

City of Carpinteria
Special City Council Meeting Agenda
Thursday, July 10, 2025
Council Chamber, 5775 Carpinteria Avenue, Carpinteria, CA 93013

6:00 p.m. Special Meeting
In-Person and Virtual Participation Options

Attendance/Viewing Options:

- Attend the in-person meeting in City Council Chambers at City Hall (5775 Carpinteria Ave.).
- View the meeting live through the City's website (<https://carpinteriaca.gov/city-hall/agendas-meetings/>).
- View the meeting on Government Access Television Channel 21 (broadcast live and rebroadcast on the Wednesday and the Saturday following the meeting at 8:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., respectively).
- Call 669-900-9128 (and enter Webinar ID 849 5178 9727) to listen to the meeting.
- Join the City's Zoom webinar by [CLICKING HERE](#). Alternatively, you can join the Zoom webinar by logging on to www.zoom.us, downloading the application, selecting "Join Meeting", and entering Webinar ID 849 5178 9727.
- Spanish interpretation will be available at the in-person meeting and through the City's Zoom webinar.

Public Comments

- Provide a live public comment in City Council Chambers at City Hall (5775 Carpinteria Ave.).
- Provide a live comment through the City's Zoom webinar platform (through the link provided above). To make public comments through this platform please use the "raise your hand" feature to notify staff that you would like to make a public comment during designated public comment times. Once it is your turn to provide a public comment, staff will unmute your microphone and you will be given a designated amount of time to provide your comment. At the end of your comment, staff will once again mute your microphone.
- Submit a written comment (as either a general public comment or on a specific agenda item) to be distributed to Council Members by **12:00 P.M. on the day of the meeting** by either submitting your comment via (1) email to PublicComment@carpinteriaca.gov, or (2) the **eComment** link on the City's agenda website available at <https://carpinteriaca.gov/city-hall/agendas-meetings/>. Please reference the agenda item to which your comment pertains. Although written comments become part of the record, they will not be read aloud at the meeting.

Please note that the City will make every effort to make the meeting accessible virtually; however, if one of the above virtual attendance/viewing or public comment options is unavailable due to technological issues, you are invited to take advantage of one of the other participation options outlined above (including attending and providing public comment in-person in the City Council Chambers). Additional options may be made available at the meeting.

Levine Act Warning

Applicants and their agents before the City Council are subject to the campaign disclosure provisions detailed in Government Code Section 84308. No City Council Member may accept, solicit, or direct a contribution of more than \$500 from any party for 12 months following the date a final decision is rendered by the City. No City Council Member may accept, solicit, or direct any contribution from an agent of the party during the same time frame. This prohibition commences when an item involving the entitlement has been placed on the City Council's agenda for a public meeting, when the City Council Members knows the action is within the City Council's jurisdiction and it is reasonably foreseeable that it will come before the City Council as a decisionmaker, or when the proceeding is before the City Council for its decision. A party to a City proceeding—which includes both applicants and agents—shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contribution of more than \$500 made to any Council Member by the applicant, or any donations made by the agent, during the preceding 12 months. No party to a City proceeding, or agent, shall make a contribution to a Council Member during the proceeding and for 12 months following the date a final decision is rendered by the City. Prior to rendering a decision on a City proceeding, any Council Member who received contribution of more than \$500 within the preceding 12 months from any party, or who received any donations from an agent, to a proceeding shall disclose that fact on the record of the proceeding, and shall be disqualified from participating in the proceeding. However, if any Council Member receives a contribution that otherwise would require disqualification, and returns the contribution within 30 days of knowing about the contribution and the relevant proceeding, the Council Member shall be permitted to participate in the proceeding. If you believe that these provisions apply to you or a Council Member, please inform the City Clerk at the earliest possible opportunity. Failure to do so may affect the City's ability to process your application.

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENT WILL ONLY BE HEARD CONCERNING THE AGENDIZED ITEM BELOW

CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:

The City Council will meet to consider the following items:

1. Consider Statement and Proclamation from the City Council Regarding Recent Federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Activity.

Recommendation: Consider issuing a statement and adopting a Proclamation regarding the City Council's position on recent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) activity in the City of Carpinteria.

Staff Presenter: Michael Ramirez, City Manager

- a. Staff Report
 - b. Public Comment
 - c. City Council Determination
2. Consider Appropriation of Funds for Response Efforts to Support the Local Immigrant Community.

Recommendation: (a) Consider authorizing the appropriation of \$5,000 (or another dollar amount) from the General Fund to support nonprofit organizations serving residents impacted by recent federal immigration enforcement actions and (b) Provide direction on priority criteria for the selection of nonprofit organizations to receive funding.

Staff Presenter: Ryan Kintz, Assistant City Manager

- a. Staff Report
 - b. Public Comment
 - c. City Council Determination
3. Consider Additional City Responses to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Activity.

Recommendation: Receive a report on recent federal immigration enforcement activity in the community and provide direction to staff regarding additional actions the City may take in response.

Staff Presenter: Michael Ramirez, City Manager

- a. Staff Report
 - b. Public Comment
 - c. City Council Determination

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular City Council meeting will be held July 14, 2025 at 5:30 p.m.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (805) 755-4403 or the California Relay Service at (866) 735-2929. Notification two business days prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements for accessibility to this meeting.

Materials related to an agenda item submitted to the City Council after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public review at the City Clerk's Office, located at 5775 Carpinteria Avenue, Carpinteria, CA 93013 or by going to the City's website at <https://carpinteriaca.gov/city-hall/agendas-meetings/>.

This agenda was posted on Wednesday, July 9, 2025, in the City Clerk's Office, on the City Hall Public Notices Board, and on the Internet.

