

Extended Abstract

(Note: this research work is only preliminary. Please do not cite without the permission of the authors).

The Effects of 287(g) and Sanctuary City Agreements on the Foreign-Born Population in the United States

Nadia Y. Flores-Yeffal (Texas Tech University) & Maria Aysa-Lastra (Winthrop University),
(Hanna Spevak, Winthrop University).

Introduction:

In this study we explore the effects of anti-immigrant polices in the foreign-born population such as the adoption of section 287 (g) which allows local police officers to arrest immigrants and process them for deportation as if they were immigration officers or ICE (Immigration and Custom Enforcement) agents. Using census and American Community Survey data, we compare the social and economic characteristics of the foreign-born population (citizens and non-citizens) who live in counties which have adopted section 287 (g) to those who live in adjacent counties with similar number of residents and to urban areas which have declared their localities as sanctuary cities. Through this exercise, we also test the theory of migration-trust networks (Flores-Yeffal 2013) which argues that undocumented immigrants segregate themselves to cope with their unlawful status and experience social and economic disadvantage. These isolated immigrant communities are prevented by uneven local policies from experiencing assimilation, such as learning English, or leaving their labor niches.

Literature Review:

The anti-immigrant sentiment in the United States has been on the rise during the past few decades (Massey, Pren & Durand 2016; Flores-Yeffal, Vidales & Martinez 2017). One of the most important anti-immigrant pieces of legislation was written together with the Welfare Care Act of 1996, this is (IIRAIRA), The Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act before 1996, it was only the job of the federal government to enforce immigration laws until section 287 (g) was written as part of IIRAIRA.

287 (g):

Section 287(g) allowed for the first-time collaboration between the federal government and local police departments to enforce immigration laws. If the local authorities signed a local (287 (g)) memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the federal government, then the police officers from that locality could receive training and work under the supervision of ICE (the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement which worked under the office of Homeland Security). These ICE agents provide these local police officers with the authorization to identify, process and arrest or detain (when appropriate) immigration offenders, that they encountered during their daily law enforcement activity, even if there was no other probable cause for their arrest. In

other words, these police officers were trained to act as ICE officers and be able to execute an immigration arrest (Wong 2012). According to Wong (2012), in the year 2012 there were already 63 active (287 (g)) agreements operating in twenty different states in the United States in which a total of 849 local police officers participated in the program. Previous research has found that local decisions by authorities and the urgency of local immigration control efforts is not necessarily related to local crime rates, but instead, it is driven by political factors (Wong 2012).

Sanctuary cities:

At the same time, Sanctuary cities (or towns) emerged across the United States. These sanctuary cities “opted against honoring immigration detainers” (Benenson 2016). Since 1950’s given that only federal agents were allowed to make immigration related arrests, the federal government ordered local police departments to execute what is called, immigration detainers. Through these detainers local police would hold those people they had arrested for other non-immigration violation (s) , and who also were suspects of an immigration violation once in custody or it was “determined that there is reason to believe the individual is an alien subject to removal from the United States” (Benenson 2016), for a period of 48 hours, so the ICE agents could come and verify the immigration status of the individual. If the individual then was not able to provide a proof of their lawful presence in the United States, then the ICE agents would take the individual into custody and process the individual for deportation and/or other immigration violations. The local police departments would process this immigration detainer using the form DHS Form I-247 (Benenson 2016).The difference with current implementation of 287(g) MOUs is that local officials can detain unauthorized immigrants for minor non-criminal violations, like traffic violations, and immediately process the individuals for immigration violations and hand the individuals to ICE, regardless to whether there was a probable cause against the individual or not. Therefore, under the jurisdiction of counties that have adopted the 287 (g) being exposed to the police would be considered the same as being exposed to immigration agents (or ICE agents). The local authorities in these counties, which declared themselves as sanctuary cities argued that there was no reason to detain or hold an individual longer if there was no probable cause against the individual. Many counties also ordered their police officers to never detain an individual only for the reason of suspecting that the individual was unlawfully present in the United States. We found that most of the counties or cities declared themselves Sanctuary cities after the summer of 2014 as a result of a couple of court cases ((Miranda-Olivares v. Clackamas County)¹ & (Galarza V. Szalczyk))² in which the defendants claimed that they were not unlawfully in the United States when the immigration detainer was used against them. Specifically, the ruling of the United States District Court of Oregon in the Miranda-Olivares v. Clackamas County case indicated that the 4th amendment

¹ Sample memorandum citing this court case:

https://www.ilrc.org/sites/default/files/resources/la_habra_ca_0.pdf

² Statement from ACLU citing court case can be found in this link <https://www.aclu.org/cases/immigrants-rights/galarza-v-szalczyk>

civil rights of the offender were violated³. Some of these counties or cities decided that it was too risky for their entities to uphold immigration detainers. Others just decided that they were not going to uphold the immigration detainers because they wanted to keep a good relationship with the immigrant population who lived in those counties. They wanted the immigrant population to have a good relationship and cooperate in non-immigration related cases with the local police. We found that by 2016 there were over 120 counties nationwide who had declared themselves as Sanctuary cities (each of the declarations can be found here <https://www.ilrc.org/detainer-policies>).

