

February 19, 2026

To: Interested Parties

From: ACLU, ACLU of Michigan

Re: **New polling shows that Michiganders support statewide legislation that would rein in ICE and other federal immigration officials**

On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the ACLU of Michigan, YouGov fielded a survey of 833 registered voters in Michigan, including 230 from four key state senate legislative districts (04, 12, 30, and 35) between January 28 and February 3, 2026. Results show that the majority of Michiganders, particularly in key legislative districts, disapprove of ICE and their tactics, and strongly favor legislation that would establish limits on ICE access to schools, hospitals, and other “sensitive areas,” limit data sharing between local government agencies and ICE, and ban masks & require uniforms for ICE and all other law enforcement officials. The following are key findings from the poll:

Michigan voters are paying a great deal of attention to the actions of ICE and other federal immigration officials, and resulting protests in Minnesota—even above and beyond other issues.

- **Over six in 10** Michiganders have heard “a great deal” about the killing of Renee Good (**66%** statewide, **61%** key districts) and Alex Pretti (**63%** each statewide and key districts), and the continued protests in Minnesota (**67%** statewide; **60%** key districts).
 - In comparison, only a quarter had heard about anti-government protests in Iran (**27%** each statewide and key districts) and ongoing debates about AI data centers in Michigan (**23%** statewide; **21%** key districts).

ICE is substantially underwater among Michigan voters.

- **Over half (53%)** of Michiganders statewide hold an **unfavorable opinion of ICE (35% favorable)**, with unfavourability even higher in key districts (**57%, vs. 33% favorable**). **Almost six in 10 think ICE has been too aggressive (59% each in statewide and key districts, vs. 23% in each who think it has struck the right balance)**. **Only a third think ICE’s actions are making cities more safe nationwide (36% statewide, 32% key districts), whereas half think ICE’s actions are making cities less safe (49% statewide; 50% in key districts).**
- Among the **88%** of Michigan voters statewide, and **92%** in key districts, who have **seen or heard about ICE activities in Michigan, less than a quarter think ICE has “struck the right balance”** in their actions in Michigan (**24%** statewide; **23%** key districts), whereas half think **ICE has been too aggressive in the state (51% statewide, 48% key districts)**.

Michiganders want their state elected officials to enact legislation protecting their communities and neighbors from ICE abuses.

- **Half of Michiganders statewide (53%), and in key districts (55%), want their elected officials to stand up to the Trump administration and oppose the administration’s agenda. Six in 10 (61% statewide; 60% in key districts) want their state elected officials to take action to protect Michiganders from federal immigration activity.**

Over two-thirds of Michigan voters support bills in the Michigan legislature to rein in how ICE operates in Michigan.

- **70%** of Michigan voters statewide (including **96%** Democrats, **67%** Independents, and **44%** Republicans) support **legislation that would push ICE to seek a warrant from a Judge before carrying out immigration enforcement in schools, places of worship, and other “sensitive areas” (SB 508)** as do **74%** in our priority districts (**97%** Democrats, **77%** Independents, **49%** Republicans).
- **65%** of Michigan voters statewide (**93%** Democrats, **71%** Independents, **33%** Republicans) support **data privacy legislation to protect Michiganders’ personally identifying information (e.g. names, addresses, health information, etc.) from being carelessly released to ICE and other federal agencies (SB 509)**, as do **66%** in our priority districts (**93%** Democrats, **57%** Independents, **39%** Republicans).
- **65%** of Michigan voters statewide (**96%** Democrats, **63%** Independents, **33%** Republicans) support legislation **that would ban all law enforcement officials, including ICE, from wearing masks/face coverings, and require all officials to wear uniforms**, unless in case of health and safety or undercover assignments, as do **66%** in our priority districts (**94%** Democrats, **59%** Independents, **37%** Republicans).
- **Two-thirds or more of Michiganders support their elected representative voting to pass** sensitive area legislation (**67%** statewide, **72%** key districts), data privacy legislation (**64%** each statewide and key districts), and mask bans/uniform requirement legislation (**65%** statewide, **62%** key district).

Methodology: This above is based on 833 interviews conducted by YouGov on the internet of registered voters in Michigan, including 230 interviews oversampled from four key Michigan state senate legislative districts (04, 12, 30 and 35). Respondents from the legislative districts (n=230) were analyzed separately from those in the rest of the state (n=680), with separate weights used for each. Please note that respondents in the base sample who reside in the legislative districts of interest were also weighted with the legislative districts sample resulting in some respondents having two weights.

The statewide sample ("statewide") was weighted according to gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, and Michigan region based on voter registration lists, the U.S. Census American Community Survey, and the U.S. Census Current Population Survey, as well as 2020 Presidential vote and approximate 2024 Presidential vote based on available results. Respondents were selected from YouGov to be representative of registered voters in Michigan. The margin of error (a 95% confidence interval) for the statewide base is approximately 4.1%.

The legislative district sample ("key legislative districts") was weighted according to gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, and Michigan legislative district based on voter registration lists, the U.S. Census American Community Survey, and the U.S. Census Current Population Survey, as well as 2020 Presidential vote based on available results. Respondents were selected from YouGov to be representative of registered voters in these legislative districts in Michigan. The margin of error is approximately 7.8% for the legislative district sample.

Legislation Descriptions

SB 508 (sensitive areas)- The [first/second/third] law would require ICE and other law enforcement officers to secure a judicial warrant before engaging in immigration enforcement actions at a handful of limited, sensitive areas across the state. These designated spaces include religious institutions and ceremonies, like funerals and weddings; hospitals and organizations that assist children, pregnant women, victims of crime or abuse, or those with significant mental or physical disabilities; and any educational institution or school, be it public or private.

SB 509 (data privacy) - The [first/second/third] law aims to protect Michiganders' sensitive and personally identifying data by prohibiting state and local agencies from providing personal information solely for the purpose of immigration enforcement, unless they are presented with a judicial warrant. 'Personal information' in this context includes any information that could identify an individual, including their name, photo, address, phone number, criminal history, or even medical or disability information. It would also require any requestor to provide their name, contact information, and sworn statement declaring the purpose of their request to access this data.

SB 510 (mask ban / uniform requirement) - The [first/second/third] law would prevent ICE and other law enforcement officers, from wearing face coverings that conceal or obscure their identity while interacting with the public, unless there is a legitimate health and safety reason for them to do so. In addition, it would require all on-duty ICE agents and other law enforcement officers to wear their uniform, which must show their name or badge number, unless, of course, they are engaged in an undercover assignment.