CITY of CARPINTERIA, CALIFORNIA



Members of the City Council

Natalia Alarcon - *Mayor*
Mónica Solórzano - *Vice Mayor*
Al Clark
Julia Mayer
Wade T. Nomura

City of Carpinteria Statement in Response to Recent Federal Actions

The City of Carpinteria offers this statement to reiterate our unwavering commitment to being a “Community for All” that will continue to support a safe and welcoming community for all of our residents, regardless of immigration status.

Earlier this year, the Carpinteria City Council unanimously passed a resolution reaffirming our commitment to the California Values Act, which limits local cooperation with immigration authorities. Since then, federal immigration enforcement agents – often masked and, in some documented cases, lacking visible identification – have conducted raid operations in public spaces and workplaces throughout the Southern California community, including in the City of Carpinteria. These raids have generated fear and negatively affected the health, safety, and daily lives of those in our community.

As authorized by law and as enshrined in the system of checks and balances of the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights, the City of Carpinteria commits to protecting the rights, liberties, and freedoms of all people within the City's jurisdiction and will continue to uphold these principles to ensure that all people can engage with City services without fear of local enforcement actions based solely on immigration status.

5775 CARPINTERIA AVENUE • CARPINTERIA, CA 93013-2603
(805) 684-5405 • FAX (805) 684-5304
www.carpinteria.ca.us



**A PROCLAMATION OF
COMMITMENT TO CALIFORNIA
VALUES ACT AND TO PROVIDING
A SAFE AND WELCOMING
COMMUNITY FOR ALL RESIDENTS,
VISITORS, AND WORKERS**

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2025, the Carpinteria City Council unanimously passed Resolution No. 6372 reaffirming its commitment to Senate Bill 54, the California Values Act, which limits local cooperation with immigration authorities; and

WHEREAS, although the California Values Act does not prevent federal agencies from operating independently within our community, the City continues working to support immigrant communities—including through the distribution of “Know Your Rights” resources at the Carpinteria Community Library and providing City staff and employees with a guidance document on how to appropriately interact with federal law enforcement and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents; and

WHEREAS, on May 29, 2025, the Department of Homeland Security released a list identifying over 500 jurisdictions it designated as “sanctuary jurisdictions,” which included Santa Barbara County and neighboring Ventura County; and

WHEREAS, since June 6, 2025, federal immigration enforcement agents—often masked and, in some documented cases, lacking visible identification—have conducted raid operations in public spaces and workplaces throughout the Southern California community, including in the City of Carpinteria; and

WHEREAS, a multitude of organizations throughout Southern California have sued the Department of Homeland Security and other federal agencies to allege a litany of violations under the United States Constitution and other federal laws for illegal immigration enforcement tactics; and

WHEREAS, the illegal immigration enforcement tactics used by the Department of Homeland Security and other federal agencies have involved aggressive tactics that appear to disproportionately impact Latino and immigrant communities, generating fear and negatively affecting the health, safety, and daily lives of those targeted and the community at large; and

WHEREAS, The City is a diverse community of people from a variety of cultural backgrounds, immigration statuses, socioeconomic backgrounds, and ethnicities, and recognizes the importance of supporting residents, workers, or visitors who may become the targets of federal raids; and

WHEREAS, many residents and families in the City of Carpinteria have expressed growing fear and concern about their safety and rights in light of the ongoing illegal immigration enforcement tactics; and

WHEREAS, the City Council acknowledges the uncertainty and fear expressed by many members of the community in response to increased federal immigration enforcement activity and recognizes its responsibility to speak out against illegal practices that undermine the well-being and cohesion of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY PROCLAIMED THAT:

1. All the recitals set forth above are true, correct, and valid; and
2. The City of Carpinteria will continue to uphold the California Values Act to ensure that all residents, workers, and visitors, regardless of immigration status, can engage with City services without fear of local enforcement actions based solely on immigration status; and
3. Copies of this Proclamation shall be posted on all outside public access doors of the City Hall and shall be provided to news media; and
4. This Proclamation shall be effective immediately and shall remain in effect until terminated by the City Council.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Mayor has hereunto set their hand and caused the official seal of the City of Carpinteria, California, to be affixed this 10th day of June, 2025.

ATTEST:

Brian C. Barrett, CMC, CPMC
City Clerk



Natalia Alarcon, Mayor
City of Carpinteria



City of Carpinteria

COUNCIL AGENDA STAFF REPORT

ITEM FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

Consider Appropriation of Funds for Response Efforts to Support the Local Immigrant Community

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Consider authorizing the appropriation of \$5,000 (or another dollar amount) from the General Fund to support nonprofit organizations serving residents impacted by recent federal immigration enforcement actions; and
2. Provide direction on priority criteria for the selection of nonprofit organizations to receive funding.

Sample Motion: I move to authorize the appropriation of \$5,000 from the General Fund to support nonprofit organizations serving residents impacted by recent federal immigration enforcement actions, and to direct staff to use the criteria outlined in the staff report to guide the selection of eligible organizations.

(The motion requires a roll call vote.)

BACKGROUND

In response to recent federal immigration enforcement activity conducted by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) within the City of Carpinteria, the City Council has convened a special meeting to consider a range of immediate actions to support the local immigrant community and others impacted by these events.

Community-based organizations and nonprofit partners are often the first point of contact for impacted individuals and are currently working to provide critical services, including legal support, resource navigation, and emergency assistance.

The purpose of this agenda item is for the City Council to consider appropriating funds from the General Fund to support nonprofit organizations providing legal assistance,

emergency aid, and outreach to residents impacted by recent immigration enforcement activity, and to establish criteria to guide the selection of eligible organizations.