Therefore, as we can see while some counties around the United States are cooperating with the federal government to detain and process immigrants who are unlawfully present in the United States (those who have 287 (g) MOUs), at the same time, we also have another large number of counties who have declared their counties as sanctuary cities and aim to ignore the immigration detainers and protect the immigrant population from immigration arrests and deportations in their areas of jurisdiction. In our search, we found that some counties and cities that signed 287(g) MOUs around 2008, declared themselves sanctuary cities in or after 2014.

At the same time, no solution has been given to the estimated more than 12 million undocumented immigrants who are unlawfully living in the United States as they have been facing an immigration system in which their possibility to legalize their immigration status is almost non-existent (Flores-Yeffal 2018). Most of these individuals have zero possibilities to legalize their immigration status given that most of the immigration laws only favors those immigrants with very high skills and/or extraordinary abilities, or family reunification⁴ for example (Flores-Yeffal 2018).

Migration-Trust Networks

Recent work on undocumented settlement and social networks has argued that undocumented immigrants live in segregated settlements and develop dense networks or migration-trust networks (MTNs) to cope with their undocumented status (Flores-Yeffal 2013). Unfortunately, while this migration-trust networks may be helpful for their settlement process and for finding housing and jobs, living in these migration-trust networks can also be detrimental

³ The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution is part of the Bill of Rights that prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures. It requires "reasonable" governmental searches and seizures to be conducted only upon issuance of a warrant, judicially sanctioned by probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized. Under the Fourth Amendment, search and seizure should be limited in scope according to specific information supplied to the issuing court, usually by a law enforcement officer who has sworn by it.

⁴ Also, as a result of IIRAIRA in 1996 those undocumented individuals who had entered the United States without inspection were subject to a ban for up to 10 years outside the United States regardless to whether the individuals qualified for family reunification under previous immigration law (such as being married to a U.S. citizen). Therefore, those undocumented immigrants who entered the country without inspection after 1996 were unable to regularize their immigration status under the family reunification law until after spending 10 years outside of the United States in their home country and also only after asking for a pardon from the United States consulate from their country of origin (Gubernskaya & Derby 2017).

to their social and economic upward mobility and assimilation process. Flores-Yeffal argues that these undocumented immigrants will never be able to fully integrate themselves into the American society as European migrants once did. This is due to the fact that most European migrants were able to regularize their status in the US once they were processed through Ellis Island, while these more recent immigrants don't have a means to regularize their immigration status in the U.S. The Dreamers (or DACA) recipients can serve as a good example. These undocumented youth have been living in the United States for most of their lives as they arrived as children. They were raised in the U.S. attending U.S. schools and speaking English. Many even already attended college, but they cannot experience full upward social and economic mobility because their immigration status still in a limbo (Gonzales 2016)). Flores-Yeffal (2013) argues that as long as undocumented immigrants are not able to obtain a way to acquire legal documents, they are going to be forced to continue living inside the migration-trust networks in which they find a safety net to cope with their lack of legal status. Flores-Yeffal (2013) argues that as long as these undocumented immigrants live in migration-trust network, they will be less likely to learn English, to get better jobs (find jobs outside the immigrant niches), and to move out of those segregated communities as the Europeans did once they were able to integrate themselves into the American society in the past.

Thesis statement:

In this study we analyze Census 2000, Census 2010 and American Community Survey 2016 (5yr) data to explore how the foreign-born population in the United States is being affected, or benefited by living in those localities who have either signed 287 (g) MOUs, live in similar localities that neither have not signed 287(g) MOUs nor have declared themselves as sanctuaries, or by living in counties in which their local authorities have declared their localities as sanctuary cities? We want to explore social and economic variables at three points in time, in 2000 before the signature of many 287(g) MOUs as baseline, in 2010 after the signature of 287(g) MOUs and in 2016 after the *Miranda-Olivares v. Clackamas County* case ruling that sparked the emergence of sanctuary cities. Therefore, this is a longitudinal study in which we compare the social and economic county level average indicators of the foreign born population through time and between four different type of counties, 1) those who have signed the 287 (g) MOUs, 2) those who have declared their counties as sanctuary cities, 3) some counties which we have selected as controls (who have done neither one) but that they look very similar to those who have adopted the 287 (g) in each state, 4) those counties which once had signed 287 (g) MOUs, but later decided to become sanctuary cities.

Given that studies have shown that anti-immigrant laws and anti-immigrant discrimination affects not just those who are undocumented, but that the anti-immigrant sentiment is spread to the entire foreign-born population (see Flores-Yeffal et al. 2017), therefore, we believe that these laws and sanctuary city declarations would affect all the foreign born residents living in those localities regardless of their immigration status (undocumented or not). In our analysis we do separate analysis of the foreign-born citizens (those who have naturalized their status) and non-citizens.

An additional concern that this paper pursues is the drivers and likelihood that county authorities sign 287(g) MOUs. We argue that this instrument is a tool to implement local-anti immigrant policies with substantial negative consequences for the immigrant communities regardless of any objective measurement of increased criminal activity that would result in increasing law enforcement activities.

Hypotheses:

H 1: Given the theory of migration-trust networks, we expect to find that those who live in localities that have signed 287 (g) MOUs are less likely to experience upward mobility through time than those living in control counties or in sanctuary cities. We measure average county indicators for variables such as, income, and poverty levels, house ownership, and language isolation among others.

