

Testimony in Support of LD 1971

An Act to Protect Workers in This State by Clarifying the Relationship of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies with Federal Immigration Authorities

Sponsor: Representative Dhalac

Public Hearing: Judiciary Committee 19th, May 2025 1:00 PM

Senator Carney, Representative Kuhn, and esteemed members of the Judiciary Committee:

My name is Ruben Torres, and I serve as the Advocacy, Communications, and Policy Manager for the Maine Immigrants' Rights Coalition (MIRC). MIRC represents more than 100 organizations across Maine, including grassroots immigrant-led organizations, legal service providers, housing advocates, and direct service agencies, working collectively to improve the economic and social standing of Maine's immigrant communities, thereby uplifting the state as a whole. We are testifying in strong **support** of LD 1971 An Act to Protect Workers in This State by Clarifying the Relationship of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies with Federal Immigration Authorities.

LD 1971 is about the appropriate role of state and local law enforcement agencies in society. It ensures that local resources are focused on local priorities and that trust between communities and law enforcement is preserved, and not undermined by blurred lines and inconsistent practices.

Maine's public safety relies on a simple principle: when people trust law enforcement, they engage with it. They report crimes, serve as witnesses, and call for help when something is wrong. We have seen, in both urban and rural areas, how quickly that trust deteriorates when local agencies are perceived to be acting as an extension of federal immigration enforcement.

LD 1971 codifies clear boundaries around immigration detainers, civil warrants, and hold requests; while still allowing law enforcement to take action in cases of serious criminal charges, open warrants, or threats to public safety. It ensures law enforcement understand their jurisdiction and just as importantly, it allows officers to focus on the work they are trained to do: protecting our communities, responding to emergencies, and preventing harm.

This legislation is also about Maine's economic resilience and social stability. When immigrant residents are pushed into the shadows, when they are unsure whether a 911 call could lead to detention, that has consequences far beyond the individual: it affects families, schools, workplaces, and our broader public health and safety infrastructure. Legislation like LD 1971 prevents the erosion of public trust that leads to underreporting of crime. It prevents the misallocation of law enforcement resources. And it prevents the kind of high-cost legal exposure that other jurisdictions have faced for detaining individuals unlawfully based on ICE detainers without judicial warrants.

Across our coalition, we regularly engage with both direct service providers and community leaders who ask the same question: *What happens when ICE arrives?* The reality is that civil immigration enforcement is a federal responsibility, and local agencies need clarity and consistency to avoid missteps. LD 1971 provides a uniform standard that protects both individuals and institutions.

This bill affirms that Maine's correctional facilities are not extensions of federal immigration detention. By requiring notice before interviews with ICE, and prohibiting decisions about

custody levels or access to programming based solely on immigration status, LD 1971 reflects basic due process.

Maine remains one of the safest states in the country. LD 1971 helps keep it that way by affirming clear lines of responsibility and reducing the confusion that has plagued other states.

We urge the Committee to vote Ought to Pass on LD 1971. This bill can be a solution to a legal and operational gray area. It's good policy, and most importantly, it helps ensure that all who live in Maine can participate in public life without fear.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

###

Contact:

Ruben Torres

Advocacy, Communications, and Policy Manager, Maine Immigrants' Rights Coalition

rtorres@maineimmigrantrights.org

Endnotes

- Ascherio M. (2022). Do sanctuary policies increase crime? Contrary evidence from a county-level investigation in the United States. *Social science research*, 106, 102743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2022.102743>
- Eshbaugh-Soha, M. (2020). Trump and Us: What He Says and Why People Listen. By Roderick P. Hart. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 280p. \$84.99 cloth, \$24.99 paper. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18, 947 - 948.
- **Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes, Monica Deza (2020). *Can Sanctuary Policies Reduce Domestic Violence?*. Social Science Research Network**
- Hausman D. K. (2020). Sanctuary policies reduce deportations without increasing crime. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(44), 27262–27267. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2014673117>
- International Association of Chiefs of Police, “Enforcing Immigration Law: The Role of State, Tribal and Local Law Enforcement,” *Police Chief* 72, no. 4 (2005): 5, <http://www.markwynn.com/trafficking/enforcing-immigration-law-the-role-of-state-tribal-and-local-le-2004.pdf>.
- Manning, D.T., & Burkhardt, J. (2022). The local effects of federal law enforcement policies: Evidence from sanctuary jurisdictions and crime. *Contemporary Economic Policy*.
- Martínez-Schuldt, R.D., & Martínez, D.E. (2019). Sanctuary Policies and City-Level Incidents of Violence, 1990 to 2010. *Justice Quarterly*, 36, 567 - 593.
- O'Brien, B.G., Collingwood, L., & El-Khatib, S.O. (2019). The Politics of Refuge: Sanctuary Cities, Crime, and Undocumented Immigration. *Urban Affairs Review*, 55, 3 - 40.