DISCUSSION

To promote transparency and effective use of public funds, staff recommends the City Council consider establishing the following criteria to guide the selection of eligible nonprofit organizations. The list below is not presented in order of priority:

- **Direct Services:** Organizations providing case management, emergency financial support, food distribution, mental health services, or other direct assistance to impacted individuals and families.
- **Legal Assistance:** Organizations offering immigration-related legal services, including know-your-rights education, deportation defense, or legal representation.
- **Outreach and Education:** Organizations conducting culturally competent outreach to raise awareness of legal rights, public resources, and community safety planning.

Eligible organizations should have an existing presence in Carpinteria and the demonstrated capacity to respond quickly to community needs.

Should the Council authorize the appropriation, staff will coordinate a simplified, expedited funding allocation process to distribute funds.

POLICY CONSISTENCY

The recommended action advances Fiscal Year 2025/26-2026/27 Strategic Plan Goal No. 3: Enhance Quality of Life for Residents, specifically the objective to “Strengthen community institution collaboration.”

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed action would result in a one-time appropriation of \$5,000 (or another amount as determined by the City Council) in the Professional Services Acct.# 101-111-5201 from the General Fund available fund balance of \$1,076,890. Staff may return to the Council with recommendations for further appropriations if future needs are identified.

LEGAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The City Attorney participated in the drafting of this staff report. No legal concerns have been identified at this time.

OPTIONS

The City Council may consider the following options:

1. Approve the appropriation of \$5,000 from the General Fund and provide direction on priority criteria for selecting nonprofit organizations, as recommended by staff.
2. Modify the recommended amount of funding and/or revise the criteria for selection of nonprofit recipients.
3. Defer or decline to approve the appropriation and provide alternate direction to staff.

PRINCIPAL PARTIES EXPECTED AT MEETING

Representatives from nonprofit and community-based organizations that provide services to immigrant residents and others impacted by ICE activity are expected to attend the meeting and may speak during public comment.

ATTACHMENTS

None.

Staff contact:

Ryan Kintz, Assistant City Manager
(805) 755-4400; ryank@carpinteriaca.gov



Signature

Reviewed by:
Michael Ramirez, City Manager
(805) 755-4450; michaelr@carpinteriaca.gov



Signature



City of Carpinteria

COUNCIL AGENDA STAFF REPORT

ITEM FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

Consider additional City responses to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) activity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive a report on recent federal immigration enforcement activity in the community and provide direction to staff regarding additional actions the City may take in response.

Sample Motion: I move to direct staff to return with policies and action for the City Council to consider related to option(s) ____.

BACKGROUND

Given the recent escalations in ICE-related activity throughout the City and Southern California, the Carpinteria City Council requested staff to provide potential options for the City to consider in response to heightened federal immigration enforcement, including options that aim to protect the City’s public health, safety, welfare, and community cohesion.

Federal Immigration Enforcement and the California Values Act

In his first term, President Trump issued Executive Order 13768, *Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States* ([82 FR 8799](#)), which sought to strip “sanctuary jurisdictions” of federal funding unless deemed necessary for law enforcement purposes. The executive order defined a “sanctuary jurisdiction” as any jurisdiction that “willfully refuses to comply with 8 U.S.C. § 1373,” which provides that state and local governments cannot prevent the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services from receiving information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any individual. Particularly, 8 U.S.C. § 1373 governs only information sharing and does not extend to broader cooperation, such as assisting ICE in arrests. The statute does not require states or localities to actively participate in immigration enforcement; rather, it simply prohibits policies that restrict communication with federal immigration agencies.

California Values Act

After extensive litigation surrounding Executive Order 13768, California lawmakers enacted the California Values Act, which restricts state and local law enforcement agencies from using their resources to assist federal immigration enforcement, except in limited circumstances. Specifically, the California Values Act prohibits the use of personnel, facilities, equipment, or funds for immigration enforcement activities. However, it provides exceptions for cooperation in serious criminal cases, including (1) individuals convicted of serious or violent felonies (e.g., murder, rape, robbery), and (2) participation in joint task forces with federal agencies for criminal investigations not primarily focused on immigration enforcement. Notably, the California Values Act does not prevent ICE from operating within the state or halt deportations.

The Trump Administration sued California, arguing that SB 54 violated 8 U.S.C. § 1373¹ by restricting law enforcement from cooperating with ICE. However, in *United States v. California* (2019), the Ninth Circuit upheld SB 54, ruling that the federal government cannot force states to participate in federal immigration enforcement, reaffirming state sovereignty under the Tenth Amendment.² The Ninth Circuit ruled that “California has the right, pursuant to the anticommandeering rule [derived from the Tenth Amendment], to refrain from assisting with federal efforts.”³ When the prior Trump Administration asked the Supreme Court to review that decision, the Court denied the request, leaving the Ninth Circuit’s decision and SB 54 in place.

Current Immigration-Related Executive Orders and Presidential Proclamations, Lawsuits, and Immigration Enforcement Efforts

Since taking office for his second term on January 20, 2025, President Trump has issued several executive orders and proclamations aimed at immigration policies and citizenship, including: *Protecting the Meaning and Value of American Citizenship* (Executive Order 14160, [90 FR 8449](#)); *National Emergency Concerning the Southern Border of the United States* (Proclamation 9844, [90 FR 8327](#)); *Securing Our Borders* (Executive Order 14165, [90 FR 8467](#)); *Protecting the United States from Foreign Terrorists and Other National Security and Public Safety Threats* (Executive Order 14161, [90 FR 8451](#)); and *Protecting the American People Against Invasion* (Executive Order 14159, [90 FR 8443](#)).

These orders and proclamations have led to an increase in immigration enforcement efforts across the country, and again a focus on “sanctuary” jurisdictions. Specifically, Executive Order 14159 provides the following: “The Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security shall, to the maximum extent possible under law, evaluate and undertake any lawful actions to ensure that so-called ‘sanctuary’ jurisdictions, which seek

¹ 8 U.S.C. § 1373 is one of the original “anti-sanctuary” laws and was passed in 1996 before “sanctuary” was a common term, and states that no state or local official can prohibit any other state or local official from communicating immigration information to the federal government.

