathway (12–18 months)

For participants who:

- Attend required classes
- Maintain nonviolent conduct
- Follow campus rules
- Show consistent work performance

They may be:

- Recommended for lawful permanent residency (green card) under a special statutory category created by Congress for FICP graduates. Matched with community sponsors or employers in receiving communities.

Released from campus into the broader community with continued case management for a defined period (e.g., 12 months). **Phase 4: Naturalization (3–5 years after green card)**

- After meeting residency requirements, participants may:
 - Apply for citizenship.
 - Take the naturalization exam (with preparation provided).
 - Complete interview and oath ceremony.

Evaluation and accountability system

Individual evaluation

Each participant has:

- Case manager: Tracks progress, attendance, and legal status.
- Social worker: Monitors well-being, family dynamics, and mental health.
- Work supervisor: Provides performance feedback and skills assessments.

Criteria:

- Compliance: Adherence to campus rules and laws.
- Engagement: Participation in classes and work.
- Behavior: Nonviolence, conflict resolution, respect for others.
- Progress: Language improvement, skills acquisition, and civic understanding.

Handling serious misconduct

Nonviolent infractions: Addressed with counseling, warnings, and restorative measures.

Violent or dangerous behavior:

- Immediate safety response.
- Formal investigation.
- Legal proceedings as required.

Possible transfer to more secure facilities or, after due process, removal from the U.S.

No one is deported solely on administrative discretion; all actions follow existing law and court oversight.

Program-level oversight

- Quarterly reports to Congress: Capacity, outcomes, costs, and incidents.
- Independent review boards: Include legal experts, community leaders, and human rights organizations.

Public transparency: Regular summaries and data dashboards (with privacy protections).

Federal budget blueprint (pilot phase)

These are rough, policy-level estimates to make the concept concrete.

1. Capital costs (per campus)

Base conversion and construction:

Renovation of existing structures, modular housing, utilities upgrades.

Approx. \$150–\$250 million per campus (depending on size and condition).

Education and work facilities:

Classrooms, workshops, IT infrastructure.

Approx. \$30–\$50 million per campus.

Total capital per campus:

Roughly \$180–\$300 million.

For 5 pilot campuses:

\$900 million–\$1.5 billion in one-time capital costs.

2. Annual operating costs (per campus)

Per-person annual cost for housing, food, health care, education, and administration in similar federal facilities often ranges around

\$30,000–\$50,000. Average per-person annual cost: \$40,000

Campus capacity: 4,000 people

Annual operating per campus:

$$4,000 \times \$40,000 = \$160,000,000$$

So about \$160 million per campus per year.

For 5 campuses:

\$800 million per year in operating costs.

3. Program-wide annual budget (pilot)

Operating: $\approx$ \$800 million

Capital amortization (over 10 years):

If total capital is \$1.2 billion, amortized $\approx$ \$120 million/year.

Total annual budget (pilot): $\approx$ \$920 million–\$1 billion.

4. Funding sources

DHS appropriation: Primary funding line for FICP.

HHS and DOL contributions: For health, social services, and training.

DoD cost-sharing: Limited to infrastructure and utilities.

Corporate partnerships:

Companies pay wages and may contribute to training infrastructure.

Tax incentives for participation

(e.g., credits for certified training and hiring graduates). **Corporate and**

employment framework

Corporate participation model

Voluntary enrollment: Companies apply to join the FICP Workforce Partnership.

On-site operations:

Manufacturing, logistics, call centers, food processing, or tech support.

Must meet safety and labor standards.

This would allow for jobs in China to be performed in the United States.

Wages and protections:

Participants are paid at least local minimum wage (ideally higher).

Covered by workers' compensation, OSHA, and anti-discrimination laws.

Training-to-hire pipeline:

Companies commit to hiring a percentage of successful campus graduates into off-campus jobs. **Safeguards against exploitation**

Independent labor monitors.

Clear complaint mechanisms.

Penalties and removal from the program for violating labor standards.

Political and community strategy

Messaging

Frame the program as:

Orderly, humane management of migration.

Economic opportunity: Filling labor shortages with trained, vetted workers.

Security and stability: Structured, supervised campuses instead of ad hoc overcrowded facilities. Values-based: Reflecting American commitments to law, fairness, and opportunity. **Community**

integration

Partner with local governments and nonprofits to:

Prepare receiving communities.

Offer mentorship and support networks.

