A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

University of Washington

Reading Committee:

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

University of Washington

Abstract

Constructing Pro-Immigrant Spaces: An Analysis of the Policies and Practices of Sanctuary

Wei-Ting Anne Tseng

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Alexes Harris

Department of Sociology

In the United States, sanctuary cities are generally defined as sub-federal jurisdictions that refrain from engaging in the enforcement of federal immigration law. Proponents defend sanctuary cities based on the claim that local participation in immigration enforcement compromises trust and cooperation between residents and local law enforcement agencies which is detrimental to public safety. Not surprisingly, many existing studies have treated "sanctuary city" as a binary independent variable tied to sub-federal involvement in immigration enforcement. These studies have no doubt been instrumental to advancing our knowledge of local responses to expanding and intensifying federal immigration enforcement. However, sociological insight into sanctuary cities is likely to benefit from broadening current perspectives and assessing the potential implications sanctuary city policies have for shaping local contexts of reception and facilitating immigrant integration.

The emerging interest in the study of sanctuary cities among sociologists has seen very little intersection with relevant bodies of literature on contexts of reception, immigrant assimilation, and citizenship. This dissertation is an in-depth exploration of sanctuary city policies at the municipal level with attention to the intended outcomes associated with sanctuary cities as they pertain to not only public safety and crime, but also immigrant inclusion and participation in civic spaces. Specifically, this study is informed by comprehensive content analyses of legislative text, police documents, and news media from 1979 to 2019, covering 210 sanctuary cities across 41 states. A case study of Seattle is also conducted to provide a closer look at the meanings policy makers, civil servants, and service providers attach to the concept of "sanctuary." Using 23 semi-structured in-depth interviews, the case study examines the processes by which employees of the City of Seattle and immigrant-serving non-profit organizations widen the boundaries of inclusion and participation for immigrants while simultaneously resisting and operating within the legal framework of hostile federal immigration laws.

This dissertation builds upon current understandings of sanctuary cities and introduces new angles for theorizing and conceptualizing sanctuary cities as more than just a place-based designation. The content analyses highlight the different strategies cities adopt to dilute the reach of federal immigration enforcement and policing on vulnerable immigrant populations. While proponents and opponents of sanctuary cities tend to converge around narratives of public safety and crime, the findings from my dissertation suggest that there are additional considerations that inform the development and implementation of sanctuary city policies. Furthermore, policymakers and advocates in cities center decisions in response to federal immigration enforcement priorities around objectives that potentially shape immigrant experiences such as

integration, civic engagement, and the practice of citizenship. Supplementary analyses conducted in Seattle provide support for recognizing sanctuary city policies as pro-immigrant policies that are intended to encourage immigrant participation and inclusion in civic spaces, in addition to building trust and cooperation between city officials and residents to promote public safety. Specifically, the Welcoming City resolution in Seattle is analyzed as a framework for developing pro-immigrant policies and practices that facilitate civic engagement, affirm membership, and enable immigrants to practice local citizenship in their daily lives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I owe a debt of gratitude to my advisor and the chair of my committee Alexes Harris for her excellent mentorship. At all stages of this project, Alexes provided invaluable feedback and cheered me on, emphasizing the importance and value of my research. Throughout my time here at the University of Washington, Alexes has always been generous in sharing opportunities so I could learn more about qualitative methodologies and gain research experience. These opportunities allowed me to develop the skills and confidence to pursue this dissertation. Thank you, Alexes, for investing your time and energy in me, and for believing in me.

My committee members, Carolyn Pinedo-Turnovsky and Peter Catron, are also excellent mentors. Even before I had any idea of the direction of this dissertation, Carolyn was always available to share her knowledge and expertise on immigration and steer me in the right direction to develop and expand my research interests. I remember many of these conversations sparking curiosities in new subject areas which certainly informed the direction of this dissertation. Thank you, Carolyn, for always finding time for me and offering constructive feedback and support along the way.

Peter was instrumental in helping me develop a proposal for this dissertation and pushing this project into fruition. While the dissertation took many turns, Peter maintained his support and offered guidance along the way. Peter always shared of any events or opportunities that might benefit me as a graduate student and researcher. Thank you, Peter, for your flexibility and patience, and for the extensive feedback you provided in the beginning and revision stages of this project.

I must also express my appreciation for Barbara Baquero for serving as the GSR and jumping through many hoops so I could move forward with my dissertation. I thoroughly enjoyed our conversation about my research findings.

The Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration (REI) working group spearheaded by René Flores connected me to a supportive an amazing group of researchers, including Kerice Doten-Snitker and Hannah Lee who shared an interest in trying to theorize and conceptualize sanctuary cities sociologically. In those early stages, these conversations were exactly what I needed.

In my role as a teaching assistant, I was lucky to meet Kara Hannula and Will Atienza. When I encountered a dissertation roadblock several years ago, Kara lent an ear to listen and motivated me to keep moving forward. Will stepped in during the height of the pandemic to help me refine my data instruments, recruit participants, and conduct interviews. I value my friendships with Kara and Will very much.

To my friends back at home, thank you for being amazing. I appreciate every phone call and text and I especially treasure those adventures that I got to share when you visited and allowed me a break from writing.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. My parents and my brother have helped me in so many ways to get to this moment today. They have celebrated each success, however big or small, along the way with excitement. I cannot mention my family without acknowledging my loyal dog, Hunter. This dissertation is dedicated to Hunter, whom I miss dearly. His curiosity, intelligence, and perseverance inspire me every day.

Financial support for data collection came from the Clarence and Elissa ("Lee") Schrag Endowed Fellowship in Sociology. Partial support for this research also came from a Shanahan Endowment Fellowship and a Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development training grant, T32 HD101442-01, to the Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology at the University of Washington.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Immigration has always been a contentious issue heavily debated in social and political discourse in the United States. Restrictions on entry into the United States and the extent of participation and inclusion in U.S. society have always been embedded in immigration law. Most notably, over the past forty years, the enforcement of federal immigration law has expanded from points of entry along national borders to the interior of the United States. This has contributed to the ongoing criminalization of immigration and immigrants. The election of President Donald J. Trump unleashed a new wave of restrictions and punitive measures that has been met with both support and opposition. In addition to attempting to tighten security along the U.S.-Mexico Border and heightening enforcement in the interior, the former president also threatened to defund sub-federal jurisdictions that limit their involvement in enforcing federal immigration law. This latter effort, which was unsuccessful, channeled new attention to and interest in sanctuary cities and the role of cities and counties in shaping immigration affairs.

In the United States, sanctuary cities are recognized as any sub-federal jurisdiction ranging from the municipal to state level that has at least one policy prohibiting the direct or indirect enforcement of federal immigration law (Lee et al. 2017).[1] The earliest sanctuary cities established in support of immigrants can be traced back to the 1980s. Today, it is estimated that there are over 500 sanctuary jurisdictions across the United States (Dinan 2018). Despite growing presence and increasing relevance in the discourse on immigration, our understanding of sanctuary cities remains limited along numerous dimensions.

[1] In this dissertation, I use the term "sanctuary city" to refer to any sub-federal jurisdiction, at both the county and city level, that has at least one policy either restricting enforcement of federal immigration law or restricting cooperation with federal agencies for the purpose of enforcing federal immigration law. While the application of this label is consistent with the general discourse on sanctuary cities, it is important to note that not all sub-federal jurisdictions with non-enforcement or non-cooperation policies embrace or claim the term "sanctuary city" to describe their orientations towards immigration, immigrants, or federal immigration law.

Research on sanctuary cities is gaining traction within the discipline of Sociology, especially among scholars at the intersection of immigration, crime, and policy. Much of this research has progressed linearly along the public safety and crime axis, assessing the impact of being a sanctuary city on public safety and crime in local communities. Research in this vein has been incredibly important in dispelling highly politicized assumptions about the dangers and harms associated with sanctuary cities. However, aside from examining "sanctuary city" as the focal independent variable and crime as a dependent variable, there has been very little attention devoted to understanding the specific policies that make jurisdictions "sanctuary cities." Moreover, there has been limited exploration into other outcomes aside from public safety and crime that may supplement our knowledge of immigrant integration.

My dissertation attempts to narrow this gap in understanding through a comprehensive in-depth analyses of municipal level sanctuary policies in the United States and a case study of Seattle utilizing semi-structured in-depth interviews. Broadly, the objectives of this dissertation are to identify the major policy orientations of sanctuary cities, examine the intended outcomes that motivate policy development and implementation, and explore sanctuary policies as pro-immigrant policies that potentially facilitate immigrant integration via practices that affirm membership and citizenship in local spaces. In doing so, my work introduces an operational conception of sanctuary cities and provides insight into the local understandings and practices that inform policymakers, service providers, and advocates vested in the interests and wellbeing of immigrant communities.

Below, I provide a brief history and overview of sanctuary cities, with attention to the contemporary meanings that converge around immigrants and immigration. From here, I review the emerging literature on sanctuary cities and identify shortcomings and gaps in understanding

that inform this current study. Next, I present my guiding research questions and describe the objectives of each chapter. I follow this with an explanation of my methodological approach. I close this chapter a discussion of why sociological research on sanctuary cities should expand beyond its law enforcement orientations and incorporate the work on immigrant integration.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF SANCTUARY CITIES AND THE DEVOLUTION OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

Currently, there is no official government or legal definition of "sanctuary city." In the United States, the term generally refers to any county or city that has at least one policy that limits local agencies from participating in enforcing immigration law, either directly or indirectly. In 2018, the Trump administration offered their definition of sanctuary city as "a state or local jurisdiction that refuses to cooperate with federal immigration enforcement" (White House 2018). Though neither official nor legally-binding, this definition reflected the sentiments of the administration at the time which were paired with unsuccessful attempts to withhold funding from sanctuary cities.

Today, sanctuary cities are understood in relation to the phenomenon of immigration, but this is a relatively modern development. Sanctuary cities have existed throughout history and served to protect various populations. The earliest notions of "sanctuary" can be found in the six cities of refuge in the bible which offered protection from vengeance and punishment for individuals who had accidentally killed another. In Ancient Rome and Medieval Europe, it was common practice for churches to shield and protect criminals and murderers (Shoemaker 2013; Lippert 2005). Outside of the churches, several European cities also became sanctuaries for serfs who abandoned their land in violation of the laws of feudalism (Bauder 2017).

Within the United States, the idea of establishing and providing sanctuary was

historically embodied in the resistance against the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, which permitted the federal government to capture fugitive slaves even if they were in states where slavery had been abolished. Activists actively defied federal law and assisted fugitive slaves in their journey to Canada (Krauthamer 2017). More formally, the first sanctuary city in the U.S. to be established by way of policy was the City of Berkeley in 1971. A resolution was passed by the city to protect U.S. sailors resisting the Vietnam war; city employees were prohibited from enforcing federal laws pertaining to military service (Ridgley 2011).

It was not until the 1980s, due to the Central American refugee crisis, that immigration would become a central organizing focus for sanctuary activists and policy makers. Churches and synagogues were central to establishing the early foundations of immigration-related sanctuary (Gzesh 2006). Perhaps one of the most notable events that helped to catalyze the spread of sanctuary practices and policies to address immigration matters was when the Southside Presbyterian Church in Tucson, Arizona defied Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) by opening its doors to Central Americans at risk of deportation. This effort was a reaction to the lack of legal channels available for Central Americans to seek asylum in the U.S. Specifically, the U.S. government refused to grant refugee status to Central Americans fleeing civil war and instead framed them as economic migrants (Coutin 2011). By the mid-1980s, over 150 religious congregations had proclaimed themselves to be places of sanctuary for undocumented Central American families (Gzesh 2006). Those who sought refuge in these spaces were offered legal representation, food, medical care, and assistance with finding employment.