H 2: We also expect to find that compared with the other two type of counties, those who have been living in places in which first they had 287 (g) and then later they adopted a sanctuary city status, that the foreign-born population in those places will have different social and economic experiences than those who live in the other three types of counties.

H 3: Counties that have signed 287(g) have done so as a reaction to the arrival of immigrants regardless of their immigration status, and also despite the low crime rates from foreign-born individuals in those counties. Most counties with 287(g) MOUs are more likely to be governed by conservative local authorities than control or sanctuary counties.

Analytical Strategy:

The analytical strategy has three phases. In the first phase, we look at average indicators for the foreign-born population by year, type of county and citizenship and assess any differences (see Table 1). In the second phase, we estimate fixed effects multivariate regressions and test whether there are statistically significant differences in upper mobility indicators (real family income, poverty to income ratio, household ownership, employment in a non-immigrant occupational niche, language isolation, and carpooling practices). Finally, by incorporating data from the FBI uniform crime reports and electoral statistics, as well as population density of counties, and relative weight and growth of the immigrant population, we estimate the probability that a county would sign a 287(g) MOU.

Preliminary Findings:

Estimations for the first phase of the analysis indicate that:

1. The percentages of non-citizen foreign-born population has gradually decreased for all types of counties between 2000 and 2016.
2. In 2016, there are higher percentages of non-citizens of the total foreign-born population in 287(g) counties than in control or sanctuary counties.
3. The number of foreign-born persons in Latin America regardless of their citizenship status has decreased over time in counties that signed 287(g) MOUs.

4. There is a sustained increase in the percentage of foreign-born persons with college degrees across all types of counties with substantial increases for counties with 287(g) MOUs and those counties that had 287(g) MOUs and later became sanctuary cities.
5. The largest gains in homeownership among the foreign-born population regardless of citizenship status is counties with 287(g) MOUs.
6. Counties with 287(g) MOUs have the lowest average housing value, average cost of owning a home and average cost of renting a home for the foreign born regardless of citizenship status.
7. Average real household income and poverty to income ratios are lowest for counties that signed 287(g) MOUs at any point in time than for control counties or sanctuary cities.
8. Linguistic isolation has decreased across all county types over time. However, it is higher in counties with 287(g) MOUs.
9. According to Capps et. al (2011) half of 287(g) activity involves noncitizens arrested for misdemeanors and traffic offenses. In order to evaluate the impact of traffic law enforcement on immigrant behavior in counties with 287(g) MOUs we include variables on transportation to work. Results indicate that foreign-born non-citizens are more likely to carpool than citizens; and that in counties with 287(g) MOUs the average number of riders is higher than in all other counties.

-----Table 1 About here ----

Significance of the study:

This study explores the extent to which anti-immigrant legislation affects the social and economic conditions of the foreign-born population in the United States. We believe that this work reveals the increasing vulnerability of immigrant communities, particularly of those who do not have access to legal status. The current administration through executive orders has rescinded Temporary Permanent Status to thousands of Salvadoran immigrants, and the status of DACA recipients is still pending in federal courts. Increasing barriers to authorized and non-authorized immigrant populations is likely to increase the vulnerability of millions. If in fact the undocumented population in the United States is being forced to live as members of migration-trust networks, and if indeed as a result millions of immigrants and their children are experiencing social and economic disadvantage and isolation, this study can contribute to reveal the social consequences of implementing piecemeal local legislation to the broken immigration system in the United States.

References:

Benenson, Laurence.2016. "The Trouble of Immigration Detainers." *The National Immigration Forum*. May 24th, 2016. Retrieved on September 16th, 2018. URL: <https://immigrationforum.org/article/trouble-immigration-detainers/>

- Capps, Randy Marc R. Rosenblum, Muzaffar Chishti, and Cristina Rodríguez. 2011. "Delegation and Divergence: 287(g) State and Local Immigration Enforcement" *Migration Policy Institute Reports*. Retrieved on September 17th, 2018 URL: <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/delegation-and-divergence-287g-state-and-local-immigration-enforcement>
- Flores-Yeffal, Nadia Y. 2013. *Migration-trust networks: Social cohesion in Mexican US-bound emigration*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Flores-Yeffal, Nadia Y. Guadalupe Vidales, and Girsea Martinez 2017. #WakeUpAmerica, #IllegalsAreCriminals: the role of the cyber public sphere in the perpetuation of the Latino cyber-moral panic in the US. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-18.
- Flores-Yeffal, Nadia Y. 2018. "Explained: Why undocumented immigrants don't just get to 'the back of the line.'" *San Antonio Express-News*. February 24, 2018. Retrieved on September 16th, 2018 URL: <https://www.mysanantonio.com/opinion/commentary/article/Explained-Why-undocumented-immigrants-don-t-12704372.php>
- Flores-Yeffal, N. Y., & Pren, K. A. (2018). Predicting Unauthorized Salvadoran Migrants' First Migration to the United States between 1965 and 2007. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*.
- Gonzales, Roberto. G. (2016). *Lives in limbo: Undocumented and coming of age in America*. Berkeley Ca: University of California Press.
- Gubernskaya, Zoya, and Joanna Dreby. 2017. "US immigration policy and the case for family unity." *Journal on Migration & Human Security*. 5: 417.
- Massey, Douglas.S., Karen A. Pren and Jorge Durand. 2016. "Why Border Enforcement Backfired 1." *American Journal of Sociology* 121(5):1557-1600.
- Wong, T. K. (2012). 287 (g) and the politics of interior immigration control in the United States: Explaining local cooperation with federal immigration authorities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(5), 737-756.