² *United States v. California* (9th Cir. 2019) 921 F.3d 865 available at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/9th_cir_ca_opinion%20SB%2054.pdf.

³ *Id.* at p. 873.

to interfere with the lawful exercise of Federal law enforcement operations, do not receive access to Federal funds.”⁴

On February 5, 2025, newly-confirmed U.S. Attorney General, Pam Bondi, issued a memo (the “Sanctuary City AG Memo”) stating that the sanctuary jurisdictions should not receive access to federal grants administered by the DOJ.⁵ Similar to some of the executive orders, the Sanctuary City AG Memo references the Supremacy Clause, stating that federal law trumps state and local law and invalidates any inconsistent state and local laws.

On February 6, 2025, the Trump Administration sued the state of Illinois, the city of Chicago, and Cook County for allegedly thwarting federal efforts to enforce immigration laws.⁶ The lawsuit seeks to invalidate state and local laws (the Way Forward Act, the TRUST Act, Chicago’s Welcoming City Act, and Cook County Ordinance 11-0-73), which the DOJ alleges are preempted by federal immigration law and impede the federal government’s ability to carry out its immigration enforcement activities.

On February 12, 2025, the U.S. Attorney General filed a lawsuit against the New York Governor, Kathy Hochul, and state Attorney General Letitia James over immigration enforcement.⁷ The lawsuit seeks to invalidate New York’s “Green Light Law,” which the DOJ alleged is preempted by federal immigration law and impedes the federal government’s ability to carry out its immigration enforcement activities.

On May 5, 2025, the America First Legal Foundation filed a lawsuit against the State of California, Governor Newsom, and Attorney General Bonta, seeking to invalidate the California Values Act and other state laws regarding immigration enforcement.⁸ In addition to arguing that the various state laws violate the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution and 8 U.S.C. § 1373, the lawsuit additionally argues that California’s state laws violate the Naturalization Clause,⁹ the First Amendment, and various other federal immigration laws. This litigation is ongoing, in addition to the other litigation described above.

Finally, on June 30, 2025, the Trump administration sued the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles City Council for allegedly thwarting federal efforts to enforce immigration

⁴ 90 FR 8443 (emphasis added).

⁵ Sanctuary Jurisdiction Directives (Feb. 05, 2025) available at <https://www.justice.gov/ag/media/1388531/dl?inline#:~:text=So-called%20sanctuary%20jurisdictions%22,other%20applicable%20federal%20immigration%20laws.>

⁶ February 06, 2025 Complaint, available at: <https://news.wttw.com/sites/default/files/article/file-attachments/gov.uscourts.ilnd.473062.1.0.pdf>.

⁷ February 12, 2025 Complaint, available at: <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/25524004-1-united-states-v/>.

⁸ May 05, 2025 Complaint, available at: <https://aflegal.org/press-release/america-first-legal-adds-riverside-county-sheriff-chad-bianco-as-plaintiff-in-lawsuit-against-gavin-newsom-and-the-state-of-california-to-end-illegal-alien-sanctuary-laws/>.

⁹ Article I, section 8, cl. 4 of U.S. Constitution.

laws.¹⁰ The lawsuit seeks to invalidate Los Angeles Ordinance No. 188441 (2024) (“Prohibition of the Use of City Resources for Federal Immigration Enforcement”), which generally prevents city law enforcement from participating in ICE raids or providing information to federal immigration agents, except in limited circumstances. This lawsuit alleges that the Los Angeles Ordinance is preempted by federal immigration law and impedes the federal government’s ability to carry out its immigration enforcement activities.

Recent Escalation in ICE-Related Activity in Southern California and the Central Coast

Since June 6, 2025, the federal administration has conducted ICE raids and other immigration-related enforcement activities throughout Southern California.¹¹ The raids have included stops and interrogations that have prompted concern and scrutiny, with some journalists and community observers raising questions whether these actions are being carried out based primarily on perceived racial or ethnic identity.¹² These operations have reportedly targeted both public and private locations such as: day laborer pickup corners;¹³ businesses such as car washes and recycling centers;¹⁴ farm and agricultural workers in Ventura, Santa Barbara, and Imperial Counties;¹⁵ and targeted public gathering spaces such as parks, farmers markets and swap meets,¹⁶ street vendors,¹⁷ and places of worship.¹⁸

During such raids, individuals have been documented and filmed approaching people suddenly and in large numbers, dressed in military-style or SWAT clothing and equipped

¹⁰ June 30, 2025 Complaint, available at: <https://www.justice.gov/opa/media/1406366/dl>.

¹¹ Elizabeth Findell, et al., *The White House Marching Orders That Sparked the L.A. Migrant Crackdown*, The Wall Street Journal (June 9, 2025).

¹² Brittany Mejia & Rachel Uranga, *Fears of racial profiling rise as Border Patrol conducts ‘roving patrols,’ detains U.S. Citizens*, L.A. Times (June 15, 2025).

¹³ Kaitlyn Huamani, *Home Depot caught in the crosshairs of L.A. immigration raids*, L.A. Times (June 9, 2025) (discussing how Home Depots across Southern California have been impacted by the immigration raids); Maanvi Singh, *At Home Depot, Ice raids terrorize the workers who helped build LA: “They just come and grab you”*, The Guardian (June 16, 2025); Pat Maio, *Home Depot’s day laborer haven turns into immigration target across Southern California*, L.A. Daily News (June 13, 2025) (listing multiple Home Depot locations in Los Angeles and Orange County where day laborers have been detained).