Sub-federal governments soon became embedded in the sanctuary movement as well alongside religious congregations. However, rather than offering physical spaces of sanctuary,

cities and counties enacted ordinances and resolutions that prohibited city officials and local police from assisting federal immigration authorities or enforcing immigration law directly. Identifying the major turning points in immigration law is central to understanding the growth and expansion of sanctuary cities in the United States. More specifically, these turning points reveal how the responsibilities of enforcement and policing have devolved from federal to sub-federal agencies, resulting in tensions and conflicts about the roles of government and law enforcement agencies.

1980s – Present: Pivotal Moments in Immigration Enforcement

Enforcing immigration law has always been the jurisdiction of the federal government and until recent decades, non-cooperation between federal and sub-federal entities was the norm and expectation. However, over the years, as immigration enforcement strategies expanded and intensified, and shifted into the interior, sub-federal jurisdictions became implicated in what some scholars have referred as a system of "crimmigration" (Menjívar et al. 2018; Armenta 2016; García and Cuautemoc 2015; Coleman 2012). Increasingly, local law enforcement agencies including local police departments are expected to assist and support federal agencies in enforcing immigration law. The notion of "sanctuary" then, in the contemporary context, actually builds upon what has been accepted and expected for much of history – that local governments and agencies do not involve themselves in matters concerning the enforcement of immigration law, which is the jurisdiction of the federal government.

It is important to note that these non-cooperation and non-assistance policies are crafted within the scope of the law. In addition, these sanctuary policies do not and cannot guarantee safety for immigrants at risk of deportation or detention, but they may potentially create an area of underenforcement (Bauder 2016; Kraehenbuehl 2011). Counties and municipalities that

implement such policies and practices follow what has long been the norm for local policing before the task of enforcing immigration law devolved to sub-federal entities.

Traditionally, border patrol and ICE, or the former INS, had the exclusive responsibility of enforcing civil and criminal violations of immigration law (Kanstroom 2004; Wishnie 2004). This is evident in the Department of Justice's (DOJ) 1978 press release that clearly stated that the responsibility of enforcing immigration law "rests with the INS, and not with state and local police" (US Department of Justice 1978: 206). The document also emphasizes the special training INS officers receive to help them navigate the complexities associated with enforcing immigration law. This position was reinforced in 1996 with a DOJ Office of Legal Counsel Opinion that suggested state and local police lacked the legal authority to stop and detain individuals on suspicion of deportable immigration status. Just six years later, a new statement would be released by the DOJ declaring that local law enforcement agencies have the "inherent authority" to participate in immigration law enforcement.

Early examples of expected cooperation and assistance can be traced back to the Central American Refugee Crisis which was perceived by many as a humanitarian crisis worsened by the United States (Chinchilla et al. 2009). Though it was churches and synagogues that spearheaded the movement, several municipalities were quick to express support for refugees and asylum seekers by assuring local residents that city employees would not assist in federal efforts to deport those lacking regular status. For example, in 1985, the Los Angeles city council adopted a resolution that declared Los Angeles as a sanctuary city and prohibited city officials from assisting federal immigration authorities. Several other cities did the same, including San Francisco when it adopted a "City of Refuge" resolution.

Throughout the late 1980s and 1990s, major reforms to immigration and welfare law

renewed another wave of sanctuary efforts among sub-federal governments. The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 made it illegal for employers to hire undocumented workers and for private citizens to provide housing or transportation to undocumented individuals. Although the goal was to restrict the resources that undocumented individuals could access, these provisions of IRCA opened new opportunities for surveillance and policing among local law enforcement agencies and local service providers (Coleman 2007).

In the 1990s, welfare reforms contributed to growing anti-immigrant sentiment. The erosion of social welfare programs was blamed on immigrants and noncitizens who were framed as abusers of a taxpayer funded system (Ridgely 2008). Laws such as the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) and Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) distinguished the privileges of citizens versus noncitizens by making proof of citizenship status a requirement for obtaining access to even the most basic social services. Consequently, service providers in social services, health care, law enforcement, and education became entangled in the work of immigration enforcement with the need to now verify immigration and citizenship status (Ridgely 2008; Welch 2003). These federal level developments redefined the parameters of illegality for undocumented individuals and reinforced the second-class status of immigrants with legal status.

These reforms also contributed to the racialization and criminalization of Latino immigrants, who represent over three quarters of the undocumented population (Passell 2002; Massey 2007; Armenta 2016; Abrego et al. 2018). From this emerged the profile of the criminal alien that continues to be the primary target associated with immigration enforcement and policing in the United States. Criminalization is evident in the rapid increase of deportations over this decade, which increased from 20,039 in 1990 to 188,467 in 2000 (DHS 2010).

Moving into the 2000s, the onset of the war on terror only continued to entrench local and state police in immigration enforcement. Anti-terrorism initiatives heightened priorities for policing and surveillance of noncitizens For example, shortly after the events of September 11th, local police were tasked by the FBI to collect information on a group of Middle Eastern men living in the U.S. on temporary visas; although most police departments complied with this request, several police departments, including in Seattle and Portland, refused to assist with this effort.

In the present period, growing restrictions on immigration and immigrants advanced by the Trump administration have emboldened existing sanctuary cities to strengthen their policies and other cities and counties to join the movement. At the state level, governors in several states, including California and Colorado, signed "sanctuary state" bills.

Perhaps more unique than the policies targeting immigrants is the attempt by President Trump to go after sanctuary cities by withholding federal funding ("Executive Order 13768" 2017). Claiming that "sanctuary cities shield dangerous criminals" and that "they're safe havens for just some terrible people" helped to further polarize public sentiments on immigration and elevate the issue of sanctuary cities into the mainstream discourse ("Remarks by President Trump on Combatting the Opioid Crisis" 2018).

Police participation in immigration enforcement is a fairly new practice resulting from changes in federal immigration law that prioritize enforcement and policing over integration. Armenta and Alvarez (2017) observed that immigration enforcement by local police has increased in scope and intensity across three dimensions: direct enforcement of immigration law, cooperation with federal immigration authorities, and everyday policing of immigrant communities. Engagement in immigration policing ultimately shapes the relationship that local

law enforcement agencies have with their constituents. For the most part, police departments prefer to establish and maintain positive relationships with immigrant communities (Armenta 2016; Culver 2004). However, when police become an extended arm of ICE, immigrant residents may develop more negative perceptions about law enforcement.

A report published in 2012 details the numerous problematic aspects of collaboration between Border Patrol and local agencies and the impact on border communities in northern Washington (Curry et al. 2012). Even when collaboration was not built upon the aims of enforcing immigration law, the involvement of Border Patrol generated confusion among residents and created perceptions of immigration enforcement, further exacerbating fear, anxiety, and mistrust among community members. The researchers also found that Latinos, Muslims, and Arabs were overpoliced and overprofiled. The observations from this report are not unique and can be situated within a broader body of research on the consequences of a joint-effort approach immigration enforcement.

A 2008 Pew Hispanic Center survey reveals that respondents who have been stopped by police and asked about immigration status report low levels of confidence in police (Barrick 2012). Immigrants who fear deportation may also be reluctant to report crime due to skepticism that police will treat them fairly (Becerra, Wagaman, Androff, Messing, and Castillo 2016). Unreported crime and lack of confidence in law enforcement agencies arguably affect communities negatively. Therefore, it is not surprising that local governments and police departments are resisting the overreach of federal immigration enforcement by not only enacting policies that restrict immigration policing by local law enforcement, but also establishing programs and initiatives that foster a community that is favorable and receptive to immigrants.

SOCIOLOGICAL RESESARCH ON SANTUARY CITIES

The study of sanctuary cities is expanding in Sociology and other social science disciplines, but it remains fairly limited in scope. Much of this emerging body of research has focused on the relationship between sanctuary cities and crime, which is unsurprising given that the mainstream public perception is that immigrants are more prone to crime (Gallup 2017). Claims from the Trump administration that "sanctuary cities shield dangerous criminals" and that "they're safe havens for just some terrible people" have helped to magnify public opposition against pro-immigrant efforts ("Remarks by President Trump on Combatting the Opioid Crisis", 2018). Studies, repeatedly, show that these statements issued by the federal government are simply not true.

The research is overwhelmingly clear that immigrants are not more crime prone than their native-born counterparts (Sampson 2008; Kubrin and Ishizawa 2012; Martinez and Stowell 2012; Davies and Fagan 2016; Adelman et al. 2017), and sanctuary cities are not hotbeds for crime and disorder. Regarding this latter point, empirical data so far points to a protective effect of sanctuary cities against crime or no effect at all. Utilizing a sample of 55 sanctuary cities in the post-911 period, O'Brien et al. (2017) find that rates of violent crime, property crime, and rape did not change significantly after the introduction of a sanctuary city policy. This null effect was replicated in Kubrin and Bartos' (2020) study that examined the impact of California's sanctuary state bill (SB54) on property and violent crime.

Other studies suggest a protective effect of sanctuary city policies. For example, looking at county level data, Wong (2017) finds that in large central metropolitan, micropolitan, and rural sanctuary counties, rates of violent and property crime were significantly lower than comparable non-sanctuary counties. When focusing on homicide and robbery, cities with sanctuary city status help to strengthen the inverse relationship between immigrant presence and crime

(Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017). In areas with a high concentration of immigrants, the presence of policies limiting immigration enforcement is also usually associated with lower rates of crime (Lyons et al. 2013).

The speculated mechanism behind this protective effect is straightforward: local contexts that are politically receptive to immigrants help to enhance trust between local law enforcement and vulnerable residents while boosting social control in neighborhoods which in turn helps to lower crime (Lyons et al. 2013). While research on this topic is still growing, the findings so far suggest that sanctuary cities do not lead to increases in crime and in some cases, is associated with a decline.

Beyond a Binary Understanding of "Sanctuary"

Studies assessing the relationship between sanctuary city policies and crime have undoubtedly been instrumental in shifting perspectives and dispelling harmful narratives about sanctuary cities. These studies also oversimplify the notion of what it means to be a sanctuary city. The studies cited operationalize sanctuary city on a binary basis of whether a local jurisdiction has a policy that limits the enforcement of immigration law. O'Brien et al. (2017:2) classifies sanctuary cities as "any city or police department that passed a resolution or ordinance expressly forbidding city or law enforcement officials from inquiring into immigration status and/or cooperation with ICE". In a similar vein, Lyon et al. (2013:9) operationalizes sanctuary cities as "any municipality that has at least one or formal resolution limiting local enforcement of immigration laws."

There are certainly practical and methodological reasons for operationalizing "sanctuary city" as a binary variable especially when employing statistical modeling techniques. However, sociological research on sanctuary cities need not progress only along this trajectory.

Sociological knowledge on sanctuary cities can greatly be expanded by broadening our view of what the concept of sanctuary represents and examining the variation that is inherent in local policies concerning immigration.