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Observations (n)	145,876	182,715	236,078	76,612	95,781	112,501	381,415	409,970	461,323	251,959	254,013	280,148
Citizens	0.3553	0.4190	0.4747	0.4027	0.4636	0.5000	0.4481	0.5321	0.5753	0.3960	0.4971	0.5480
Non-citizens	0.6447	0.5810	0.5253	0.5973	0.5364	0.5000	0.5519	0.4679	0.4247	0.6040	0.5029	0.4520
Demographic Variables												
Male												
Citizen	0.4882	0.4777	0.4747	0.4819	0.4721	0.4704	0.4691	0.4622	0.4627	0.4716	0.4607	0.4591
Non-citizen	0.5399	0.5305	0.5160	0.5218	0.5158	0.5156	0.5149	0.5181	0.5088	0.5124	0.5084	0.4999
Mean Age (years)												
Citizen	42.42	45.64	46.97	44.14	46.49	47.29	45.40	47.59	48.97	44.95	49.16	51.65
Non-citizen	31.70	34.81	37.85	33.02	35.52	38.27	33.90	36.31	38.66	33.88	37.44	40.86
Hispanic												
Citizen	0.4392	0.4220	0.4006	0.3550	0.3625	0.3678	0.2402	0.2437	0.2495	0.4023	0.3943	0.3975
Non-citizen	0.7190	0.7333	0.6868	0.6522	0.6902	0.6784	0.4636	0.5100	0.4962	0.7090	0.7113	0.6968
Married spouse present												
Citizen	0.5939	0.5877	0.5739	0.5870	0.5846	0.5726	0.5644	0.5616	0.5523	0.5856	0.5860	0.5699
Non-citizen	0.4674	0.4700	0.4909	0.4731	0.4824	0.4978	0.4513	0.4494	0.4619	0.4529	0.4509	0.4630
Married spouse no present												
Citizen	0.0285	0.0329	0.0322	0.0306	0.0364	0.0309	0.0330	0.0369	0.0361	0.0305	0.0354	0.0332
Non-citizen	0.0618	0.0559	0.0472	0.0579	0.0569	0.0475	0.0608	0.0585	0.0509	0.0550	0.0545	0.0479
Separated, divorced, widowed												
Citizen	0.1536	0.1722	0.1781	0.1606	0.1680	0.1751	0.1708	0.1772	0.1838	0.1666	0.1835	0.1997
Non-citizen	0.0902	0.1032	0.1128	0.0932	0.1070	0.1149	0.1003	0.1075	0.1145	0.1040	0.1152	0.1291
Single												
Citizen	0.2241	0.2071	0.2158	0.2218	0.2110	0.2214	0.2319	0.2243	0.2278	0.2173	0.1951	0.1972
Non-citizen	0.3806	0.3709	0.3490	0.3758	0.3538	0.3398	0.3876	0.3846	0.3727	0.3881	0.3794	0.3599

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Household Composition												
Two parental family												
Citizen	0.7483	0.7290	0.7219	0.7367	0.7243	0.7237	0.7087	0.6971	0.6914	0.7277	0.7059	0.6934
Non-citizen	0.7212	0.6980	0.7025	0.7336	0.7115	0.7075	0.7009	0.6657	0.6698	0.7257	0.6834	0.6744
Single family household												
Citizen	0.1386	0.1449	0.1529	0.1402	0.1411	0.1460	0.1549	0.1582	0.1663	0.1594	0.1684	0.1766
Non-citizen	0.1777	0.1822	0.1775	0.1681	0.1762	0.1693	0.1867	0.1944	0.1881	0.1913	0.2116	0.2101
Single householder												
Citizen	0.0845	0.0979	0.0961	0.0868	0.0981	0.0940	0.0979	0.1070	0.1042	0.0785	0.0932	0.0967
Non-citizen	0.0404	0.0556	0.0597	0.0402	0.0495	0.0543	0.0515	0.0646	0.0653	0.0369	0.0500	0.0555
Householder living with others												
Citizen	0.0221	0.0198	0.0210	0.0270	0.0229	0.0245	0.0277	0.0244	0.0250	0.0258	0.0219	0.0236
Non-citizen	0.0545	0.0549	0.0491	0.0500	0.0454	0.0500	0.0516	0.0587	0.0590	0.0375	0.0439	0.0464
One generation												
Citizen	0.2940	0.3243	0.3266	0.3167	0.3356	0.3371	0.3191	0.3444	0.3415	0.2695	0.3129	0.3302
Non-citizen	0.2303	0.2441	0.2435	0.2117	0.2295	0.2461	0.2423	0.2666	0.2644	0.1724	0.2177	0.2244
Two generations												
Citizen	0.5734	0.5634	0.5498	0.5473	0.5487	0.5437	0.5404	0.5313	0.5274	0.5619	0.5389	0.5229
Non-citizen	0.6412	0.6439	0.6421	0.6440	0.6464	0.6338	0.6201	0.6169	0.6105	0.6596	0.6373	0.6237
Three generations												
Citizen	0.1326	0.1123	0.1236	0.1360	0.1158	0.1192	0.1405	0.1243	0.1311	0.1686	0.1482	0.1468
Non-citizen	0.1285	0.1120	0.1144	0.1443	0.1241	0.1201	0.1376	0.1164	0.1251	0.1680	0.1451	0.1518
Average families in household												
Citizen	1.10	1.06	1.07	1.13	1.08	1.09	1.13	1.09	1.10	1.15	1.09	1.10
Non-citizen	1.34	1.21	1.15	1.33	1.22	1.18	1.33	1.25	1.23	1.35	1.24	1.21