¹⁴ See, e.g., Ryan P. Cruz, *Immigration Enforcement Shakes Up Communities of Santa Barbara County*, Santa Barbara Independent (June 20, 2025); Emily Baumgaertner Nunn & Anushka Patil, *Carwashes become easy targets in California’s ICE raids*, N.Y. Times (June 11, 2025); Suhauna Hussain, *‘They are grabbing people.’ L.A. and Orange County car wash workers targeted by federal immigration raids*, L.A. Times (June 11, 2025).

¹⁵ E.g., Amy Taxin & Dorany Pineda, *Immigration Raids are threatening businesses that supply America’s food, farm bureaus say*, Associated Press (June 13, 2025).

¹⁶ Jasmine Mendez, et al., *Immigration raids continue as Trump appears to soften on targeting some workplaces*, L.A. Times (June 15, 2025) (“If you looked Hispanic in any way, they just took you.”).

¹⁷ Leanne Suter, *Community members try to help street vendor taken by federal agents in Ladera Heights, video shows*, ABC7 (June 27, 2025).

¹⁸ E.g., Ricardo Tovar, *LA County Officials Say ICE Agents Targeted Individuals at Churches*, KSBW8 (June 12, 2025), (“A council member confirmed that ICE conducted raids at a Home Depot, LA Fitness, and inside and outside of two churches in the city.”); Union del Barrio (@uniondelbarrio), Instagram (June 11, 2025); Vicent Medina, *Tensions high as immigration sweeps reach Downey churches*, The Downey Patriot (June 16, 2025).

with tactical gear.¹⁹ They are often masked and do not display visible identification, making it difficult to confirm their official status as federal agents.²⁰

These raids have also occurred within our own City. For example, the Coastal View News reported today that ICE agents detained three men in Carpinteria this week, according to the 805 Immigrant Coalition and the Carpinteria Immigrant Rights Coalition (“CIRC”).²¹ Two men were detained in the Carpinteria’s Smart and Final parking lot on Monday, July 7 around 7a.m. The other man was detained on July 8. During that incident, “plain clothes agents wearing police vests in unmarked vehicles detained a man and broke the driver’s side window of a white truck” near Eucalyptus Street and El Carro Lane. We are also getting reports that there was a large raid today right on City limits at a large agricultural operation.

Federal and constitutional requirements regarding ICE arrests

ICE agents, like all law enforcement officers, must comply with the Fourth Amendment, which protects individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures.²² ICE enforcement activities are further governed by the Department of Homeland Security’s regulations that reflect Fourth Amendment restrictions, such as those outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 287.8. These regulations require law enforcement to properly identify themselves during official operations and requires that ICE agents do the following:

At the time of the arrest, the designated immigration officer shall, as soon as it is practical and safe to do so:

(A) Identify himself or herself as an immigration officer who is authorized to execute an arrest; and

(B) State that the person is under arrest and the reason for the arrest.

8 C.F.R. § 287.8(c)(2)(iii).

While these regulations do not prohibit the use of face coverings, they do require proper identification “as soon as practical and safe to do so.” Additionally, officers that make warrantless arrests (i.e., during mass raids and not made on an individualized basis) must have probable cause to believe both that (1) the individual is violating an immigration law *and* (2) the individual is “likely to escape” before a warrant can be obtained.²³

¹⁹ L.A. Times, *Unidentified agents detain L.A. fruit vendor: ‘Like he’d been kidnapped’*, L.A. Times (June 12, 2025); Jesus Jiménez & Emily Baumgaertner Nunn, *Church Leaders Shaken After a Man was Detained in Their Parking Lot*, N.Y. Times (June 11, 2025).

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ Evalyn Spence, *ICE agents detain three Carpinteria men*, Coastal View News (July 10, 2025), available at: https://issuu.com/coastalview/docs/coastal_view_news_july_10_2025.

²² *Andrade-Tafolla v. United States*, 536 F. Supp. 3d 764, 773 (D. Or. 2021); see *Sanchez v. Sessions*, 904 F.3d 643, 651 (9th Cir. 2018) [under the Fourth Amendment, ICE agents “may not stop and briefly detain a person for investigative purposes ... unless they have reasonable suspicion supported by articulable facts that criminal activity may be afoot.”] [internal quotation marks and citations omitted].

²³ 8 C.F.R. § 1357(a)(2); § 287.8(c)(2)(ii) (same); *Tejeda-Mata v. INS*, 626 F.2d 721, 725 (9th Cir. 1980); see *Pedro Vasquez Perdomo v. Kristi Noem*, No. 2:25-cv-05605 (C.D. Cal.) (“Congress enacted a strong preference that

Additional state requirements regarding ICE arrests

In addition to the federal requirements described above, California state law includes several provisions in addition to the California Values Act, including but not limited to Gov. Code § 7285.1, which prohibits employers from voluntarily allowing ICE agents access to non-public areas of their workplaces or employee records without a judicial warrants, and Gov. Code § 7285.2, which prohibits employers from allowing ICE agents to access, review, or obtain the employer's employee records without a subpoena or judicial warrant.

DISCUSSION

The City Council unanimously passed Resolution No. 6372 on March 10, 2025 to confirm the City's commitment to the California Values Act (SB 54; Gov. Code § 7284 et seq.) requirements.²⁴ In addition to complying with the requirements of the California Values Act, the City provides "Know Your Rights" handouts at the local library and has resource information posted on the City website, and developed a formal guidance document for City staff and employees' engagement with federal law enforcement and ICE (Attachment A).