A range of policies and practices meet the criteria for restriction the enforcement of federal immigration law by local agencies. These policies and practices also vary in their ability to effectively reduce the impact of federal immigration law on local communities; this is often shaped by how general or specific the policies are. For example, in some jurisdictions, there may be general prohibitions on the use of local resources to police immigration while in other jurisdictions, there may be specific restrictions on not cooperating with ICE such as in the form of not allowing access to local jails (Avila et al. 2018). It is also not uncommon to see a combination of various policies within a sanctuary city.

There have been very few attempts at redefining "sanctuary city" but the ones that exist offer promising insight. Thinking of sanctuary cities on a continuum has been one approach. Avila et al. (2018) utilizes a 7-point local policy spectrum to assess the degree of involvement with ICE with zero representing the most involvement and seven representing the least involvement. This is a particularly useful conceptual tool for assessing how sanctuary cities may vary in their effectiveness to support immigrant constituents.

Categorical conceptualizations can also be insightful for identifying the types of immigration enforcement and policing that are restricted. Kittrie (2006) finds that sanctuary policies tend to fall under three main categories: "don't ask," "don't tell," and "don't enforce." Don't ask policies prohibit inquiries into immigration status, don't tell policies prohibit information sharing, and don't enforce policies limit enforcement of immigration law by local officials.

The ability to assess the degree that immigration enforcement is restricted in local jurisdictions and categorize the various practices and policies offers additional insight that that the binary variable misses. Understanding these nuances of sanctuary cities will likely strengthen our investigations of the impacts of such pro-immigrant policies on various outcomes. However, I argue that the orientation towards immigration enforcement itself is not sufficient to capture the intended meanings and objectives that lead to the creation of sanctuary cities.

GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

My dissertation is a comprehensive in-depth exploration of sanctuary city policies at the municipal level in the U.S. utilizing content analyses of legislation, news media, and police documents, and a case study of Seattle guided by semi-structured interviews with city officials and employees working for immigrant-serving non-profit organizations. There are four analyses presented in this study. While each analysis is guided by a different set of research questions, the overall aim of this study is to examine sanctuary cities in the U.S. from the perspective of immigrant integration, in addition to public safety, with attention to variations in sanctuary policies and the role that municipal governments play in potentially shaping experiences of immigrant inclusion and participation.

Research Question 1: What are the main responses taken by cities in response to restrictive or hostile immigration law from the 1980s to present?

One of the limiting factors to how we currently understand sanctuary cities is that there is no official or legal definition for sanctuary city. Attempts to define and operationalize "sanctuary city" have defaulted to a binary variable that classifies any jurisdiction with at least one policy limiting immigration enforcement as a sanctuary city. Limiting immigration enforcement at the local level can take many forms ranging from restricting local police and municipal employees

from assisting federal immigration authorities to prohibiting inquiries into the immigration or citizenship status of local residents. Variations in sanctuary policies are also likely to stem from changes in federal priorities on immigration enforcement and policing which have intensified over time.

Chapter Two examines local policy orientations with respect to restrictive and hostile immigration law since the 1980s when the first attempts at establishing sanctuary cities appeared in the United States. Specifically, the goal is to identify the different ways that municipal governments and local police departments limit immigration enforcement and attempt to dilute the reach of federal immigration enforcement activities. To provide context to the policy orientations, I consider how current events and federal legislative developments at the time of policy implementation shape the type of sanctuary policy that is enacted.

The findings from this analysis paint sanctuary city in the U.S. as a patchwork of policies characterized by tremendous variation encouraging a more nuanced approach to how we currently define and understand sanctuary cities.

Research Question 2: What are the intended outcomes that motivate policymakers to implement sanctuary policies and pro-immigrant measures at the municipal level?

In the United States, sanctuary cities are largely understood in relation to immigration enforcement, public safety, and crime. Proponents of sanctuary cities argue that sanctuary policies help to boost trust and confidence in local authorities which are conducive to reducing crime and enhancing public safety (Lyons et al. 2013). Opponents contend that sanctuary cities harbor criminals and interfere with the ability of law enforcement agencies to protect communities (Trump White House Archives 2018). Public safety has been central to conversations about sanctuary cities.

Chapter Three examines the public safety narrative advanced by policymakers and city employees to identify the factors that motivate municipal governments and local police departments to implement sanctuary policies. Specifically, I examine government employees' perceptions of boosting trust and cooperation and concerns about resource conservation as they pertain to sanctuary policies and public safety in municipalities.

Chapter Three also considers a broader narrative of creating pro-immigrant spaces as another motivation for enacting sanctuary policies. In analyzing legislative and police documents, I focus on how immigration matters are framed and how this is used to justify policies that oppose federal efforts to police immigrants. Broadening our understandings of sanctuary cities beyond a public safety narrative is insightful for expanding our knowledge on immigrant integration and the roles of cities in shaping contexts of reception. While immigration is the jurisdiction of the federal government, everyday lives are experienced in local communities. To this end, it is important to examine if and how sanctuary cities are perceived by policymakers and civil servants to shape immigrant lives.

Research Question 3: In the City of Seattle, what does it mean to be a Welcoming City?

To supplement the content analyses presented in Chapters Two and Three, I present a case study of Seattle and conduct interviews with employees of the city and immigrant-serving non-profit organizations. The overall aim of Chapter Four is to examine the meanings that civil servants and policymakers attach to being a Welcoming City in Seattle. While the city is recognized as a sanctuary city in the media and classified as such in numerous databases (OJJPAC 2021; Beekman 2016; NILC 2008), the city passed a resolution in 2017 proclaiming its status as a Welcoming City.

Though the term "Welcoming City" is not as well-known as "Sanctuary City", it is becoming more widely adopted by cities in the United States. Many of these cities have membership or affiliation with the Welcoming America network, a non-profit and non-partisan organization dedicated to building inclusive communities (Welcoming America 2022). Whereas the concept of sanctuary evokes safe-haven imageries, the term "Welcoming City", as implied in its name, places more emphasis on welcoming rather than protecting immigrants. However, these differences in meaning, based on the prior content analyses, are not necessarily reflected in the specific policies implemented locally. Cities that adopt the name "Welcoming City" often have the same non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies as cities that adopt the name "Sanctuary City."

In Chapter 4, I explore the reasons why the City of Seattle adopted the name "Welcoming City" and how this resonates with pro-immigrant efforts advanced through the municipal government and immigrant-serving non-profit organizations. I consider both perspectives on public safety and immigrant integration to analyze the Welcoming City Resolution as a framework for establishing Seattle as a welcoming and inclusive space. I consider the extent to which the meanings associated with being a Welcoming City overlap with those associated with being a Sanctuary City.

The findings from the interviews suggest that local efforts to support immigrant communities are more than just symbolic and that contemporary notions of sanctuary, as embodied by the label "Welcoming City," in Seattle are informed by values of inclusivity, equity, and diversity. Creating a Welcoming City is an ongoing effort to blunt the reach of federal immigration enforcement while facilitating inclusive spaces to encourage participation and inclusion among immigrant groups.

Research Question 4: How does the City of Seattle advance notions of citizenship and belonging through pro-immigrant policies and practices?

In the final analysis presented in Chapter Five, I extend my case study of Seattle to further examine how sanctuary cities can be realized as pro-immigrant spaces conducive to immigrant integration. Specifically, I consider how local policies and policies can affirm membership and advance notions of local citizenship through the assignment of rights and privileges. Borrowing from the theoretical frameworks in both Geography and Sociology, I adopt two perspectives to frame my analysis. First, I begin with the consideration that citizenship is a practice grounded in daily routines more so than it is a formal status conferred by the nation-state. Second, I center the dominant view among urban scholars' that local residency is the primary condition via which informal citizenship is granted.

Three pro-immigrant policies and practices are presented to demonstrate how informal citizenship is realized in civic life: the Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) ordinance, the language access program, and departmental practices to expand opportunities for political participation. Stories from interviewees suggest that aspects of local citizenship can exhibit degrees of formalization. This is accomplished through legislative action as well as processes of bureaucratic incorporation whereby immigrant interests can be represented and advanced through non-legislative channels.

The examples presented in this analysis provide additional support for recognizing sanctuary cities as pro-immigrant spaces that have implications for immigrant integration. In Seattle, the process of improving civic engagement and amplifying immigrant voices is accomplished through creative strategies that make civic spaces more welcoming and inclusive

and ongoing and ongoing efforts to affirm membership and belonging through the recognition of local citizenship.

DATA AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This study employed content analyses and a case study with semi-structured in-depth interviews. I selected these methodologies to better examine the meanings and nuances inherent in sanctuary city policies.

While sanctuary cities can refer to any sub-federal jurisdiction including counties and state, I limit my sample to cities, towns, and villages governed by a municipal government. My primary reasoning for this is that cities represent the most typical geographic unit in which everyday lives are experienced and contained. Municipal governments often play a pivotal role in managing the spaces of social interaction, economic participation, and to some extent political engagement; institutions and organizations such as libraries, parks and recreation, rental markets, and schools, to some extent, are governed by policies at the local level. How these institutions and organizations are managed and organized, and subsequently experienced by local residents, influence the overall context of reception into which immigrants integrate.

Content Analyses

Chapters Two and Three are informed by in-depth analyses of sanctuary policies, pro-immigrant policies, municipal documents, local news media, and local police policy documents, from 1979 to 2019. Sanctuary policies include any municipal level legislation that is related to limiting municipal agencies and departments from participating in the enforcement of federal immigration law; most commonly, these policies include resolutions, ordinances, and mayoral executive orders. Pro-immigrant policies refer to any municipal level legislation that is supportive towards immigrants and builds upon initial or previous sanctuary legislation. A

resolution that establishes a legal defense fund for immigrants that is justified on the city's status as a sanctuary city or commitment to limiting immigration enforcement would be an example of a pro-immigrant policy. Municipal level documents include any information issued or developed by the local governing body or a city department, including websites, media advisories, press releases, and pamphlets.

In addition to the official municipal ordinances and policies, I examined local news articles for a sample of cities to provide verification or additional context to sanctuary or pro-immigrant policies that were vague in wording. I selected articles for inclusion if there were quotes included from a member of the municipal government, city employee, or local law enforcement official. Furthermore, I examined relevant police policy documents when and where they referred to sections of procedure manuals pertaining to immigration and bias-free policing. I considered police policies to be relevant for this study if either or both citizenship and immigration status were mentioned. More generally, I included documents issued by the police department such as FAQ for the public and public statements on immigration when relevant.

After compiling the municipal legislation and polices, local news articles, and policy documents, the final list of documents I collected for the analyses consisted of 435 unique documents covering 209 municipalities and spanning 21 states. Searching for and verifying these documents required several approaches. The first strategy I utilized included drawing from existing lists of sanctuary cities compiled by others. To begin, I relied on lists created by the Ohio Jobs and Justice PAC (OJJPAC), the National Immigration Law Center (NILC), Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) to generate a condensed list that included municipalities only. Aside from the NILC and LIRS, the organizations appeared to exhibit an unfavorable attitude towards sanctuary city policies. From

the condensed list, I searched each municipality's official website, and local police department's website if available, for evidence of sanctuary city status. Ideally, my goal in each case was to track down the legislation as an ordinance, resolution, or executive order. Occasionally, I would come across a municipality that maintained legislative records and notes through Legistar, a database that is searchable to the public. In these cases, I would enter a selection of the following key words to find additional relevant legislation: "immigrants," "immigration," "sanctuary," "ICE," "DHS," "citizenship," "undocumented," "refugee," and "asylum seeker."