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Average number of members												
Citizen	3.70	3.40	3.40	3.63	3.37	3.36	3.56	3.33	3.37	3.84	3.49	3.43
Non-citizen	4.23	3.88	3.82	4.38	3.95	3.84	4.11	3.73	3.72	4.57	4.08	3.99
Average number of minors												
Citizen	1.07	0.99	0.94	1.00	0.94	0.91	0.96	0.89	0.88	1.12	1.00	0.93
Non-citizen	1.00	1.05	1.12	1.05	1.08	1.11	0.92	0.91	0.95	1.11	1.08	1.11
Community Characteristics												
Non-Metro Area												
Citizen	0.0070	0.0078	0.0000	0.0050	0.0056	0.0037	0.0083	0.0079	0.0008	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Non-citizen	0.0117	0.0124	0.0000	0.0074	0.0085	0.0033	0.0093	0.0117	0.0008	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Immigration Characteristics												
Born in Canada												
Citizen	0.0266	0.0224	0.0206	0.0350	0.0279	0.0227	0.0271	0.0218	0.0193	0.0217	0.0153	0.0140
Non-citizen	0.0175	0.0156	0.0160	0.0237	0.0219	0.0202	0.0182	0.0167	0.0161	0.0120	0.0114	0.0126
Born in Latin America												
Citizen	0.4739	0.4610	0.4415	0.3958	0.4114	0.4128	0.3248	0.3213	0.3223	0.4198	0.4086	0.4096
Non-citizen	0.7417	0.7571	0.7106	0.6793	0.7231	0.7051	0.5247	0.5642	0.5452	0.7234	0.7215	0.7052
Born in Europe												
Citizen	0.1915	0.1605	0.1449	0.2131	0.1682	0.1543	0.2372	0.1972	0.1790	0.1258	0.1102	0.1005
Non-citizen	0.0646	0.0483	0.0471	0.0793	0.0579	0.0536	0.1400	0.1034	0.0952	0.0523	0.0481	0.0451
Born in Asia												
Citizen	0.2688	0.3055	0.3222	0.3191	0.3472	0.3527	0.3780	0.4120	0.4170	0.4112	0.4427	0.4481
Non-citizen	0.1421	0.1407	0.1775	0.1829	0.1607	0.1850	0.2698	0.2580	0.2875	0.1986	0.2026	0.2179

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Born in Africa												
Citizen	0.0350	0.0470	0.0672	0.0243	0.0354	0.0492	0.0275	0.0416	0.0553	0.0171	0.0197	0.0239
Non-citizen	0.0304	0.0347	0.0436	0.0237	0.0279	0.0289	0.0410	0.0507	0.0484	0.0099	0.0120	0.0144
Born in other region												
Citizen	0.0042	0.0036	0.0035	0.0126	0.0099	0.0084	0.0054	0.0062	0.0070	0.0044	0.0035	0.0040
Non-citizen	0.0039	0.0035	0.0052	0.0112	0.0085	0.0072	0.0062	0.0069	0.0076	0.0038	0.0044	0.0048
Average year of immigration												
Citizen	1976.35	1981.84	1986.83	1974.96	1981.23	1986.38	1975.67	1981.97	1986.75	1976.57	1980.92	1984.5
Non-citizen	1990.13	1996.12	1999.78	1989.14	1995.61	1999.60	1989.66	1996.10	2000.30	1987.98	1993.66	1996.70
Average years in the US												
Citizen	23.65	28.16	29.17	25.04	28.77	29.62	24.33	28.03	29.25	23.43	29.08	31.50
Non-citizen	9.87	13.88	16.22	10.86	14.39	16.40	10.34	13.90	15.70	12.02	16.34	19.30
Years living in current location												
Citizen	1.65	1.77	1.81	1.74	1.78	1.80	1.93	1.89	1.92	1.75	1.89	1.93
Non-citizen	0.75	0.97	1.10	0.80	0.98	1.10	0.83	0.97	1.05	0.81	1.03	1.12
Labor Market Characteristics												
Education												
Less than middle school												
Citizen	0.2256	0.1648	0.1526	0.2130	0.1565	0.1500	0.1768	0.1432	0.1405	0.2042	0.1649	0.1680
Non-citizen	0.4007	0.3452	0.3111	0.4010	0.3470	0.3167	0.3175	0.2834	0.2634	0.4005	0.3371	0.3150
Less than high school												
Citizen	0.0954	0.0784	0.0657	0.0813	0.0677	0.0626	0.0763	0.0618	0.0530	0.0837	0.0679	0.0600
Non-citizen	0.1583	0.1560	0.1406	0.1341	0.1383	0.1340	0.1174	0.1158	0.1037	0.1525	0.1452	0.1368
High school graduate												
Citizen	0.2828	0.2811	0.2638	0.2754	0.2732	0.2606	0.2960	0.2758	0.2709	0.2785	0.2742	0.2667
Non-citizen	0.2381	0.2618	0.2729	0.2285	0.2538	0.2578	0.2726	0.2754	0.2787	0.2506	0.2733	0.2785