The following sections provides examples of additional actions taken by California jurisdictions in response to the recent federal immigration efforts. These include the following:

Legal Challenges to Recent ICE Activity

On July 2, 2025, the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU") and Public Counsel filed a class action lawsuit against the Trump administration, arguing that its ongoing use of force during the ICE raids in Southern California violate the Constitution and federal law and seeking injunctive and declaratory relief.²⁵

On July 9, 2025, the City of Los Angeles, in addition to Los Angeles County and the cities of Pasadena, Santa Monica, Culver City, Pico Rivera, Montebello, Monterey Park, and West Hollywood, filed to join the ACLU lawsuit as intervenors in the case.²⁶ This lawsuit challenging the administration's immigration raids happens simultaneously as Los

immigration arrests be based on warrants. See *Arizona v. U.S.*, 567 U.S. 387, 407–08 (2012). The Immigration and Nationality Act thus provides immigration agents with only limited authority to conduct warrantless arrests. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a)(2). Federal regulations track the strict limitations on warrantless arrests. See 8 C.F.R. § 287.8(c)(2)(ii)."

²⁴ See Item 12 on March 10, 2025 city Council Agenda, available at:

https://carpinteria.granicus.com/player/clip/1598?view_id=2&meta_id=101832&redirect=true.

²⁵ July 02, 2025 Complaint, available at: <https://publiccounsel.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Vasquez-Perdomo-v-Noem-First-Amended-Petition-and-Complaint.pdf>.

²⁶ *Los Angeles joins ACLU lawsuit against Trump's immigration raids*, Reuters (July 9, 2025):

<https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/los-angeles-joins-aclu-lawsuit-against-trumps-immigration-raids-2025-07-09/>.

Angeles defends its Ordinance preventing use of city resources for federal immigration enforcement against legal challenge by the Trump administration.

Ordinances and Resolutions

Several local jurisdictions throughout Southern California have adopted ordinances, resolutions, or proclamations/statements regarding the recent immigration raids. Examples include:

- **City of Huntington Park**²⁷: On June 21, 2025, Huntington Park Mayor issued a statement condemning what he called “masked abduction” and directing police to intervene in unlawful and unauthorized operations. On June 26, 2025, the City of Huntington Park unanimously approved a resolution directing the Huntington Police Department to take steps to ensure transparency and public safety by verifying the clear identification of federal immigration agents operating within the city’s jurisdiction.²⁸ On July 8, 2025, the city unanimously passed a “Sanctuary City Ordinance” (Ordinance No. 2025-06) designating the city as a “sanctuary city” and prohibiting the use of any facilities in Huntington Park by ICE unless required by law and prohibiting use of local law enforcement or any city resources for compliance with ICE or other federal agents.²⁹
- **City of Downey**³⁰: As of July 8, 2025, the City of Downey is considering various measures, including³¹:
 - (1) passing a resolution calling upon federal officials to demand ICE agents follow federal and constitutional law, directing the city to maintain “Know Your Rights” materials and other resources, calling upon nonprofit organizations and businesses to support those impacted by ICE raids, and committing to fund and implement programs and partnerships to support the wellbeing of those at risk due to federal immigration enforcements; and
 - (2) passing an ordinance updating the city’s municipal code to prohibit the use of personal disguises, prohibits the use of masks or personal disguises by “law enforcement officers” within the city; requires law enforcement officers to be properly identified; and orders the City police department to establish a specialized unit to investigate reported incidents of individuals impersonating law enforcement officers, including ICE and FBI agents, and

²⁷ City of Huntington Park FY 25 total adopted revenue budget is \$93,431,680 (see <https://www.hpca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/11905/Adopted-FY-2026-Main-City-Budget?bidId=>) and population is 52,166 as of July 1, 2024 (see

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/huntingtonparkcitycalifornia/PST045223>).

²⁸ <https://hpca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/11884/HP-Reaffirming-Commitment-Resolution-English-1>.

²⁹ <https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/huntington-park-passes-sanctuary-ordinance/3741348/>.

³⁰ The City of Downey 2024-2025 budget contained appropriations limit of \$84,435,500 (see And population is 109,368 as of July 1, 2024 (see

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/downeycitycalifornia,huntingtonparkcitycalifornia/PST045224>).

³¹ <https://www.thedowneypatriot.com/articles/downey-considers-100k-relief-package-for-families-hit-by-ice-raids>.

develop reporting and investigation protocols. The ordinance would authorize the city to bring criminal charges against persons found to be impersonating law enforcement officers under Penal Code Sections 146a (impersonating a peace officer) 538d (unauthorized wearing of law enforcement uniform) and 532 (false pretenses).

- **City of Ventura**³²: On June 27, 2025, the City of Ventura passed the “CARE Policy” (Community Autonomy, Rights, and Equality Policy)³³ expressing support for existing protections for undocumented immigrants under state law, including the California Values Act and other state laws being targeting in the lawsuit challenging California’s sanctuary laws.
- **City of Mountain View**³⁴: The city made a statement declaring the city a “Community for All”³⁵ and declaring in a social media post³⁶ that Mountain View Police Department does not ask about immigration statuses of any crime victims, witnesses, or others who contact the city for help.

Earmarking Funds for Immigration Services Organizations

In addition to the proposed and/or adopted resolutions or ordinances above, the City of Downey is proposing to earmark \$100,000 for community organizations. Additionally, Huntington Park has established its HP With You Program,³⁷ which has allocated \$150,000 to support families impacted by immigration raids with legal aid, food distribution, and fund Know Your Rights campaigns.

City-Sponsored Immigration Resource Workshops

Other cities have also hosted immigration resource workshops. For example, on June 30, 2025, the City of Moorpark hosted a resources workshop regarding Know Your Rights and connecting individuals to legal services at City Hall, with approximately 70 members of the public in attendance and 30 people watching live online.³⁸

³² City of Ventura Citywide Budget is \$531 million for FY 2025 and the estimated population is 110,358 (see <https://www.cityofventura.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/41116/FY-2025-Adopted-Budget-in-Brief-PDF>).

³³ <https://keyt.com/news/local-politics/2025/06/26/ventura-city-council-passes-care-policy-in-a-6-to-1-vote/>.