The lack of official or legal definition for "sanctuary city" makes identification and classification a complex process. Suspecting that the lists compiled by other organizations online were not exhaustive, I also searched combined keywords such as "sanctuary", "Welcoming City", "immigration enforcement", "city council" through pdf.searchengine.net and combed through the results from pdf documents that resembled municipal policy documents. To verify the legitimacy of these documents, I went to the municipality's official website and replicated the process I used initially. If I could not locate the same document through the municipality's official website, I searched for news articles to see if sanctuary city status had been reported or discussed in the media. If I could find no evidence to corroborate the rogue document, I emailed a staff member of the city's official records department for verification. If I received a reply that verified the legitimacy of the document, I would request for copies of relevant legislative documents pertaining to immigration if available.

The compiled documents were imported into NVivo 12 for organization and analyses. My coding strategy utilized both inductive and deductive approaches. To begin, I developed a set of codes drawn from general and academic discourses on sanctuary cities; this resulted in codes that converged around the themes of enforcement of immigration law, public safety, fear

alleviation, and trust and cooperation. The intent of this set of codes was to reveal insight into the objectives and intended outcomes that inform sanctuary policies. In the early stages of coding, I realized that new meanings and themes were emerging that offered further clarity to the role of local agencies with respect to immigration enforcement. Therefore, inductive codes were created to reflect the more specific orientations to immigration enforcement adopted by municipalities.

To examine if sanctuary city policies could be framed as pro-immigrant policies that potentially facilitate immigrant integration, I also established codes that captured policy motivations related to supporting immigrant residents. This began by coding text that emphasized immigrant participation and inclusion, and eventually evolved to include broader themes pertaining to immigrant contributions, diversity, civic culture and values, family reunification, and anti-discrimination.

Case Study of Seattle

As the content analyses was largely based on my own interpretation, I wanted to use a case study to supplement my findings and examine more closely what sanctuary policies look like in practice. In Chapter Four, I provide a more in-depth explanation as to why Seattle is well-suited as a case study. In short, aside from convenience, Seattle was selected due to its public reputation in the United States as a sanctuary city and its comprehensive set of non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies (Beekman 2016). In this respect, Seattle is comparable to other recognizable sanctuary cities, such as Los Angeles and New York City, that have responded to similar federal developments on immigration and enacted similar supports for immigrant residents.

With a population of 737,015, Seattle is a fast-growing metropolitan city and a major destination for immigrants in the United States (U.S. Census 2020). Approximately 20% of all

residents are foreign-born and 22% of persons ages 5 and over report speaking a language other than English at home (U.S. Census 2020). Politically, the city leans left as evidenced by a consistent voting record in support of Democratic candidates (King County 2015). In addition to municipal level ordinances and resolutions that qualify Seattle as a Sanctuary City, the city is also nested within King County which also has its own policies limiting the enforcement of federal immigration law. In 2019, Governor Jay Inslee signed SB 5497 declaring Washington a sanctuary state effectively prohibiting police officers from inquiring into immigration status.

While it may appear that the City of Seattle exhibits the defining characteristics of a sanctuary city and is geographically nested in sub-federal environments with similar political orientations, the city has refrained from calling itself a "Sanctuary City" officially. This marks a departure from comparable cities such as Los Angeles and New York City. Instead, in 2017, the City of Seattle adopted the name "Welcoming City." As the content analyses revealed that Seattle's policies are not very different in intent and scope as Los Angeles and New York City, it was of particular interest to explore why city officials opted for the name "Welcoming City" instead of "Sanctuary City." Therefore, questions about the meanings attached to these two terms were included in the interview protocol and incorporated into the study.

Though the justification for enacting sanctuary city policies is often situated in the narrative of promoting trust and public safety, I was also interested in exploring how key actors affected by local municipal directives interpret and understand the concept of being a pro-immigrant city. To this end, I conducted semi-structured interviews with 12 civil servants employed by the City of Seattle and 11 staff members of local immigrant-serving non-profit organizations that provide services for immigrants and receive funding from the city.

I recruited participants using publicly available contact information from websites. For the City of Seattle, I targeted departments and offices that worked closely with immigrant communities or provided services to residents. Within departments and offices, I reached out to individuals whose roles involved policy or program development, service provision, or community engagement. To recruit from non-profit organizations, I focused on organizations that had contracts with the city and emailed the director if the contact information was available; for some organizations, this information was not provided, and I sent a request to the primary email address listed on the webpage. I relied heavily on snowball sampling not only to recruit additional participants, but to direct my recruitment towards individuals that existing participants believed could provide insight to my study. I offered a $25 gift card to participants at the end of the interview.

The interviews were semi-structured with questions about the participant's work roles and experiences, extent of interaction with members of the immigrant community, knowledge of federal and local immigration policy, thoughts about Seattle's Welcoming City Resolution, and perceptions of public safety. The interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 3 hours.

The interviews were conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic between February 2021 and January 2022 over Zoom and by phone. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed within 30 days of the interview date, then imported into NVivo 12 for coding and analyses. Though I initially imported my codes from the prior content analyses, there were new insights from the interviews that led to additional codes related to community partnerships, civic engagement, political participation, deterrence, and multiculturalism.

The protocols for recruitment, conducting interviews, and reporting of findings were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Washington. Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of research subjects.

TOWARDS A BROADER UNDERSTANDING OF SANCTUARY CITIES

As sanctuary cities begin to gain more traction in the research agenda, it seems appropriate to explore what it means to be a sanctuary city and how being a sanctuary city facilitates the development of pro-immigrant spaces. In this study, I use the term "pro-immigrant" to describe spaces within environments hostile to immigrants that facilitate immigrant integration and participation.

In the U.S., sanctuary cities are understood exclusively based on the relationship between local agencies and federal immigration law enforcement agencies. But there are good reasons to expand upon this understanding and recognize sanctuary cities as pro-immigrant spaces that account to more than limited enforcement spaces. First, the literature on contexts of reception suggests a role for sanctuary cities in shaping local spaces in ways that may be conducive to immigrant integration. Second, an overview of sanctuary cities from an international perspective points to the practice of sanctuary as one concerned with immigrant rights more so than the enforcement of immigration law. Lastly, sanctuary cities exhibit some degree of path-dependency in that once a jurisdiction enacts one sanctuary policy, the likelihood of backtracking seems to be low.

Immigrant Integration in Local Contexts

In the United States, the decentralization of social and economic policy makes local contexts especially pertinent for shaping immigrant integration experiences (Ellis and Almgren 2009). Whether municipal governments are favorable or hostile to immigrants may be reflected

in policy orientations. Surprisingly, sanctuary city policies have not been extensively examined in this capacity. Even if narrowed down to only account for non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies, sanctuary cities conceivably shape local contexts in ways that allow for participation in social, political, and economic spheres. For instance, if immigrants are assured that interacting with local agencies will not involve immigration policing, then immigrants might be more willing to utilize local resources and spaces in their everyday lives. This may be especially pertinent for members of undocumented and mixed-status families who bear the brunt of new immigrant enforcement priorities. This is evidenced by Beck and Shklyan's (2021) study that finds that local contexts matter more than legal status, or lack thereof, in predicting community-level civic engagement among undocumented immigrants.

The ability of non-profit organizations to serve immigrant populations is also likely to be shaped by the extent to which local governments are supportive of immigrants. Enacting sanctuary city policies may convey the pro-immigrant attitudes of local officials and potentially widen avenues for cooperation between city agencies and non-profit organizations. In contrast, anti-immigrant attitudes may foster a hostile environment that interfere with the ability of non-profit organizations to meet their objectives. When Senate Bill 4 was passed in Texas banning sanctuary cities, non-profit employees in Austin reported a decline in clients accessing services (Kaplan 2017).

Sanctuary policies, as a factor shaping local contexts of reception, have noticeably been absent from sociological research. As more and more local governments consider interventions in opposition to aggressive immigration enforcement by federal agencies, it will be important to consider if and how sanctuary policies shape local contexts of receptions and shape immigrant experiences in civic spaces.

International Perspectives on Sanctuary Cities

Another reason for considering a broader perspective is evident from an international perspective. The attention to immigration enforcement as a practice of sanctuary is quite unique to the United States. In other immigrant-receiving Western societies, sanctuary cities have very little to do with the enforcement of immigration law.

In Canada, sanctuary cities are established in collaboration between advocacy groups, community organizations, and municipal governments with the intention of encouraging immigrant residents to access city resources without fear (Bauder 2016). The "Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT)" bylaw in Toronto prohibits city employees from inquiring into immigration status so that refugees and undocumented immigrants can access and utilize city services. In Western Canada, the City of Vancouver attempted something similar with their "Access to City Services Without Fear" policy; however, immigration advocates argue that the policy current lacks breadth and effective enforcement to ensure compliance (Robinson 2016).

Unlike in the U.S., sanctuary cities in Canada are less likely to involve any significant participation from local police departments. Therefore, information sharing between local law enforcement agencies and the federal border enforcement agency can continue uninterrupted without contradicting any established local and federal practices concerning immigration matters (Keung 2015). Nevertheless, the concept of being a sanctuary city in Canada still centers on reducing unnecessary immigration policing and enforcement, but from city employees rather than official law enforcement officers. Moreover, ongoing, and persistent organizing efforts from advocates of sanctuary suggest that despite the lack of impact on law enforcement, establishing sanctuary through municipal spaces is still worthwhile and consequential for shaping immigrant experiences.

Sanctuary cities in Europe are oriented towards education and advocacy, with no restrictions placed on enforcement of immigration law or policing of immigrants. In England, the process of establishing a City of Sanctuary involves collaboration between city councils and local advocacy groups with the intent of strengthening ties with local refugee communities and promoting a "culture of hospitality" (Squire and Bagelman 2012: 155). Private citizens can play an active role in fostering an immigrant friendly environment by displaying signs, "We welcome asylum-seekers and refugees" (Bauder; 2016; Squire and Bagelman 2012). Sanctuary initiatives in the United Kingdom are largely focused on raising awareness rather than defining the role of municipal law enforcement agencies.

The sanctuary city model in the United States that emphasizes limiting immigration enforcement and policing is unique in comparison to its international counterparts. This likely reflects the different immigrant groups that are on the receiving end of anti-immigrant action. The size of the undocumented population and the perpetual Latino threat narrative are central to the discourse on immigration in the U.S. but they are not significant features of other advanced industrialized societies. However, sanctuary cities in the U.S. have not always been motivated by hostility towards undocumented populations but also other groups of immigrants and groups of color. For instance, mayors and city councils in sanctuary cities were quick to denounce President Trump's Executive Order 13769, presented in the media as the "Muslim ban," and assure protections and supports for affected residents (Toure 2017). Once sanctuary cities are established, a pathway to creating a pro-immigrant space is paved. Thinking beyond measures aside from the role of law enforcement allows for a conceptualization of sanctuary city that is dynamic and responsive to the needs of immigrant communities.