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Some college												
Citizen	0.1699	0.1951	0.2011	0.1800	0.2016	0.1966	0.1846	0.1990	0.2012	0.1922	0.2021	0.2033
Non-citizen	0.0830	0.0962	0.1097	0.0963	0.1059	0.1146	0.1139	0.1202	0.1280	0.0946	0.1105	0.1254
College graduates and more												
Citizen	0.2263	0.2805	0.3169	0.2503	0.3010	0.3302	0.2664	0.3201	0.3344	0.2414	0.2909	0.3021
Non-citizen	0.1199	0.1408	0.1657	0.1401	0.1550	0.1769	0.1787	0.2052	0.2262	0.1017	0.1339	0.1443
In the labor force												
Citizen	0.6287	0.6976	0.6920	0.6286	0.6822	0.6779	0.6191	0.6751	0.6642	0.6048	0.6617	0.6359
Non-citizen	0.6057	0.6947	0.6821	0.6170	0.6823	0.6690	0.6148	0.6952	0.6838	0.5659	0.6818	0.6590
Employed												
Citizen	0.9502	0.9405	0.9476	0.9500	0.9383	0.9510	0.9494	0.9354	0.9404	0.9464	0.9384	0.9418
Non-citizen	0.9247	0.9221	0.9381	0.8977	0.9034	0.9237	0.9172	0.9104	0.9186	0.9051	0.9132	0.9167
Self-employed												
Citizen	0.1083	0.1268	0.1191	0.1158	0.1199	0.1228	0.1036	0.1148	0.1135	0.1317	0.1461	0.1460
Non-citizen	0.0754	0.1025	0.1117	0.0783	0.0973	0.1087	0.0772	0.0919	0.0970	0.0959	0.1230	0.1446
Private employee												
Citizen	0.7700	0.7476	0.7601	0.7379	0.7321	0.7285	0.7513	0.7385	0.7462	0.7423	0.7245	0.7280
Non-citizen	0.8677	0.8508	0.8416	0.8473	0.8427	0.8320	0.8481	0.8490	0.8449	0.8499	0.8359	0.8142
State employee												
Citizen	0.1172	0.1225	0.1172	0.1423	0.1453	0.1454	0.1411	0.1439	0.1371	0.1194	0.1259	0.1226
Non-citizen	0.0527	0.0435	0.0435	0.0684	0.0563	0.0557	0.0703	0.0560	0.0548	0.0481	0.0382	0.0380
Farmworker												
Citizen	0.0046	0.0031	0.0036	0.0040	0.0028	0.0032	0.0040	0.0028	0.0032	0.0065	0.0035	0.0034
Non-citizen	0.0041	0.0032	0.0032	0.0060	0.0037	0.0037	0.0044	0.0031	0.0033	0.0061	0.0029	0.0032

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Worked one quarter last year												
Citizen	0.3709	0.3503	0.3602	0.3770	0.3629	0.3715	0.3796	0.3687	0.3859	0.3770	0.3689	0.4031
Non-citizen	0.4499	0.3959	0.3936	0.4517	0.4090	0.4063	0.4464	0.3930	0.4001	0.4682	0.3988	0.4152
Worked two quarters last year												
Citizen	0.3778	0.3455	0.3558	0.3860	0.3593	0.3686	0.3858	0.3664	0.3807	0.3825	0.3669	0.3978
Non-citizen	0.4613	0.3971	0.3899	0.4675	0.4112	0.4065	0.4579	0.3924	0.3950	0.4762	0.3989	0.4103
Worked three quarters last year												
Citizen	0.3758	0.3509	0.3649	0.3851	0.3642	0.3747	0.3838	0.3696	0.3878	0.3821	0.3704	0.4066
Non-citizen	0.4584	0.4019	0.3989	0.4648	0.4170	0.4173	0.4506	0.3973	0.4046	0.4742	0.4023	0.4183
Worked four quarters last year												
Citizen	0.3925	0.3556	0.3645	0.4012	0.3675	0.3766	0.4003	0.3757	0.3900	0.4037	0.3783	0.4077
Non-citizen	0.4685	0.4036	0.3955	0.4651	0.4082	0.4083	0.4616	0.3942	0.3996	0.4883	0.4011	0.4125
Worked more than four quarters last year												
Citizen	0.8288	0.8640	0.8823	0.8210	0.8585	0.8771	0.8327	0.8664	0.8821	0.8307	0.8765	0.8970
Non-citizen	0.7987	0.8371	0.8613	0.7651	0.8071	0.8306	0.7890	0.8226	0.8446	0.7978	0.8472	0.8680
Average hours worked a week												
Citizen	41.05	40.45	39.90	40.48	39.88	39.56	40.07	39.48	38.88	40.08	39.55	38.72
Non-citizen	40.63	39.42	39.06	40.29	39.18	38.89	40.14	39.01	38.26	39.38	38.26	37.31
Average occupational score												
Citizen	20.64	21.22	20.92	20.29	20.86	20.66	20.34	20.62	19.98	20.50	20.54	19.41
Non-citizen	16.81	16.81	16.95	16.03	16.11	16.25	17.20	17.26	17.07	16.17	16.52	15.93
Average educational score												
Citizen	48.33	54.07	58.84	49.61	55.40	59.68	50.74	56.27	59.67	49.59	55.07	58.53
Non-citizen	34.70	37.63	42.55	36.19	38.52	42.78	40.23	42.90	47.38	34.69	38.21	42.27
Professional occupations												
Citizen	0.0101	0.0117	0.0178	0.0113	0.0134	0.0180	0.0138	0.0157	0.0175	0.0093	0.0100	0.0107
Non-citizen	0.0093	0.0103	0.0136	0.0126	0.0106	0.0135	0.0162	0.0162	0.0180	0.0062	0.0060	0.0077