- Park, I.K., von Rabenau, B., & Hong, Z. (2022). The effects of 'sanctuary city' policies on the local economy: empirical evidence from US counties. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 27, 19 - 38.
- Schutt, A.R. (2020). Sanctuary Cities and Their Respective Effect on Crime Rates. *Undergraduate Economic Review*, 16, 20.
- Wong, T. K. (2017, January 26). *The effects of sanctuary policies on crime and the economy*. Center for American Progress.
<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-effects-of-sanctuary-policies-on-crime-and-the-economy>
- Y. Otsu (2020). *Sanctuary Cities and Crime*. Social Science Research Network

Testimony in Support of LD 1259

An Act to Enhance Public Safety in Maine by Defining the Relationship Between Local and Federal Law Enforcement

Sponsor: Representative Rana

Public Hearing: Judiciary Committee 19th, May 2025 1:00 PM

Senator Carney, Representative Kuhn, and esteemed members of the Judiciary Committee:

My name is Ruben Torres, and I serve as the Advocacy, Communications, and Policy Manager for the Maine Immigrants' Rights Coalition (MIRC). MIRC represents more than 100 organizations across Maine, including grassroots immigrant-led organizations, legal service providers, housing advocates, and direct service agencies, working collectively to improve the economic and social standing of Maine's immigrant communities, thereby uplifting the state as a whole. We are testifying in strong **support** of LD 1259, An Act to Enhance Public Safety in Maine by Defining the Relationship Between Local and Federal Law Enforcement.

This bill is about safety. Not politics. And for that reason, Maine should bar the enactment of immigration enforcement programs like 287(g), which deputize local police to act as federal immigration agents. These programs have failed elsewhere, and they will fail us here. They don't make communities safer; in fact, we have seen them create division and distrust.

We've seen what 287(g) does in other states, and it's not public safety. It's public harm. These agreements have been repeatedly linked to racial profiling, unlawful detentions, and expensive lawsuits. What the rhetoric suggests and what is actually achieved are vastly different. A 2011 Migration Policy Institute study found that half of all detainees issued under 287(g) were for misdemeanors and traffic violations.¹ One study in North Carolina found that 33% of people detained through 287(g) had no criminal record at all—just traffic tickets.²

And they're expensive. Prince William County, Virginia, spent \$6.4 million in a single year to implement 287(g), forcing the county to dip into its rainy-day fund and cut \$3.1 million from other critical law enforcement priorities.³ In the end, real tools for safer policing were traded for a program that sowed distrust. We cannot afford the added risk to our budget.

Even the federal government knows these programs are broken. The Department of Homeland Security's own Inspector General has issued multiple reports over the last decade

¹ Randy Capps, Marc R. Rosenblum, Cristina Rodríguez, and Muzaffar Chishti, "Delegation and Divergence: A Study of 287(g) State and Local Immigration Enforcement" (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2011), 13-14, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/delegationand-divergence-287g-state-and-local-immigration-enforcement>.

² Deborah M. Weissman, Rebecca C. Headen, and Katherine Lewis Parker, "The Policies and Politics of Local Immigration Enforcement Laws: 287(g) Program in North Carolina" (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009), 46, <http://www.law.unc.edu/documents/clinicalprograms/287gpolicyreview.pdf>

³ Mai T Nguyen and Hannah Gill, "The 287(g) Program: The Costs and Consequences of Local Immigration Enforcement in North Carolina Communities" (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2010), https://www.academia.edu/31571070/The_Costs_and_Consequences_of_Local_Immigration_Enforcement_in_North_Carolina_Communities_The_287_g_Program_The_Latino_Migration_Project

citing inadequate training, poor oversight, and ineffective evaluation.⁴ The January 2021 Government Accountability Office report confirmed that ICE failed to establish performance goals and couldn't even assess if the program was working.⁵ This is not a standard we should bring to our state.

Maine is one of the safest states in the nation. But if we bring these agreements here, we *will* import the consequences: the broken trust, the community fear, and the unnecessary expense. The International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Major Cities Chiefs Association have been consistent and loud in their opposition to using local officers for immigration enforcement.⁶ They know that policing relies on trust. And when people fear that calling the police might result in deportation, they stop reporting crimes. That means domestic violence goes unreported. Workers stay silent about unsafe job conditions. Victims stay in the shadows. And we all become less safe.

This isn't just about immigrants. This is about all of us. Immigration enforcement does not happen in a vacuum. People have been detained and deported without being charged, without a conviction, and sometimes even by mistake, including U.S. citizens and legal residents. Maine already has a shortage of legal services, and once someone is caught in the system, they are often alone and unrepresented. That should concern anyone who believes in the constitutional right to due process.

And what about the economic impact? We rely on immigrants to keep Maine's industries running—from farms to fisheries to healthcare and food service. Programs like 287(g) have disrupted local labor markets and weakened regional economies. One study found that it drove down the farm labor supply, forcing producers to pay higher costs for both labor and fuel.⁷ Adopting programs proven to drive workers and their families away would only hamper efforts to attract and grow our workforce. When people leave, so do their tax dollars.⁸

LD 1259 helps Maine stay focused on what works. It makes clear to our local and state law enforcement that we support them in protecting our communities, and not letting them get bogged down doing work for ICE. It shields our already overburdened agencies from taking on unnecessary risks, and it reaffirms Maine's commitment to safety and governance.