The Path-Dependency of Sanctuary Cities

I draw on the tenets of path dependence theory and a conceptualization of sanctuary as a "process" to advance my argument that current understandings of sanctuary cities should incorporate a longer-term view that considers immigrant integration as an outcome. From a path dependency perspective, policy continuity is preferred because the costs of policy reversal are high (Greener 2002; Pierson 2000). This reasoning can be applied to sanctuary policies, especially those that are embedded as ordinances. Furthermore, as sanctuary policies are often the result of extensive grassroots campaigning and organizing, opponents who advocate for policy reversal or change are likely to encounter resistance by activists and organizers.

In an article published in *Geographical Review*, Serin Houston (2019) builds upon an essay about sanctuary activism by Walia (2014) that conceptualizes sanctuary as a "process" as opposed to a place-based designation. The origins of this idea can further be traced to Faria Chowdhury (2010), a community organizer and cofounder of the No One is Illegal campaign in Toronto, Canada. From this view, "sanctuary" is more than a label or a status. Houston's main argument is that sanctuary policies are not static and but can over time advance practices of internal bordering which strengthen experiences of belonging. Extending Houston's ideas to the sociological literature on immigrant integration and citizenships encourages a closer look at sanctuary cities as more than places defined by their position on immigration enforcement but as dynamic spaces in which pro-immigrant values are realized through ongoing practices and policies that widen the boundaries of participation and inclusion of immigrant residents.

There is not much literature on the permanency of sanctuary cities, but my analysis here and review of sanctuary city data indicates two patterns. First, the number of sanctuary cities, at municipal, county, and state levels, has increased over time suggesting diffusion. Second, many sanctuary cities established in the 1980s continue to be sanctuary cities today and have amended

old policies and added new ones in response to changes in immigration law. In my review of sanctuary policies, there was only one non-enforcement policy that appears to have been rescinded. Therefore, it seems the case that for most jurisdictions that adopt a sanctuary city policy, this policy likely stays in effect and may also pave the way for other policies that benefit immigrant communities.

CHAPTER 2: LOCAL ORIENTATIONS TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW

In the United States, the term "sanctuary city" is used to describe any jurisdiction that has at least one policy or limiting the enforcement of immigration law by local agencies. To this end, and perhaps out of convenience, many studies that assess the impact of sanctuary cities have operationalized "sanctuary city" as a binary variable. This approach, while practical in quantitative analyses, downplays the variation of practices and policies that have been implemented in sanctuary cities. Dissecting these nuances are relevant for understanding how the lived experiences of constituents, especially those who are racialized or undocumented, are shaped by the interplay of federal and local legislation.

This section explores the main categories of immigration enforcement restriction by municipalities in the United States with attention to the scope and intensity of these efforts in response to anti-immigrant action at the federal level. I also examine the exceptions embedded in these restriction policies and assess the limitations of sanctuary cities to prevent immigration policing and enforcement in local communities. Overall, the findings suggest that the involvement of local agents and officials in enforcing immigration law can take many forms and vary in comprehensiveness against federal immigration enforcement efforts.

I preface the analysis in this section by reviewing the federal legislation over the past four decades that has contributed to the expansion of the immigration enforcement apparatus and created opportunities and expectations for participation by local agencies. I also synthesize the literature on the consequences associated with immigration enforcement by local police.

LOCAL INVOLVEMENT IN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

The task of enforcing immigration law is the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. However, as immigration enforcement efforts shift and expand from the border to

the interior, local enforcement agencies are increasingly becoming an extended arm of ICE. This is arguably a recent development in the history of the country that began to take form in the early 1980s. Immigration and welfare reform efforts created new opportunities and expectations for local agencies to participate in the enforcement of immigration law.

Over the past four decades, the federal government has expanded its enforcement and surveillance capacities by creating new roles and responsibilities for federal and sub-federal enforcement agencies. This contributed to what Huntington (2008) and Spiro (1997) refer to as immigration federalism whereby federal authority is devolved to local enforcement officers. In the sociological literature, the terms "overcriminalization of immigration" (Chacon 2012) and "crimmigration" (Armenta 2016; García Hernandez 2015; Stumpf 2006) have been used to describe the growth of the immigration enforcement apparatus. This development was enabled and accompanied by the criminalization of immigrants, which created the category of "criminal alien" and made the terms "unauthorized immigrant" synonymous with "criminal" (Abrego et al. 2018; Ewing, Martinez, and Rumbaut 2015). Below, I provide a brief overview of the key legislative pieces that solidified the linkage between crime and immigration and paved the way for the ongoing expansion of the crimmigration system.

Immigration Enforcement in the Interior and the Expanding Roles of Sub-federal Agencies

A notable characteristic of contemporary immigration enforcement is the emphasis on policing the interior and accompanying this, the increasing involvement of sub-federal actors and agencies in enforcing immigration law and policing immigrants. There are several notable legislative developments over the past four decades that have contributed to the rapid growth of what Goodman (2020) calls "the deportation machine."

One of the most significant pieces of immigration-related legislation since the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 is the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA). IRCA represents the first major attempt by the federal government to seriously address unauthorized immigration not just along the U.S.-Mexico Border but also in the interior. IRCA contained punitive measures as well as a legalization program that served as a pathway to legal status for nearly 2.7 million undocumented residents (Rytina 2002). The punitive side of IRCA included fines and the possibility of jail time for employers who knowingly employed an undocumented individual, and increased funding and security along the U.S.-Mexico border to deter unauthorized crossings. While the duties of enforcement and regulation remained the responsibility of Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS), IRCA was a crucial piece of legislation in setting the stage for the criminalization of immigration in the United States.

Shortly following IRCA, the Alien Criminal Apprehension Program (ACAP) was implemented in 1988 to expedite removals through the criminal justice system. Active in state and federal prisons, and local jails, the primary objective of ACAP was to identify removable noncitizens. Since 2006, ACAP was renamed Criminal Alien Program (CAP) and remains one of the biggest drivers of deportation.

The 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act (ADAA) and 1990 Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) were also notable developments that reinforced the association between crime and immigration. The ADAA created aggravated felonies as a new crime category. For noncitizens, an aggravated felony conviction could become grounds for deportation. The INA expanded on the list of crimes that qualified as an aggravated felony which widened the net for deportable offenses. By the 1990s, unauthorized entry and undocumented status had been solidly established as social problems that could be addressed through punitive measures, including aggressive

immigration enforcement in the interior. The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 included several punitive measures including lowering the barriers for removal proceedings for certain aggravated felons and increasing the penalties for re-entry after deportation. The bill also allocated $1.2 billion dollars for Border Patrol and $1.8 billion dollars as reimbursement for states incarcerating undocumented persons as part of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP).

The passage of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) and the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) in 1996 signified a transformation in how immigration control would be managed in the United States. One of the most notable legacies of the IIRIRA is the 287(g) program which incorporates state and local enforcement agencies into the immigration enforcement apparatus (Kerwin 2018). With training, local police were given the authority to carry out tasks that were traditionally the responsibility of federal immigration authorities. The AEDPA magnified the consequences of being undocumented as outlined in the IIRIRA by further restricting immigrants' rights to due process which made it easier to deport individuals. Together, the AEDPA and IIRIRA reframed immigration enforcement and control as a joint effort between federal, state, and local agencies.

The attacks of September 11th and subsequent responses to combat terrorism resulted in legislation and the creation of new agencies that intertwined immigration matters with issues of national security and terrorism. In 2002, the Homeland Security Act (HSA) was passed, which led to the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Though primarily intended to prevent terrorism, the DHS also has jurisdiction over immigration matters concerning the enforcement and administration of immigration laws and security of U.S. Borders. Perhaps the most significant development stemming from the DHS was the creation of new enforcement

agencies which continue to be dominant today: Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). That these immigration agencies, including Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), are housed within DHS is an important distinction from the U.S.'s peer nations that have dedicated departments for immigration affairs that exist considerably more distantly from departments dedicated to national security.

Subsequent and recent immigration enforcement legislation builds upon the joint effort model of enforcement while utilizing the capabilities of enforcement agencies such as ICE and CBP. The Clear Law Enforcement for Alien Removal Act (CLEAR Act) was introduced into the House of Representatives first in 2005, then again in 2009, with the intention of making unauthorized presence in the U.S. a felony offence and deputizing local police officers to investigate immigration violations and arrest alleged unauthorized individuals.

In 2008, the Secure Communities program, also known as S-Comm, was launched as a federal-local partnership to prioritize interior immigration enforcement through information sharing between ICE, FBI, DHS, and state and local law enforcement agencies. For a short period after its launch, participation from local authorities was voluntary but it was soon made mandatory (NILC 2011). The success of the program depended on local agencies identifying deportable immigrants in custody and submitting fingerprints to a database. At its height, Secure Communities was active in over 95% of local jurisdictions and averaged around 400,000 deportations per year (ICE 2012; Preston 2010). In contrast to 287(g) whereby select local enforcement officers directly enforce immigration law, Secure Communities depends on local enforcement officers and agencies to indirectly enforce immigration law by transmitting information to federal immigration enforcement agencies. Secure Communities has been described as an advanced means for ICE to engage in enforcement through technology without

physically being present in jails (Waslin 2011). After much opposition from local agencies, and immigrant advocacy groups, President Obama terminated Secure Communities in 2014. Only three years later, the controversial immigration control program would be reinitiated by President Trump alongside several other anti-immigrant measures.

In 2017, two executive orders were issued targeting enforcement along the border and in the interior. The Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements order met both objectives by reinstituting and expanding 287(g) and hiring more than 5000 agents to patrol border regions (Executive Order 13767 2017). The order gave power to sheriff and police departments to investigate civil and criminal immigration violations. The second executive order, Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the U.S., renewed the Secure Communities Program and authorized an additional 10,000 ICE agents to be hired to maximize immigration enforcement efforts (Executive Order 13768 2017). The order also ended the Priority Enforcement Program (PEP) which was in effect between 2015 to 2017 and protected close to 90% of undocumented immigrants from deportation. At a time when net migration to the U.S. from Mexico was negative, these executive orders continue a pattern of immigrant criminalization via the expansion and intensification of immigrant enforcement strategies (Abrego et al. 2018).

It is difficult to quantify the various ways that local agencies can support the immigration enforcement regime as the options are vast, diversified, and constantly expanding. To make sense of the increasing scope and intensity of immigration enforcement, Armenta and Alvarez (2017) identify three general forms of enforcement by local authorities: direct enforcement of immigration law, cooperation with federal immigration authorities, and every day policing of immigrant communities. Deputization of local enforcement agencies to police immigration, such

as via the 287(g) program, constitutes direct forms of immigration enforcement. Indirect enforcement through cooperation with and assistance for ICE and other federal agencies appears to be more common. Specific examples of indirect enforcement practices include honoring detainer requests, providing access to status checks, and information sharing. The last form, everyday policing of immigrant communities, is shaped by policing practices that sharpen the criminal portrayal of immigrants (Armenta and Alvarez 2017). Routine police procedures like asking for identification or a driver's license, and vehicle stops can become immigration policing events, which can contribute to deportation (Armenta 2016; Stuesse and Coleman 2014). In public spaces, immigration policing also occur when police enforce anti-vending ordinances that disproportionately affect daylaborers (Varsanyi 2008). The three forms of immigration enforcement outlined by Armenta and Alvarez (2017) demonstrate broadly the current range of opportunities that are available for local authorities, mainly police, to participate in the enforcement of immigration law.