Encourage hiring of graduates.

Implementation timeline (pilot)

Year 1

Legislative authorization and funding.

Site selection and interagency agreements.

Design and construction/renovation.

Development of curricula and corporate partnership framework.

Year 2

Open first 2–3 campuses.

Begin intake and Phase 1–2 programming.

Establish oversight boards and reporting systems.

Years 3–4

Full pilot operation across all campuses.

First cohort reaches Phase 3 (conditional residency).

Evaluation of outcomes: employment rates, compliance, community integration.

Year 5

Congressional review.

Decision on expansion, modification, or sunset.
Possible scaling to additional campuses or integration into broader immigration reform. Below is a **fully structured, formal policy proposal** written in the style of a federal legislative and administrative blueprint. It is formatted as if intended for congressional staff, executive agencies, and policy stakeholders. It avoids political advocacy and stays within legal and constitutional boundaries. Please confirm details with trust

Section 2 —

Program Governance

Lead Agencies

Department of Homeland Security (DHS) — Program authority, intake, security, and compliance.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) — Legal status processing, green card issuance, and naturalization.

Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) — Health care, mental health, and social services.

Department of Labor (DOL) — Workplace protections, apprenticeships, and labor compliance.

Department of Defense (DoD) — Infrastructure, utilities, and logistical support only.

Oversight Mechanisms

Quarterly reporting to Congress on capacity, outcomes, incidents, and expenditures.

Independent Oversight Board composed of legal experts, civil society representatives, and community leaders.

Inspector General audits for compliance, safety, and financial integrity.

Section 3 — Campus Infrastructure and Operations

Campus Locations

DoD shall identify 3–5 pilot sites meeting the following criteria:

Non-critical operational status

Adequate existing infrastructure

Proximity to workforce partners and receiving communities

Environmental and logistical suitability

Campus Components

Residential Housing: Modular units and renovated barracks with family and single-adult sections.

Medical Facilities: Clinics, mental health centers, and emergency care access.

Education Centers: ESL classrooms, civics instruction rooms, and vocational training labs.

Workforce Facilities: Workshops, light manufacturing spaces, logistics hubs, and corporate training centers.

Administrative Offices: Case management, legal aid, social services, and federal staff.

Community Areas: Dining halls, recreation spaces, quiet rooms, and outdoor areas.

Section 4 — Participant Pathway

Phase 1 — Intake & Stabilization (0–3 months)

Identity verification and background checks

Health and mental health screening

Legal orientation and explanation of rights

ESL placement and skills assessment

Assignment to housing and case manager

Phase 2 — Integration & Training (3–12 months)

Daily programming includes:

- ESL instruction (2–3 hours/day)

- Civics and legal education

- Vocational training (manufacturing, trades, logistics, tech support)

- Paid employment with corporate partners

- Social services including counseling and conflict resolution

All employment is governed by federal and state labor laws.

Phase 3 — Conditional Residency (12–18 months)

Participants demonstrating:

- Compliance with campus rules

- Nonviolent behavior

- Consistent work performance

- Engagement in education programs

may be recommended for:

- FICP Conditional Residency Status**

- Placement into receiving communities**

- Employment continuation with partner companies**

Phase 4 — Lawful Permanent Residency & Citizenship (3–5 years)

Upon meeting statutory residency requirements, participants may apply for:

- Lawful permanent residency (green card)

- Naturalization exam

- Citizenship interview and oath ceremony

Section 5 — Evaluation and Conduct Standards

Evaluation Criteria

- Attendance and participation

- Workplace performance

- Language acquisition

- Civic understanding

- Behavioral compliance

- Community engagement

Misconduct Procedures

Nonviolent infractions:

- Counseling, corrective plans, restorative practices.

Violent or dangerous behavior:

- Immediate safety response

- Formal investigation

- Due process under INA

- Possible transfer or removal following legal proceedings

No participant may be removed

from the United States without
lawful adjudication. **Section 6 —**

Corporate Partnership

Framework Participation

Requirements

Corporations may apply to join the

FICP Workforce Partnership

Program, agreeing to: Provide

paid employment and training

Maintain OSHA and labor law compliance

Offer apprenticeships and certifications

Contribute to training infrastructure

Consider hiring graduates post-release

Federal Incentives

Workforce development tax credits

Training reimbursement grants

Priority access to federal apprenticeship programs

Safeguards

Independent labor monitors

Worker complaint mechanisms

Penalties for violations, including removal from the program

Section 7 — Federal Budget Blueprint

Capital Costs (Pilot Phase)