⁴ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, "The Performance of 287(g) Agreements: FY 2013 Update," September 6, 2013,

<https://www.oig.dhs.gov/reports/2013-09/performance-287g-agreements-fy-2013-update/oig13-116sep13>

⁵ U.S. Government Accountability Office, "Immigration Enforcement: ICE Can Further Enhance Its Planning and Oversight of State and Local Agreements," January 27, 2021, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-21-186>

⁶ International Association of Chiefs of Police, "Enforcing Immigration Law: The Role of State, Tribal and Local Law Enforcement," Police Chief 72, no. 4 (2005): 5, <http://www.markwynn.com/trafficking/enforcing-immigration-law-the-role-of-state-tribal-and-local-le-2004.pdf>.

⁷ Jennifer Ifft and Margaret Jodkowski, "Is ICE freezing US agriculture? Farm-level adjustment to increased local immigration enforcement," Labour Economics Volume 78, 102203, October 2022, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S092753712200094X>.

⁸ Guzman C. Davis, E. M. Sifre, (2024, July 30) Tax Payments by Undocumented Immigrants. Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy. <https://itep.org/undocumented-immigrants-taxes-2024/>

We can't always predict the consequences of a new policy. But here, we don't have to guess. We've seen the damage this program has caused elsewhere. We know the trade-offs. And we know better.

For these reasons, we urge the committee to vote Ought to Pass on LD 1259. Let's keep Maine a place where all communities feel safe calling for help, without fear.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

###

Contact:

Ruben Torres

Advocacy, Communications, and Policy Manager, Maine Immigrants' Rights Coalition
rtorres@maineimmigrantrights.org

Endnotes

- American Immigration Council. (2025, January 20). *The 287(g) program: An overview*. The 287(g) Program: An Overview.
https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/the_287g_program_an_overview_2025_0.pdf
- State of Maine Department of Public Safety, (2023), *Crime in Maine 2023*, Colonel William G. Ross.
https://www.maine.gov/dps/msp/sites/maine.gov.dps.msp/files/inline-files/2023%20Crime%20In%20Maine%20Final_2.pdf
- Deborah M. Weissman, Rebecca C. Headen, and Katherine Lewis Parker, "The Policies and Politics of Local Immigration Enforcement Laws: 287(g) Program in North Carolina" (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2009), 46,
<http://www.law.unc.edu/documents/clinicalprograms/287gpolicyreview.pdf>
- Guzman C. Davis, E. M. Sifre, (2024, July 30) *Tax Payments by Undocumented Immigrants*. Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy.
<https://itep.org/undocumented-immigrants-taxes-2024/>
- Jennifer Ifft and Margaret Jodlowski, "Is ICE freezing US agriculture? Farm-level adjustment to increased local immigration enforcement," *Labour Economics* Volume 78, 102203, October 2022,
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S092753712200094X>.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police, "Enforcing Immigration Law: The Role of State, Tribal and Local Law Enforcement," *Police Chief* 72, no. 4 (2005): 5,
<http://www.markwynn.com/trafficking/enforcing-immigration-law-the-role-of-state-tribal-and-local-le-2004.pdf>.
- Immigrant Legal Resource Center. (2025, April 23). *287(g)*.
<https://www.ilrc.org/practitioners/national-map-287g-agreements>

- Mai T Nguyen and Hannah Gill, “The 287(g) Program: The Costs and Consequences of Local Immigration Enforcement in North Carolina Communities” (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2010),
https://www.academia.edu/31571070/The_Costs_and_Consequences_of_Local_Immigration_Enforcement_in_North_Carolina_Communities_The_287_g_Program_The_Latino_Migration_Project
- Randy Capps, Marc R. Rosenblum, Cristina Rodríguez, and Muzaffar Chishti, “Delegation and Divergence: A Study of 287(g) State and Local Immigration Enforcement” (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2011), 13-14,
<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/delegationand-divergence-287g-state-and-local-immigration-enforcement>.
- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2025, May 8). *Memorandum of Agreement 287(g) Task Force Model*. Delegation of Immigration Authority Section 287(g) Immigration and Nationality Act.
https://www.ice.gov/doclib/287gMOA/WellsPDME_TFM_MOA_040225.pdf
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, “The Performance of 287(g) Agreements: FY 2013 Update,” September 6, 2013,
<https://www.oig.dhs.gov/reports/2013-09/performance-287g-agreements-fy-2013-update/oig13-116sep13>
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, “Lack of Planning Hinders Effective Oversight and Management of ICE’s Expanding 287(g) Program,” September 2018,
<https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/oig-reports/OIG-18-77-Sep18.pdf>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office, “Immigration Enforcement: ICE Can Further Enhance Its Planning and Oversight of State and Local Agreements,” January 27, 2021, <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-21-186>