Role of Municipal Agencies and Employees

A lesser explored area of immigration enforcement at the local level concerns the role of municipal employees that work in non-policing positions. Municipal departments provide services such as utilities and operate mainstream institutions and public spaces like libraries and recreation centers for residents. In the provision of services and management of civic spaces, public employees interact with members of the community on a regular basis which creates many opportunities for immigration policing to occur unintentionally. Procedures for verifying identification and restrictions on the types of identification accepted can inadvertently expose residents to indirect enforcement and marginalized membership in their communities (de Graauw 2014). Furthermore, since most police departments are accountable to municipal governments,

local officials can influence policing matters related to immigration enforcement. To this end, it is important to account for the role that public employees play in the immigration enforcement apparatus and how this may alter commitments to their constituents.

The current scale of immigration enforcement in the United States is unprecedented. The participation of local authorities in policing immigration has not been the norm until recently, and even now, immigration law and regulation remain the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. There is a lot on the line when local authorities prioritize and take on the tasks of federal enforcement agencies, including, but not limited to, the depletion of scarce municipal resources, and weakened trust and confidence from residents in local police and city officials.

PROBLEMS WITH CONTEMPORARY IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

At the local level, the various dimensions of the crimmigration apparatus directly intertwine with the daily routines and lives of residents. Menjívar and Abrego (2012) argue that the immigration regime enables legal violence to be unleashed through structures, institutions, and practices in ways that produce harm and suffering. The ongoing construction of the profile of the criminal alien also reinforces racialization processes which transfer over to enforcement practices that may lead to racial profiling and the over-policing of Latino communities (Romero and Serag 2005). Not surprisingly, the practices that sustain immigration enforcement have been described as "the racial policy of our times" (Aranda and Vaquera 2015:88). Armenta's (2016) fieldwork in Nashville, Tennessee demonstrates that when local police officers enforce immigration law, they inevitably engage in practices that reinforce the subordinate status and stereotype of Latinos as criminal aliens. These enforcement practices contradict the expectations of community-oriented policing which is built on trust and cooperation between local police and residents, and instead unleash fear and suspicion among members of the community including

citizens, permanent residents, and undocumented immigrants (Pew Hispanic Center 2007). This ultimately creates a chilling effect that drives vulnerable residents into the shadows preventing them from full participation and inclusion in mainstream institutions (Nguyen and Gill 2015).

Rather than improving public safety, the police-immigration nexus has compromised it. The effectiveness of local enforcement agencies to fight crime and enhance public safety hinges on the willingness of residents to report crimes. Most local enforcement agencies, including police departments, prioritize the positive relationships and trust that have been established with the communities they serve (Armenta 2016; Lewis and Ramakrishnan 2007). Introducing immigration enforcement into the local policing agenda presents a threat to the foundations of community-oriented policing by criminalizing the very populations with which police departments have worked to establish trust. Perceptions that police may engage in racial profiling deter immigrants from reporting crime in an effort to avoid anticipated negative interactions (Correia 2010; Wu 2010; Becerra et al. 2016).

Service providers that work in public-facing municipal departments can also facilitate the chilling effect when they inquire about immigration status or limit the forms of identification accepted. As eligibility for publicly funded programs often require citizenship or residency, immigrants lacking status may be deterred from applying together even if they are qualified. This control results in exclusion and marginalization of an already vulnerable group. However, even when conditions for eligibility are removed, immigrants, on average, are less likely to access publicly funded services (Capps et al. 2002).

Mistrust of government institutions and anxiety and fears about immigration enforcement likely explain these patterns of avoidance. Ethnographic research conducted by Gómez Cervantes and Menjívar (2020) reveal that fear of deportation prevented Latina immigrants from

seeking medical care and avoiding public spaces in general. In some families, parents fearful of deportation chose to keep their children out of schools; this is apparent in lower rates of enrollment observed across the country (Goodman 2020). Deportation fears among Latinos have also been documented by Asad (2020) who reported that levels of fear have increased substantially even among U.S. citizen Latinos, especially in the years following 2016. These findings speak to pervasive reach of the immigration enforcement apparatus and the profound impact that it has on the daily routines of immigrants, particularly those who are racialized, undocumented, or embedded in mixed-status networks.

The positive benefits of heightened immigration enforcement are difficult to pinpoint and justify while the social and economic costs of policing immigrant communities are well documented (Pew Hispanic Center 2007; Correia 2010; Wu 2010; Capps et al. 2002; Nguyen and Gill 2015; Becerra et al. 2016). In local communities where service providers and police officers work to support the wellbeing of residents, immigration enforcement can seriously undermine the ability to efficiently deliver services. Enacting policies that prohibit or restrict immigration enforcement has become a primary means through which municipalities can attempt to exercise control over their own communities as immigration enforcement expands across the interior.

WORKING WITHIN THE LAW AND RESISTING THE FEDERAL ANTI-IMMIGRATION AGENDA: THE ROLE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES

Sanctuary cities in the United States are often identified based on their orientation to immigration enforcement. More specifically, any local jurisdiction with at least one policy of restricting immigration enforcement in some form qualifies as a sanctuary city. However, it is

important to note that the sanctuary movement was well underway prior to IRCA in 1986 and the development of the federal-local immigration enforcement nexus. Throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s, sanctuary cities in the U.S. were established largely as part of a humanitarian mission to support refugees and asylum seekers fleeing violence and political prosecution in Central America. But the spirit of protest was nonetheless a vital character of early sanctuary cities in that it was an insurgent act of defiance to provide shelter and resources to displaced individuals from whom the federal government had denied assistance and safe passage. Then and now, sub-federal governments, including those at the municipal level, have occupied an integral role in shaping the lived experiences of residents that are affected by hostile immigration law.

Being that federal law is the supreme law of the land and that immigration regulation is a federal responsibility, the task of confronting and opposing immigration law from the municipal level can appear daunting and even futile. In addition to overcoming the inherent bureaucratic and political hurdles inherent in policy making, sub-federal governing bodies attempting to implement pro-immigrant measures must also account for the complex legal terrain of immigration law (Davis 2020). But prior investigation into sanctuary cities suggests that despite the limitations of municipal power, local governments can have considerable influence over the extent to which immigration enforcement disrupts life in local communities (Lewis et al. 2013; Ridgley 2008). Though municipalities cannot prevent federal agencies from operating in local communities, local policies and directives are powerful tools for limiting the amount of support and resources that federal agencies have access to during the course of their mission. In some cases, this may increase the costs for federal agencies to initiate enforcement missions and subsequently create a space of underenforcement (Bauder 2016; Kraehenbuehl 2011). In other words, decisions to withhold support and resources to federal agencies on matters related to

immigration can create a "significant impediment" for the federal government's anti-immigrant agenda (Davis 2020:101). In localities where local law enforcements cooperate with ICE, deportations were approximately 75% higher (Bialik 2018).

Becoming a Sanctuary City

The process of becoming a sanctuary city in the United States, in the contemporary period, requires municipal policymakers to employ creative strategies within the scope of the law to minimize the opportunities for involvement by local agencies in immigration enforcement matters (de Graauw 2014). Municipal governments usually have two loci of policy making – the council and mayor which makes up the governing body and the chief of police who oversees the police department. The position of police departments is interesting as their status as a local law enforcement agency situates them in a position between the opposing interests of the crimmigration system and the local governing body. Despite this, there is evidence that a city government's orientation to immigration enforcement can have significant influence over policing practices (Lewis et al. 2013).

Standing in opposition to the immigration enforcement apparatus is a grand task requiring careful and strategic planning. With limited administrative powers and autonomy, municipal governments in sanctuary cities must work within the confines of the law to enact policies and practices that are conducive to immigrant inclusion and participation. Contrary to popular belief, jurisdictions that enact sanctuary policies are not in violation of the law. Rather than framing sanctuary cities exclusively as jurisdictions that oppose federal law, broader attention should be paid to the processes of expanding membership and rights for immigrant communities. Such an approach could provide new insights into how controversial decisions to withhold support from federal agencies and restrict enforcement are justified and realized.

A PATCHWORK OF OPPOSITION STRATEGIES

My analysis suggests that sanctuary cities range in their comprehensiveness of policies in opposition to restrictive federal immigration law, and also differ in the types of policies and practices enacted. In addition to general directives to not enforce federal immigration law, there are also more specific strategies that municipalities implement to resist anti-immigration efforts. These strategies directly target enforcement expectations across five main areas: working with federal agencies, information sharing, status inquiries, registration, and surveillance.

Arguably, the task of immigration enforcement is in itself a joint operation whenever local agencies are involved as this is supportive of the work of federal agencies. Status inquiries make information sharing possible, and the information shared is a form of assistance that local agencies can provide to federal agencies. However, from the perspective of local residents, inquiries into immigration or citizenship status may be experienced directly as immigration policing whereas municipal involvement information sharing and surveillance are more subtle and indirect in its immediate impact.

The interrelatedness of these forms of enforcement are apparent but for the purpose of clarity and organization, I distinguish between these actions to highlight the specific procedures that are implemented to limit enforcement and target specific enforcement approaches at the federal level. Analyses of policies restricting local authorities and officials from working with federal agencies will specifically refer to situations in which ICE or another federal agency formally requests assistance or cooperation, and contractual obligations between local and federal agencies such as is the case with a program like Secure Communities.

Working With Federal Agencies

Immigration enforcement in the interior depends on partnership between federal and local agencies. Federal immigration officers rely on the expertise and resources provided by local

agencies to carry out enforcement and removal operations (ICE 2021; Davis 2020). Arrangements between agencies as a product of enforcement programs like 287(g) and S-Comm represent avenues for contractual partnerships within the crimmigration system. Outside of these programs, immigration authorities can also formally request assistance from local authorities for other enforcement operations. Consequently, in an effort to blunt the impact of immigration enforcement, localities have enacted policies of non-cooperation and non-assistance, in addition to opting out of 287(g) and S-Comm. Policies that address working with federal agencies have existed for as long as the INS and ICE have been engaged in enforcement and removal operations and represent one of the most common forms by which localities assert authority over restrictive immigration policies.

Throughout the 1980s, despite a very small number of sanctuary cities, non-cooperation and non-assistance policies established the groundwork for subsequent policies in the contemporary era of crimmigration. The key player in enforcement in the 1980s was the INS which sought to remove refugees and asylum seekers who had not been granted legal status. Though the effort to establish spaces of sanctuary was largely spearheaded by churches, synagogues, and local organizations, municipal governments pledged their support to protecting sanctuary spaces and ensured that local resources would not be expended on immigration enforcement.

California is home to many of the early sanctuary cities of the 1980s. Close analyses of municipal resolutions and ordinances indicate that approaches to withholding assistance and support from INS were largely similar in tone and orientation.

In 1989, San Francisco's enacted the City and County of Refuge Ordinance which prohibited city and county resources from being used to enforce immigration law.

> No department, commission, officer, or employee of the City and County of San Francisco shall use any City funds or resources to assist in the enforcement of federal immigration law…The prohibition set forth in this Chapter shall include, but shall not be limited to: (a) Assisting or cooperating, in one's official capacity, with any Immigration and Naturalization (INS) investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, relating to alleged violations of the civil provisions of the federal immigration law. ("San Francisco Ordinance 375-89" 1989)

Berkeley, the country's first sanctuary city, declared itself to be a City of Refuge in a 1985 resolution in response to the Central American refugee crisis and pledged support to local churches and organizations that created spaces of sanctuary. The resolution directs employees of the city to withhold assistance from agencies engaging in immigration enforcement operations.