³⁴ City of Mountain View predicted budget (operating balance) is approximately \$232,000 (see <https://www.mountainview.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/11376/638840353766730000>) and its population is approximately 87,316 as of July 1, 2024 (see <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/mountainviewcitycalifornia,US/PST045224>).

³⁵ <https://www.mountainview.gov/Home/Components/News/News/1086/284>.

³⁶ https://www.instagram.com/p/DKS_hYxuwGl/.

³⁷ <https://hpca.gov/876/HP-With-You-HP-Contigo>.

³⁸ <https://moorparkca.gov/1222/Immigration-Resources-and-Contacts>.

Proposed State and Federal Legislation

In addition to the actions taken by municipalities outlined above, there have been multiple bills at both the federal and state levels that have been introduced to require more transparency around ICE officer identification. These include:

Bill	Authors	Summary	Links
California			
No Secret Police Act (SB 627)	Senators Scott Wiener (D-San Francisco) and Jesse Arreguín (D-Berkeley)	This bill prohibits law enforcement officers at all levels (local, state, and federal) from covering their faces during operations in California. It also requires officers to wear uniforms or badges that clearly identify them by name or other official identifier. Exceptions: SWAT teams, medical-grade masks (e.g., N95s), and protective gear used during wildfires or health emergencies.	• Bill text • Press release
No Vigilantes Act (SB 805)	Introduced by Senators Pérez and Wiener (Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Elhawary) (Coauthors: Senators Arreguín and Gonzalez) (Coauthor: Assembly Member Lee)	Seeks to strengthen California’s laws against impersonation of law enforcement and other public safety officials by expanding the definition of impersonation and increasing penalties. The bill also requires all law enforcement officers—including federal agents and contractors operating in California—to visibly display a name or badge number during official duties, and mandates that vendors verify a buyer’s affiliation before selling official uniforms or badges. It further prohibits bounty hunters from engaging in immigration enforcement and from disclosing a defendant’s immigration status. Exceptions: undercover work does not have to visibly display a name or badge number during official duties.	• Bill text • Press release
Federal			
ICE Security Reform Act (H.R. 673 (2025))	Rep. Robert Garcia (D-CA)	The reform would allow Homeland Security Investigations (“HIS”) to focus on public safety, law enforcement, and national security missions independently from ICE, with increased oversight and accountability. ICE would continue to operate as a smaller agency.	• Bill text • Press release
The VISIBLE Act	Senators Cory Booker (D-NJ), Alex Padilla (D-CA), Patty Murray (D-WA)	Aims to improve transparency and public trust in immigration enforcement by requiring officers—including those from ICE and CBP—to display clearly visible identification, such as their agency name and badge number, during public-facing operations. It also prohibits non-medical face coverings that obscure identity, except in cases involving environmental hazards or covert operations. The bill does not limit	• Bill text • One-pager of bill • Press release

		enforcement authority but ensures the public can identify who is exercising federal immigration power in their communities.	
--	--	---	--

Additionally, the City of Downey has proposed to update the city’s legislative platform to include advocacy for immigration reform, including writing advocacy letters in support of proposed immigration reform to be sent to the city’s congressional representatives.

POLICY CONSISTENCY

This agenda item is consistent with the City of Carpinteria’s Mission Statement by supporting transparency, equity, and public participation in local governance. By exploring legally compliant options in response to recent federal immigration enforcement activity, the City aims to protect public safety, maintain community cohesion, and ensure the judicious use of resources in a manner that reflects community needs. The discussion of potential policies or partnerships also reinforces the City’s commitment to inclusive service delivery, the protection of residents’ rights, and collaboration with trusted community institutions. These actions align with the City’s long-standing values of serving all residents equitably and fostering an open, informed, and participatory decision-making process.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The U.S. Attorney General Bondi’s Sanctuary City AG Memo aims to prohibit any “sanctuary jurisdictions” from accessing federal grants administered by the DOJ. While the City itself has not identified itself as a sanctuary jurisdiction, further actions could put the City at risk of being unable to access federal funding. Litigation related to sanctuary jurisdictions is ongoing and it is still unclear whether funding will be frozen in California jurisdictions.

That being said, compliance with state law is required. Staff’s recommendations align with state law mandates, the California Values Act, and other laws.

Any funds appropriated for services will come from the City’s available fund balance, depending on what option the Council chooses to pursue.

LEGAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The City Attorney’s Office will be in attendance at the meeting to provide additional guidance answer any questions that arise.

OPTIONS

Provide direction to staff.

PRINCIPAL PARTIES EXPECTED AT MEETING

Following ICE and National Guard enforcement actions earlier today at the Glass House Farms cannabis facility on Casitas Pass Road there is expected to be a significant presence of community members, including impacted residents, workers, and advocacy group representatives.

Key groups anticipated include:

- **Affected individuals and family members**, especially those directly impacted by today's and other Carpinteria raids.
- **Local advocacy and service organizations**, and other nonprofits that provide legal, resource, and emergency support for immigrant residents.
- **Other Public officials** such as local, state, and federal representatives or their staff.

ATTACHMENTS

A. ICE Interaction Reference Memo Distributed to City Staff

Reviewed by:

Ryan Kintz, Assistant City Manager
(805) 755-4400; ryank@carpinteriaca.gov



Signature

Reviewed by: Michael Ramirez, City Manager
(805) 755-4450, michaelr@carpinteriaca.gov



Signature

ATTACHMENT A



City of Carpinteria

April 29, 2025

***Internal Communication Distributed to
City of Carpinteria Staff and Employees***

Dear City Staff and Employees,

We understand that the possibility of increased activity by federal immigration enforcement has raised concerns among both City staff and residents.

