

FACT SHEET

WHAT WE LEARNED ABOUT INTERIOR ENFORCEMENT FROM TRUMP 1.0

29 JAN 2025

The first Trump administration implemented aggressive and expansive immigration enforcement strategies, many of which set new precedents that could inform future actions in a second term. Programs like 287(g) agreements saw a dramatic [increase of over 260%](#) during his term, fostering closer cooperation between local authorities and federal immigration enforcement agencies. Federal-local partnerships under programs like Secure Communities facilitated widespread deportations, while workplace enforcement actions and large-scale detention operations became hallmarks of the administration's approach. Additionally, the administration sought to incentivize compliance by tying federal funding to participation in immigration enforcement programs and penalizing states and localities that resisted. These strategies created profound disruptions for families and communities, trends that are expected to continue or expand during Trump's second term.

WHAT WERE SOME OF THE TOOLS USED DURING THE FIRST TRUMP TERM TO INCREASE DEPORTATIONS?

The first Trump administration kicked off its term by setting an [expansive immigration enforcement agenda](#), which among other things moved the DHS away from the tailored use of limited enforcement resources on the most serious national security and public safety threats. Instead, Trump's approach seemed to focus on creating chilling effects in immigrant communities – in a misguided effort to convince immigrants to leave the U.S. – through showy enforcement operations. A case in point were the dramatic increase of highly visible worksite enforcement actions (colloquially known as “worksite raids” in immigrant communities). Between October 1, 2017, and May 4, 2018, ICE conducted 60% more employer audits than the previous year, resulting in the arrest of over 1,100 largely undocumented workers. These operations were not limited to major urban areas but also targeted small rural towns in the southeastern U.S., where ICE made [mass arrests](#), sometimes exceeding 100 individuals in a single worksite raid.

Another area of increased enforcement activity during the first Trump term was in the expansion of so-called “collateral arrests.” This approach involved arresting unauthorized immigrants who happened to be present during a targeted ICE enforcement action, even if they weren't the primary target of the operation. In many instances these individuals did not have any criminal incidents. Indeed, between FY2016 and FY2017, ICE interior removals of people without criminal convictions [nearly tripled](#) from 5,014 to 13,744, respectively.

The next Trump term would likely build on these lessons, with even more aggressive policies aimed at expanding the scope of deportations. The political climate under a second Trump administration would likely push for further militarization of immigration enforcement, with federal support for state and local cooperation growing, as seen through the expansion of programs like 287(g). These strategies, combined with the rhetoric of a tougher immigration policy, would signal a more aggressive stance towards immigrants, ensuring that deportation policies reach far beyond the criminal population, affecting millions of families across the country.

WHAT MIGHT BE DIFFERENT IN A SECOND TRUMP ADMINISTRATION?

In its early days, the second Trump administration is already pursuing an even more aggressive and far-reaching approach to immigration enforcement. It has brought more people within the scope of deportation by ending

enforcement prioritization, terminating parole processes from the previous administration, and liberalizing immigration enforcement in so traditional protected spaces like schools, hospitals, and places of worship. The Trump DOJ has also signaled its intent to sue states with sanctuary policies as part of its strategy to accelerate and expand the role of state and local police in immigration enforcement. Meanwhile, legal preemption doctrines that traditionally limit state encroachment on federal immigration authority may be tested as states like [Texas](#) and [Arizona](#) which have advanced legislation enabling local officials to enforce federal immigration laws.

The administration has also directed its agencies to make preparation in the event President Trump decided to invoke the [Alien Enemies Act](#) as well as declaring a [national emergency](#) to expedite immigration policy goals by leveraging military assets. These measures could target immigrants based on nationality or allow the use of federal troops for immigration enforcement under the guise of suppressing unrest or securing borders. Such actions would be unprecedented in modern times and would likely face legal challenges, but they underscore the administration's willingness to leverage extraordinary powers to achieve its objectives. Together, these strategies signal a shift toward a more centralized and militarized approach to immigration enforcement, with far-reaching implications for states, localities, and immigrant communities.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ON SECTORS OF THE ECONOMY?

Immigration enforcement actions under the first Trump administration had significant repercussions for various sectors of the economy. Industries heavily reliant on immigrant labor, such as agriculture, construction, and hospitality, faced [acute workforce shortages](#). These disruptions were exacerbated by workplace raids that not only removed employees but also generated fear that discouraged undocumented workers from remaining in the area. Additionally, economic instability rippled into local housing markets. Many households with mortgages—[an estimated 1.2 million](#)—relied on the income of at least one undocumented individual. Deportations often removed primary earners, destabilizing families and increasing foreclosure rates. For example, in 42 counties with 287(g) agreements, Latino households experienced nearly [70% higher foreclosure rates](#) compared to similar counties without such partnerships. The economic consequences from immigration enforcement actions of the first Trump administration highlight the interconnectedness of immigration policy, labor markets, and community stability.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ON AMERICAN FAMILIES?

The Trump administration's immigration enforcement policies profoundly affected American families, particularly those in mixed-status households. Between [4.1 and 5.7 million](#) U.S.-citizen children live with an undocumented parent, and nearly 475,000 children are at risk of family separation if programs like DACA and TPS are eliminated. This vulnerability disrupts family cohesion and imposes lasting psychological and economic burdens on children. For example:

- ▶ Educational displacement has been significant. Research shows that Latino student enrollment in schools drops by [nearly 10%](#) within two years of localities entering into 287(g) agreements with ICE.
- ▶ An increase in immigration enforcement also has a negative impact on students' academic performance, with a recent survey finding a "9% average [decline in English Language Arts scores](#) for Latinx English learners," in communities experiencing increased immigration arrests.
- ▶ "Nearly [90 percent of school administrators](#) representing over 730 schools in 12 states noted observing behavioral or emotional problems with their students," problems that appear to be connected to concerns about immigration enforcement.
- ▶ Fear of immigration enforcement also has a negative impact on the mental health of young Latinos, with a [report](#) finding that 58% of high school students surveyed met the threshold for PTSD, with much of their mental distress related to fear of immigration enforcement.
- ▶ Immigration enforcement causes significant economic challenges; it's estimated that in families affected by detention or removal, the [median household income is reduced](#) between 19 and 47%.

- ▶ Another study found that “Mexican non-citizen households with children living in an area with a 287(g) agreement are [10% more likely to experience food insecurity](#) than similar families in areas without a 287(g) agreement.

Together, these effects reveal a sobering picture of the long-term impacts on children’s health, education, and economic stability.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO PROTECT COMMUNITIES FROM THE HARSHNESS OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT?

To mitigate the effects of aggressive immigration enforcement, communities can pursue several strategies. Policymakers can resist federal attempts to tie funding to immigration enforcement and oppose expansions of programs like 287(g). Local jurisdictions can adopt [sanctuary policies](#) or limit participation in enforcement partnerships to shield vulnerable populations. Legal actions are critical in challenging civil rights violations, such as racial profiling and unlawful detentions. Additionally, providing resources to impacted families, including legal aid, mental health services, and financial support, can help offset the immediate harms of enforcement actions. Education and healthcare systems also require targeted protections, as Latino students and families face significant displacement and reduced participation due to enforcement-driven fears. Highlighting the economic contributions of undocumented individuals and advocating for family unity are essential to shaping policies that prioritize community stability over punitive enforcement. By pursuing these measures, communities can foster trust and resilience even amid heightened immigration enforcement.