> No employee of the City of Berkeley violate the established sanctuaries by assisting in investigations, public or clandestine, by engaging in or assisting with arrests for alleged violation of immigration laws by the refugees in the sanctuaries or by those offering sanctuary, or by refusing established public services to the established sanctuaries. ("Berkeley City of Refuge Resolution" 1985)

Oakland, Davis, Sacramento, West Hollywood, along with other Californian cities all had policies prohibiting employees from aiding in immigration enforcement operations. Outside of California, this orientation was present but not universal. The language is comparable in prohibiting city employees from assisting the INS or cooperating with federal enforcement agencies engaged in immigration matters. The City of Takoma Park, in Maryland, established itself as a sanctuary city in 1985 and has continuously reaffirmed its position of not cooperating in

federal immigration enforcement operations. In a media release by the City of Takoma Park that includes input from both the mayor and police chief, it is clearly stated that sanctuary ordinances from 1985 and 2007 continue to be in effect: city police and city employees are prohibited from "cooperating in the enforcement of federal immigration laws that could lead to the deportation of residents" ("Takoma Park, A Sanctuary City" 2017).

In the early days of the sanctuary movement, ICE was not yet in existence and the INS was the primary agency for immigration regulation and control. The earliest sanctuary cities in the United States implemented policies of non-assistance and non-enforcement as a means of conserving limited city resources and vulnerable immigrant communities. In these sanctuary cities from the 1980s, non-cooperation and non-assistance continue to inform practices in policing and the provision of services. The sanctuary cities that followed in later decades also continue the tradition of non-cooperation and non-assistance as a form of resistance.

The extension of enforcement from the border to the interior created new agencies and programs for partnerships between local and federal enforcement agencies. This is reflected in the language of policies that begin to reference other immigration agencies in addition to the INS. Though ICE was the most common agency that policies refer to, occasionally, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Customs and Border Patrol (CBP), and the practice of Enforcement and Removal Operations (EROs) also garnered a few mentions.

> Members shall not assist ICE, CBP, or ERO with the execution of administrative removal warrants. Members shall not honor or comply with federal immigration detainer requests issued by ICE, CBP, or ERO. Members shall not assist ICE, CBP, or ERO as it pertains to the enforcement of federal immigration laws. ("Portland Police Department Directive 810.10" 2018)

> No City department, agency, officer, or employee shall allow the use of any City facility by DHS for the enforcement of federal civil immigration law, including, but not limited to, the use of office space and interview rooms. ("Salinas City Welcoming City Resolution" 2017)

Formal and contractual partnerships via 287(g) and Secure Communities also inspired cities to adopt new policies and update existing ones. Sometimes the intent of a sanctuary resolution was merely to affirm that local agencies did not or would not enter contractual obligations with ICE that would involve immigration law enforcement. In Long Beach, a police department special order makes this clear: "The Long Beach Police Department does not participate in the 287(g) program" ("Long Beach PD Federal Immigration Enforcement Special Order" 2017). Examples from Hyattsville and Seattle are presented below to show how different language is used to reject partnership and cooperation in interior enforcement missions.

> No official or employee may enter into an agreement under 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) or any other federal law that permits state or local government entities to enforce federal immigration laws. ("Hyattsville Ordinance 2017-02" 2017)

> The City will reject any offer from the federal government to enter into a Section 287(g) agreement per the Immigration and Nationality Act. ("Seattle Welcoming Resolution" 2017)

Non-cooperation and non-assistance policies help to establish and standardize the protocols for responding to these requests for assistance and cooperation. This form of enforcement restriction at the local level has been a long-standing practice of sanctuary cities

since the birth of the movement in the 1980s. Today, as strategies for enforcement evolve and expand, local governments and police departments have adapted by renewing their policies. Though withholding cooperation and assistance from federal agencies does not prevent these agencies from operating in local communities, these policies can present an impediment to immigration enforcement operations and increase the costs of pursuing enforcement in sanctuary jurisdictions.

Information Sharing

ICE depends heavily on information sharing from local and international agencies to carry out their enforcement and removal operations (ERO). Primarily, information sharing occurs via collaborations with local enforcement agencies, jails, and prisons to identify removable individuals (ICE 2021). Information sharing represents a more specific form of cooperation between federal and sub-federal agencies. Municipalities that refrain from information sharing requests could present as a barrier to enforcement operations by cutting off the flow of valuable information. Refraining from information sharing may also signal to immigrant communities that they can feel safer engaging with city employees and police officers without fear of being funneled into the deportation and removals pipeline.

Although information sharing is a cornerstone of the Secure Communities program whereby data is transmitted between the FBI, ICE, state and local agencies, policies usually did not directly address the program by name. In general, restrictions on information sharing were not limited to the Secure Communities era and can be found as early as the 1980s and in the present period. Compared to non-cooperation and non-assistance policies, information sharing restriction policies are not as universally adopted. This is possibly because refraining from information sharing is implied to be a form of non-cooperation and non-assistance. Language

that captures information sharing is presented below from city and police texts in Sacramento, Denver, and Portland.

> No City employee or department shall disseminate information regarding the citizenship or residency status of any person unless authorized to do so by State/Federal law, or City ordinance/regulation. ("Sacramento Resolution No. 85-973" 1985)

> The prohibition set forth in this section shall include but not limited to: …(4) Disseminating information about the national origin, immigration, or citizenship status of any individual except to the extent required by any federal, state or city law or regulation… ("Denver Public Safety Enforcement Priorities Act Sec. 28-250" 2017)

> Except as required by state or federal law, members shall not disclose any of the following. Personal information to a federal immigration law enforcement agency for the purpose of enforcing federal immigration laws: A person's address; place of employment or work hours; a school or school hours; contact information; known associates ore relatives; date, time, or location of hearings, proceedings, or appoints with a person that are not matters of public record. ("Portland PD Directive 810.10" 2018)

The language above is representative of information sharing restriction policies. Exceptions are granted to accommodate legal requirements. The goal of restricting the sharing of information is framed as a way of preventing the misuse of data by federal agencies to target

local immigrant residents. To that extent, the policies, such as the one from the Portland police department, can be quite comprehensive in capturing the scope of information that could be utilized for enforcement purposes. Below, I provide an excerpt from the Mayor of Los Angeles' executive order. The language is more direct in referencing specific procedures, but the intention to protect sensitive information from enforcement remains central.

> I hereby deem any information in the City's possession that can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's citizenship or immigration status, either on its own or when combined with other information, to be Personally Identifiable Information (PII). All City employees shall treat PII as Confidential Information as allowed by law and shall handle, maintain, and secure such information according to the standards for Confidential Information that the Information Technology Policy Committee established in the Information Handling Guidelines. ("Los Angeles Executive Directive No. 20" 2017)

The extent to which information sharing restrictions are in place is unknown. Because sensitive information in the context of immigration enforcement can encompass information beyond just immigration status such as contact information, it is expected that most municipalities will have some sort of standard for protecting confidential data. Within the sample of sanctuary cities examined, information sharing restrictions were present but not universal. I expect that as more cities continue to review their policies in response to developments in immigration regulation, information sharing restrictions will become more commonplace and explicitly specified as a type of sanctuary policy.

Status Inquiries

The welfare reforms of the 1990s, particularly those embedded in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) and Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), tightened the eligibility for accessing publicly funded benefits. As a punitive response to the perceived misuse of benefits by immigrants, local agencies involved in the provision of services now had the additional responsibility of verifying citizenship and legal status. These interactions mark individuals as citizens or noncitizens, and legal or illegal, which may become grounds for differential treatment.

At the municipal level where services such as utilities, education, and policing are supplied, inquiries into immigration status can be interpreted as another avenue for immigration policing. To encourage utilization of local services and resources, policies restricting status inquiries have been central to the development of pro-immigrant sanctuary spaces. Sometimes referred as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT), policies that prohibit service providers from inquiring into immigration status can potentially alleviate fear among immigrant communities and increase utilization of municipal services and participation in civic life. Prohibitions on status inquiries complement "Access for All" initiatives in cities that seek to make municipal services available to all local residents (Bauder 2016). This is discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Numerous municipalities and police departments across the United States have placed restrictions on inquiries into immigration and citizenship status or prohibited inquiries altogether. In many policies, it is made clear that service providers cannot condition the provision of services on immigration or citizenship status. A selection of policies against inquiries are

presented below. While some cities appear to have a blanket ban on inquiries, other cities and police departments express conditions in which inquiries may be appropriate. The first example presented is from Olympia and Emeryville; both cities utilize the same wording in their respective resolutions. Another example is presented from a resolution in Burlington, Vermont to highlight the assumption that status inquiries may compromise the delivery of services.

> The City will not inquire upon a resident's immigration status in providing municipal services or in the course of law enforcement. ("Olympia Resolution M-1857" 2016; "Emeryville Welcoming City Resolution" 2017)

> The City Council reaffirms the City of Burlington's commitment to continue its longstanding and legal practice of not inquiring into the immigration status of individuals being provided local government services. ("Burlington Resolution Concerning Fair and Impartial Policing Policy" 2018)

Policies from Lowell, Lansing, and New Haven are more specific to include exceptions in which immigration status may be relevant. Though not explicitly stated in the examples presented above from Olympia and Burlington, it is possible and likely these exceptions also apply as sub-federal sanctuary policies are crafted within the scope of the law.

> Officers shall not question any person about his or her specific citizenship or immigration status unless pertinent to local or state criminal activity. ("Lowell PD General Order 320.07" 2015)

> Lansing officials, officers and employees will not ask about, nor record information on, any person's immigration status, except as required by federal or state statue or

> court decision…Lansing Police Department personnel are prohibited from soliciting information regarding immigration status from persons who are seeking police services or are victims of, or witness to, a crime. ("Lansing Welcoming City Executive Order" 2017)

> The New Haven Police Department issued General Order 06-2 in 2006, providing, inter alia, that City police officers may not inquire about immigration status…In the interim, it shall be the policy of the City that no New Haven officer employee shall inquire about a person's immigration status unless required by state or federal law. ("New Haven Executive Order Concerning Undocumented Immigrants" 2019)

In some municipalities, additional parameters are in place to prevent the collection of information that could be used to deduce the immigration status of an individual seeking municipal services. By limiting the availability of sensitive information, municipalities reduce the ability of local officials to engage in immigration enforcement and investigation, which can potentially reduce the motivations for federal agencies to seek collaboration or assistance.

> Officers will not detain a person for the sole purpose of verifying their immigration status nor will they question a person about their immigration status during a routine detention for another matter (i.e. traffic stop or a minor criminal offense). ("Chapel Hill PD Policy 400.02" n.d.)

> Public servants and police officers: (1) Shall not solicit information concerning immigration status for the purpose of ascertaining a person's compliance with federal immigration law; or (2) Shall not solicit information concerning

> immigration status from a person who is seeking police and other city services. ("Hamtramck Ordinance Section 5" 2008)

A rather unique finding about status inquiry prohibitions was Article 5.4 of Los Angeles Municipal Code which was developed specifically in response to housing discrimination. As a city, Los Angeles already has DADT practices established for those employed by the city, but this particular ordinance extended and mandated the practice in the private sector. This degree of specificity is not common, but supports Houston's (2019) conceptualization of sanctuary as a process rather than a status; Los Angeles is among one of the earliest cities to become a sanctuary city and has over time amended policies and added new ones.