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Food service												
Citizen	0.0128	0.0129	0.0129	0.0136	0.0140	0.0140	0.0129	0.0132	0.0137	0.0125	0.0139	0.0141
Non-citizen	0.0286	0.0281	0.0284	0.0294	0.0281	0.0267	0.0274	0.0326	0.0340	0.0251	0.0297	0.0305
Cleaning services												
Citizen	0.0371	0.0368	0.0381	0.0352	0.0373	0.0382	0.0372	0.0393	0.0419	0.0358	0.0385	0.0406
Non-citizen	0.0694	0.0811	0.0861	0.0621	0.0675	0.0767	0.0621	0.0774	0.0802	0.0689	0.0838	0.0882
Landscaping												
Citizen	0.0082	0.0071	0.0069	0.0104	0.0080	0.0082	0.0057	0.0059	0.0061	0.0088	0.0079	0.0084
Non-citizen	0.0271	0.0371	0.0372	0.0268	0.0366	0.0367	0.0185	0.0252	0.0251	0.0278	0.0331	0.0348
Hairdressers and personal appearance												
Citizen	0.0123	0.0176	0.0204	0.0103	0.0137	0.0153	0.0105	0.0123	0.0143	0.0119	0.0136	0.0152
Non-citizen	0.0066	0.0080	0.0117	0.0059	0.0072	0.0086	0.0075	0.0104	0.0109	0.0059	0.0065	0.0073
Packing industry												
Citizen	0.0136	0.0157	0.0147	0.0152	0.0176	0.0149	0.0135	0.0135	0.0130	0.0120	0.0132	0.0136
Non-citizen	0.0218	0.0242	0.0247	0.0259	0.0332	0.0291	0.0230	0.0275	0.0259	0.0243	0.0274	0.0281
Agricultural workers												
Citizen	0.0041	0.0015	0.0020	0.0267	0.0152	0.0116	0.0066	0.0034	0.0041	0.0023	0.0023	0.0024
Non-citizen	0.0112	0.0066	0.0079	0.1007	0.0913	0.0778	0.0291	0.0282	0.0320	0.0102	0.0102	0.0113
Construction												
Citizen	0.0305	0.0265	0.0227	0.0265	0.0211	0.0202	0.0187	0.0198	0.0187	0.0191	0.0195	0.0174
Non-citizen	0.1049	0.1286	0.1044	0.0648	0.0850	0.0893	0.0477	0.0717	0.0610	0.0533	0.0757	0.0704
Food preparation												
Citizen	0.0048	0.0039	0.0047	0.0046	0.0027	0.0044	0.0040	0.0032	0.0045	0.0036	0.0024	0.0043
Non-citizen	0.0090	0.0091	0.0109	0.0080	0.0064	0.0088	0.0073	0.0081	0.0098	0.0070	0.0078	0.0098
Clothing manufacturing and cleaning												
Citizen	0.0048	0.0039	0.0047	0.0046	0.0027	0.0044	0.0040	0.0032	0.0045	0.0036	0.0024	0.0043
Non-citizen	0.0090	0.0091	0.0109	0.0080	0.0064	0.0088	0.0073	0.0081	0.0098	0.0070	0.0078	0.0098