The California Values Act was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown on October 5, 2017, and took effect on January 1, 2018 to ensure that state and local resources are not spent to support mass deportations, separate families, or compromise public safety by undermining trust between immigrant communities and local government. The City has historically upheld the California Values Act, ensuring that all residents, regardless of immigration status, can engage with City services without fear of local enforcement actions based solely on immigration status. Additionally, during a City Council meeting dated February 10, 2025, the City of Carpinteria's Chief of Police Services, Rich Brittingham, stated that the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office is familiar and complies with the California Values Act. Further, on March 10, 2025, City Council reaffirmed the City's commitment to compliance with the California Values Act (SB 54) requirements.

To further support City staff and employees, we have worked with our City Attorney's Office to develop the attached document (**Attachment A**) to provide guidance on how to respond if federal law enforcement officials and/or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") agents ("Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents") arrive at City public buildings and facilities.

General tips and reminders:

- ICE can access areas open to the public (e.g., lobbies, public service counters, council chambers during open meetings). ICE cannot access **non-public areas**, except where permitted or required by law.
- ICE can review or request public records that are routinely available to the public.
- Please remember that all staff have the personal right to remain silent if Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents ask personal questions or questions that are not related to your official job duties. (For example: If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents enter a city building and ask, "*Does anyone live near here who wasn't born in this country?*" — you are not required to answer.
- We do not share **non-public** information related to City residents, staff, or employees except where disclosure is permitted or required by law.
- Almost none of our public programs collect information on immigration status.

- Personal information collected by the city on residents, staff, and employees should always be out of view (desks, tables) when you are not using it to perform a specific task.
- If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents arrive at your workplace, please notify your immediate supervisor immediately.
- Please defer any requests to search the facility or provide information until your immediate supervisor arrives.

Taking care of you: Recent communications about changes in enforcement priorities have been stressful and anxiety-provoking for many of us. We want to remind you that the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) offers free, confidential counseling and resources. You can reach them by phone at 1 (800) 367-7474.

We are grateful for your work, especially during these challenging times. Together, the City will navigate this time of change as a community in order to stay focused on protecting the rights, liberties, and freedoms of Carpinteria residents, workers, and visitors, regardless of color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, immigration status, national origin, race, ethnicity, and/or English proficiency.

Sincerely,



Michael Ramirez
City Manager

Attachment A

GUIDE FOR INTERACTIONS WITH FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND/OR U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT (ICE) AGENTS

The following reference guide provides guidance on how to respond if you encounter Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents during work or on City property. For additional guidance or if you have any questions, please call your immediate supervisor.¹

1. **NOTIFY City personnel.** Immediately notify your immediate supervisor. In the event you cannot get into contact with your immediate supervisor, notify the City Attorney.
 - Ask Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents to wait for a moment, and let them know that you must notify your immediate supervisor of their arrival.
2. **Ask if the Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents have a warrant:**
 - No warrant: You are not required to provide Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents access to **non-public areas** to arrest or search. You are not required to give Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents any information except information that is routinely available to the public. You may ask Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents to leave if they are requesting **non-public** information or access to **non-public** areas.
 - If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents presents a warrant: Go to Step 3.
 - If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents presents a subpoena or Notice to Appear (“NTA”): Go to Step 4.
3. **If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents show you a warrant:**
 - Is it a judicial warrant?
 - Issued by “U.S. District Judge” or “U.S. Magistrate Judge” from “U.S. District Court.”
 - You are required to comply with a judicial warrant and must allow Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents to search.
 - Is it an administrative warrant?
 - Issued by “Department of Homeland Security,” “Immigration Judge,” or “Immigration Officer.”
 - You are not required to provide access to **non-public areas** to arrest or search. You are not required to give Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents any information except information that is routinely available to the public. You may ask Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents to leave if they are requesting **non-public** information or access to **non-public** areas.
4. **If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents show you a subpoena or NTA:**
 - Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents’ Subpoenas:
 - This is a document requesting that the city turn over documents or evidence. The subpoena will contain the following information: file number, subpoena number, mailing address to which to mail the requested information, a list of the regulations that apply, the request for information, and the signature(s) of the agent(s).
 - You do not need to provide documents on the spot (unless these documents are routinely available immediately to the public) and are not required to give Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents consent to search.
 - Provide the subpoena to your immediate supervisor.

¹ Under the California Values Act (Gov. Code §§ 7284–7284.12), California state and local agencies are prohibited from using public resources to assist federal immigration enforcement, except in very limited circumstances. Additional information on the [California Values Act](#) can be found here.

- Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents' Notice to Appear ("NTA"):
 - This is a document notifying a person of removal proceedings. An NTA contains allegations about a person's immigration status and notifies an individual that he or she is expected to appear before an immigration judge on a certain date.
 - You are not required to provide access to **non-public areas** to arrest or search. You are not required to give Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents any information except information that is routinely available to the public. You may ask Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents to leave if they are requesting **non-public** information or access to **non-public** areas.

5. **If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents begin questioning you about immigration-related details:**

- All City staff and employees have the right to remain silent and not answer questions from Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents when outside your job duties/responsibilities. If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents enter a City building and ask, "*Does anyone live near here who wasn't born in this country?*" — you are not required to answer. You may say: "*I'm not authorized to speak on that. Let me connect you with my immediate supervisor [or our City Attorney].*"
- If you are unsure whether a question pertains to your job duties, or you feel uncomfortable, you may state: "*I'm not comfortable answering questions without speaking to my supervisor [or our City Attorney].*"

6. **If Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents demand access after you tell them you do not consent:**

- Do not physically interfere with Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents.
- Say: "*I do not consent to officers entering non-public areas [or non-public information] without a warrant.*"
- Immediately call your immediate supervisor or the City Attorney.
- Document all of Federal Law Enforcement and/or ICE Agents' actions (including names, badge numbers, and purpose of visit) and **non-public** areas/information that they forced entry to, if safe to do so. Submit documented information to your immediate supervisor and the City Attorney.