Category Cost per Campus Total for 5 Campuses

Base conversion &

construction

\$150–\$250M

\$750M–\$1.25B

Education & workforce

facilities

\$30–\$50M

\$150M–\$250M **Total**

Capital \$180–\$300M

\$900M–\$1.5B

Annual Operating Costs

Assuming 4,000 participants per campus:

Per-person annual cost: ≈ \$40,000

Annual per campus: ≈ \$160M

Annual for 5 campuses: ≈ \$800M

Program-wide Annual Budget (Pilot)

Operating: ≈ **\$800M**

Capital amortization (10-year): ≈ **\$120M**

Total annual cost: ≈ **\$920M–\$1B**

Funding Sources

DHS appropriations

HHS and DOL contributions
DoD infrastructure support
Corporate partnership contributions

Section 8 — Implementation Timeline

Year 1

Congressional authorization
Site selection
Interagency agreements
Construction and renovation
Corporate partnership development

Year 2

Launch first 2–3 campuses
Begin intake and Phase 1–2 programming
Establish oversight mechanisms

Years 3–4

Full pilot operation
First cohort reaches conditional residency
Comprehensive program evaluation

Year 5

Congressional review
Decision on expansion or modification
Integration into broader immigration reform frameworks

Section 9 — Expected Outcomes

Reduced strain on border communities
Increased workforce participation in critical industries
Improved legal compliance and civic integration
Enhanced national security through structured intake
Transparent, humane, and orderly immigration management

Conclusion

The Federal Integration Campus Program provides a lawful, structured, and economically beneficial approach to migrant integration. By combining temporary housing, education, employment, and clear legal pathways, the United States can uphold its constitutional values while strengthening its workforce and improving national security.

-Michael Bienesntock

COMMITTEE MEETING: JULY 17, 2026

On July 17, 2026 at 10:15 AM, the Committee on Immigrant and Refugee Rights held a Committee Meeting in Room 201A of City Hall.

ROLL CALL

A quorum was established.

The following members were present: Chair Vasquez (40), Alderperson Gutierrez (14), Alderperson Cruz (30), Alderperson Cardona (31), Alderperson Quezada (35), Alderperson Knudsen (43), Alderperson Manaa-Hoppenworth (48)

The following members requested and were granted a virtual option to attend via Rule 59: Alderperson Taliaferro (29), Alderperson Rodriguez-Sanchez (33)

The following members were not present: Vice Chair Taylor (20), Alderperson Dowell (3), Alderperson Rodriguez (22), Alderperson Fuentes (26), Alderperson Hadden (49)

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public speakers were each given three minutes to provide their testimony:

- Kelly Howe
- Wendy Siegel, Indivisible Lincoln Square
- Noelle Clennon, Indivisible Lincoln Square
- Mary McCarthy, Indivisible Lincoln Square
- Micaela Cayton Garrido, Ascend Justice
- Noah Bazis, UIC Law
- Elianne Bahena, 10th District Councilor, CCPSA
- Maria Lourdes Ochoa, Street Vendors Association
- Juan Gama, Street Vendors Association
- Guillermo Flores
- Salvador Salas
- Clara Barrios

THE COMMITTEE ADDRESSED THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

SUBJECT MATTER HEARING

The Committee held a subject matter hearing on the following agenda items:

1. Investigation process for DHS violations in Chicago, and how DHS-related Mayoral executive orders are being operationalized
2. Chicago Police Department enforcement of street vendor violations and related detainments and deportations
3. Proposed sale of Chicago Parking Meters to Stonepeak Partners, and their related financial interest in Omni Air International, facilitator of ICE deportation flights

The following speakers provided testimony:

- Jill Stevens, Deputy Chief, Chicago Police Department
- Beatriz Ponce de Leon, Deputy Mayor for the Mayor's Office of Immigrant, Migrant and Refugee Rights
- Sheila Bedi, Chief Strategy Officer & Counsel to the Mayor
- Maria Orozco, Street Vendors Association of Chicago
- Gillian Brockell, Journalist

A complete recap of the meeting can be found at: <https://vimeo.com/1210612137>

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Vasquez asked for a motion to adjourn. Alderperson Quezada so moved. Hearing no objections, Chairman Vasquez adjourned the meeting.