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Production workers												
Citizen	0.0012	0.0008	0.0006	0.0004	0.0004	0.0008	0.0008	0.0007	0.0005	0.0010	0.0010	0.0007
Non-citizen	0.0023	0.0019	0.0018	0.0016	0.0014	0.0015	0.0015	0.0012	0.0011	0.0021	0.0027	0.0023
Transportation												
Citizen	0.0043	0.0049	0.0064	0.0037	0.0049	0.0060	0.0083	0.0103	0.0128	0.0038	0.0059	0.0076
Non-citizen	0.0033	0.0033	0.0040	0.0031	0.0032	0.0039	0.0101	0.0093	0.0102	0.0043	0.0055	0.0061
Housing Characteristics												
Home ownership												
Citizen	0.6904	0.7619	0.7298	0.7249	0.7682	0.7332	0.6484	0.6887	0.6498	0.6276	0.6609	0.6294
Non-citizen	0.3897	0.4501	0.4222	0.4532	0.4779	0.4472	0.3528	0.3776	0.3354	0.3422	0.3546	0.3166
Real Housing value (2000 US dollars)												
Citizen	142,747	207,304	183,456	203,544	261,828	245,054	246,074	358,092	334,482	241,824	390,828	368,284
Non-citizen	107,070	148,444	126,559	141,234	173,429	152,023	214,701	308,490	277,928	189,294	318,990	272,915
Real cost of owning a home (2000 US dollars)												
Citizen	1,096	1,293	1,059	1,215	1,436	1,160	1,439	1,747	1,462	1,503	1,809	1,422
Non-citizen	966	1,148	886	1,026	1,171	901	1,459	1,844	1,429	1,369	1,770	1,266
Real cost of renting a home (2000 US dollars)												
Citizen	202	229	300	209	246	320	270	348	453	288	405	498
Non-citizen	382	494	580	387	499	593	509	720	885	478	758	892
Income												
Real household income												
Citizen	65,110	64,191	66,718	71,264	69,364	71,804	73,734	72,521	73,514	69,674	69,313	67,027
Non-citizen	48,674	43,812	44,071	52,132	45,672	46,016	58,671	54,551	55,437	50,199	47,700	45,041
Real personal total income												
Citizen	28,114	28,495	29,019	30,273	30,327	30,622	30,914	31,090	30,908	28,835	29,199	27,815
Non-citizen	16,236	16,103	16,421	16,808	16,121	16,446	19,222	19,031	19,482	15,139	15,716	14,692

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Real family total income												
Citizen	62,261	61,934	64,152	67,428	66,702	68,357	69,487	69,124	69,553	65,667	66,160	63,450
Non-citizen	42,320	39,050	40,008	44,971	40,510	41,187	50,869	47,710	48,216	42,858	41,555	39,531
Poverty-income ratio												
Citizen	304.12	309.90	310.48	314.68	317.12	316.19	328.19	331.02	322.40	304.70	317.19	307.11
Non-citizen	212.73	211.11	213.96	217.55	210.72	211.12	248.21	247.51	242.80	204.02	217.99	208.31
Social Characteristics												
Linguistic isolation												
Citizen	0.1841	0.1656	0.1461	0.1597	0.1511	0.1364	0.1846	0.1847	0.1716	0.2060	0.1982	0.1855
Non-citizen	0.4261	0.4281	0.3377	0.3650	0.3755	0.3122	0.3608	0.3698	0.3083	0.3967	0.3893	0.3026
Speaking Spanish												
Citizen	0.4192	0.4018	0.3724	0.3362	0.3466	0.3451	0.2294	0.2307	0.2328	0.3852	0.3803	0.3756
Non-citizen	0.6867	0.7188	0.6757	0.6203	0.6808	0.6668	0.4457	0.4991	0.4870	0.6746	0.7021	0.6815
Do not speak English												
Citizen	0.0377	0.0318	0.0324	0.0411	0.0377	0.0354	0.0262	0.0326	0.0367	0.0375	0.0497	0.0531
Non-citizen	0.1894	0.1876	0.1659	0.1832	0.2072	0.1861	0.1298	0.1486	0.1344	0.1818	0.1939	0.1776
Private transportation												
Citizen	0.8984	0.8968	0.8962	0.8971	0.8925	0.8859	0.7795	0.7664	0.7573	0.9078	0.9006	0.8925
Non-citizen	0.8447	0.8561	0.8600	0.8474	0.8526	0.8561	0.7007	0.6815	0.6775	0.7785	0.7815	0.7939
Public transportation												
Citizen	0.0467	0.0409	0.0351	0.0427	0.0397	0.0367	0.1507	0.1541	0.1551	0.0360	0.0322	0.0314
Non-citizen	0.0693	0.0582	0.0556	0.0572	0.0538	0.0476	0.1948	0.2000	0.2019	0.1237	0.1185	0.1031
Bike, walk or work from home												
Citizen	0.0549	0.0624	0.0687	0.0602	0.0678	0.0773	0.0698	0.0795	0.0876	0.0562	0.0672	0.0761
Non-citizen	0.0860	0.0857	0.0844	0.0955	0.0936	0.0963	0.1045	0.1185	0.1206	0.0978	0.1001	0.1029

Table 1. Characteristics of the foreign-born population for selected US counties, by citizenship status and county type for 2000, 2010 and 2016.

	Counties with 287g MOUs			Control Counties			Sanctuary Cities			287g MOUs and later Sanctuaries		
	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016	2000	2010	2016
Carpool												
Citizen	0.1762	0.1357	0.1228	0.1787	0.1454	0.1253	0.1759	0.1466	0.1362	0.1726	0.1323	0.1208
Non-citizen	0.3656	0.2712	0.2261	0.3369	0.2886	0.2321	0.3015	0.2572	0.2310	0.3101	0.2304	0.1853
Average numbers of riders												
Citizen	0.6114	0.6529	0.6462	0.6088	0.6444	0.6287	0.5299	0.5472	0.5287	0.6010	0.6312	0.6006
Non-citizen	0.6635	0.7134	0.6878	0.6400	0.7001	0.6689	0.5149	0.5492	0.5321	0.5089	0.5850	0.5581
Average transit time												
Citizen	15.23	16.33	16.73	13.63	14.42	15.04	16.70	17.47	17.88	14.99	16.19	16.20
Non-citizen	13.30	15.48	15.73	11.60	13.23	13.82	14.82	16.48	17.22	12.88	15.83	16.07