> It shall be unlawful for any Landlord, or any agent, employee or contractor of such Landlord, to do or attempt to do any of the following: A. Inquire as to the immigration or citizenship status of a tenant, prospective tenant, occupant or prospective occupant of a Rental Unit. B. Require any tenant, prospective tenant, occupant or prospective occupant of a Rental Unit to make any statement, representation or certification concerning his or her immigration or citizenship status. ("Los Angeles Ordinance 185797" 2018)

Los Angeles' Ordinance pertaining to status inquiries in rental markets is a rare finding in the content analysis but an interesting one to examine. As one of the oldest sanctuary cities in the United States with some of the most comprehensive policies and practices advanced by both the local government and police department, Los Angeles has continued to implement measures in response to the evolving tactics of the immigration enforcement regime. However, to directly shape practices within private markets to support immigrant communities points to an

underutilized area of municipal powers that could potentially have measurable positive impact on marginalized members of immigrant communities.

Compared to other pro-immigrant policies, those related to status inquiries appear to be much less ambiguous and have more direct wording. Moreover, the exceptions for when inquiring into immigration status is acceptable are also usually better defined. Such consistency and clarity are likely to improve compliance with the policy as there is less ambiguity in interpretation and application.

Registration

The idea of developing a registry of suspicious individuals has had two controversial moments in recent U.S. history. The first was the hugely ineffective National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS) during the post 9/11 years which targeted foreign citizens and nationals from Muslim countries. The second was when President Trump attempted to reinstate a similar database, via Executive Order 13769, also targeting individuals from Muslim-majority countries. The context of registration and databases in both instances was to combat perceived terrorism. Establishing a registry departs from the conventional understandings of sanctuary cities in that it targets an ethnic or racial group that is not defined by legal status nor mode of migration. Needless to say, maintaining a registry is tantamount to legalized discrimination if individuals of a particular race, ethnicity, or national origin are placed on a list to be used for investigation purposes.

That opposition against registration was addressed in sanctuary cities was insightful and unique. Though it was rare to observe, these policies demonstrate the comprehensiveness and adaptability of local officials to react quickly to anti-immigrant measures at the federal level, even if the actual measure never materialized. Since it has been rare in the contemporary period

to propose the use of registries as an immigration enforcement tool, it does not seem likely that policies addressing databases and registration will occupy a substantial space in the territory of sanctuary city policies. Notable examples are presented from Helena, Maplewood and Soledad. The timing of these resolutions aligns with timing of precipitating events and federal responses.

> The Commission of the City of Helena, Montana: …Section 4. AFFIRMS its support of policing currently followed by the City of Helena, including how the City refrains from collecting or maintain information about the political, religious, or social views, associations, or activities of any individual, group, association, organization, corporation, business, or partnership …("Helena Community Resolution 19181" 2004)

> No department, employee or official of the Township of Maplewood shall take part in the registration or reporting of individuals based on religion, race, ethnicity, national origin or immigration status. ("Maplewood Resolution No. 3 – 17" 2017)

> City of Soledad officials will not use any public resources or follow any federal program requiring the registration of individuals on the basis of religious affiliation, race, national or ethnic origin, gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation. ("Soledad Resolution No. 5278" 2017)

One possibility that explains the infrequency of policies opposing or addressing registration is that the role of local agencies in the process is minimal. Registration for NSEERs occurred mostly at port of entries where entrants could be photographed and fingerprinted. As for Trump's attempt at establishing a Muslim registry, it never materialized into actual policy. Addressing registration efforts in local sanctuary policies may serve the purpose of assurance

rather than of providing guidance for city employees. In this respect, these policies are more symbolic.

Surveillance

The War on Terror intensified the policing of noncitizens in the United States. Heightened surveillance became another tool to monitor and control individuals deemed suspicious. There were attempts by the federal government to enact legislation to withhold funds from local governments who prevented police from engaging in the enforcement of civil immigration law. Resistance to surveillance efforts at the local level was largely motivated by Section 215 of the USA Patriot Act which allows the government to track library records for individuals. Attempting to identify who is deemed suspicious and potentially a national security threat is not a bias-free endeavor and motivated by concerns about discrimination and profiling, many cities enacted policies opposing surveillance. A number of sanctuary cities, including Elko, Fairbanks, Lansing, and Portland (in Maine), were born in the years between 2003 and 2005 as a result of enacting policies against surveillance.

> It is the policy of the City of Fairbanks to forbid in the absence of probable cause of criminal activity: 1. Any initiation of, participation in, assistance or cooperation with any inquiry, investigation, surveillance or detention; and 2. The recording, filing and sharing of any intelligence information concerning any person or organization, even if authorized by federal law enforcement, acting under new powers granted by the USA Patriot Act or Executive Orders. This includes collection and review of library lending and research records, as well as book and video store sales and/or rental records. ("Fairbanks Resolution No. 4036" 2003)

> The City of Portland, in the absence of reasonable suspicion of criminal activity, opposes: (1) initiation or participation in criminal inquiry, investigation, surveillance, or detention. ("Portland (ME) Resolve 8" 2004)

Resisting surveillance as an enforcement tool in the War on Terror may seem disconnected from the notion of sanctuary cities as pro-immigrant spaces. The ACLU and Westminster Law Library identify these policies as consistent with sanctuary (Colbern et al. 2019). Examining the text of sanctuary policies that addresses surveillance reveals a few similarities with sanctuary policies that directly address immigration enforcement. In both cases, noncitizens of color are disproportionately affected in ways that could compromise their ability to access resources and participate in civic life. References to immigrants within surveillance restriction policies underscore country of origin and religion as potential sources of biased policing. An example of this consideration is portrayed in Ann Arbor's resolution protesting the USA Patriot Act and similar federal orders in the post-9/11 period.

> The Ann Arbor City Council strongly supports the rights of immigrants and opposes measures that single out individuals for legal scrutiny or enforcement activity based solely on their country of origin and/or religion. ("Ann Arbor Resolution to Protest the Eroding of Civil Liberties Under the USA Patriot Act and Related Federal Orders Since 9/11/01" 2003)

In contrast to policies aimed more directly at supporting undocumented immigrants that cited human rights violations as a reason for non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies, policies developed in the War on Terror era were justified on the basis of protecting civil rights and liberties. This is evident in many resolutions; representative selections from Talent and Elko are presented.

> The new federal anti-terrorism policies may pose a threat to the civil rights and liberties of all persons within the City of Talent, and a particular threat to those who are immigrants, Muslims, or people of Arab or South Asian descent. ("Talent Resolution No. 03-642-R" 2003)

> The City of Elko affirms its strong opposition to terrorism, but also affirms that any efforts to end terrorism must not be waged at the expense of the fundamental civil liberties, rights, and freedoms of the people of the City of Elko and the United States…It is the policy of the city of Elko to oppose any portion of the USA Patriot Act that would violate the rights and liberties guaranteed equally under the State and Federal Constitutions. ("Elko Community Resolution No. 2-04" 2004)

Measures implemented by municipal governments to protest surveillance are mostly confined to the years between 2002 – 2005. However, a few resolutions drafted in response to recent efforts intensify immigration enforcement also include surveillance as a prohibited activity.

> The prohibition set forth in Section 2 above shall include, but shall not be limited to: …(b) Assisting or cooperating, in one's official capacity, with any investigation, surveillance, or gathering of information conducted. By foreign governments, except for cooperation related to an alleged violation of City and county, state, or federal criminal laws. ("Cudahy Resolution 15-01" 2015)

Overall, surveillance does not occupy much of the sanctuary city policy framework except during the War on Terror years. However, as immigration enforcement structures increase their technological capabilities to incorporate facial recognition and biometrics as standard

practices (Huszti-Orbán and Aoláin 2020), it is very likely that local governments will react and respond by implementing measures to prevent engagement from service providers and police officers.

EXCEPTIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT

How municipalities restrict immigration enforcement can take various forms. In some cases, this results in a patchwork of policies that leaves space for immigration enforcement to occur. There are likely two scenarios in which immigration enforcement by local officials may be permitted unintentionally and intentionally: 1) In localities where sanctuary policies are ambiguous, confusing, and lacking clear guidance on enforcement restrictions, and 2) In localities that clearly specify which forms of immigration enforcement are permitted or the situations in which immigration enforcement is permitted.

Ambiguous Non-Enforcement Policies

In a few of the localities examined, there was a lack of detail on the concrete practices that would be implemented as part of a resolution or ordinance to establish a sanctuary or pro-immigrant city. Situations like this are likely to result in inconsistent application and policing practices that harm certain immigrant communities that lack specific knowledge about dynamics between federal and sub-federal agencies with respect to immigration law. I provide a few cases below to demonstrate the ambiguity inherent in some municipal policies which may unintentionally create space for immigration policing by local officials and agencies.

In 2006, the City of Camden in New Jersey passed Resolution MC-06:259 which supports a City-wide policy to grant immigrants access to all City services. This decision is based on the functions of the municipal government to support the community.

> The City Council of the City of Camden understands that it is the legal responsibility of the City of Camden's officers and employees to provide City services to the community regardless of one's immigration status. ("Camden Resolution MC-06:259" 2006)

The city provides examples of City services, which include police and fire services, nutrition programs, public health services, and shelter services among others. Yet contained within the same resolution is a statement on the city's agreeable status to immigration enforcement at the local level.

> The City of Camden supports where legally appropriate, the municipal enforcement of federal immigration laws and inquiries by the City of Camden employees and law enforcement officers into immigration status, and activities designed to ascertain such status. ("Camden Resolution MC-06:259" 2006)

While it is impossible to assess the impact of this policy without a case study of the immigrant community in Camden, the contradictions present within this seemingly pro-immigrant policy is perplexing. On the one hand, the resolution is promoting an "access-for-all" approach and confirming that municipal services are available to all residents regardless of immigration status, yet it is also implied that immigrants are to expect inquiries into their immigration status in their encounters with city employees and police officers.

Another standout case can be found in Snohomish, Washington. Like many other cities across the United States, the City of Snohomish responded to the divisive rhetoric on immigration advanced over the course of Trump's presidency. The purpose of Resolution 1389 was to condemn hatred, intolerance, and discrimination, while also emphasizing the city's goal of being a welcoming and accessible city to all. Unlike Camden's Resolution, there are no

obvious contradictions in Resolution 1389 but nor are there any concrete actions specified as to how the city will limit the impact of immigration enforcement on immigrant communities

> The City Council and Mayor are committed to maintaining Snohomish as a welcoming, safe, and just community for everyone to live, work, and visit. The City Council and Mayor declare it to be the policy of the City that our City is accessible and open to everyone, to oppose all acts of intolerance, bullying and hatred toward anyone, and to provide equal access to our local government to all persons in our City. ("Snohomish Resolution 1389" 2018)

This excerpt conveys a tone of support for immigrant communities, although "immigrants" as a group are never specifically mentioned. Furthermore, unlike other resolutions and ordinances that focus on access, the word "municipal services" is never used. There are also no specific procedures or practices established for concerning immigration enforcement. It is possible that the City never intended this to be a policy that leads to their classification as a sanctuary city but the focus on hatred, unlawful discrimination, and goals to be a Welcoming City mirror the wording embedded in other pro-immigration-related resolutions passed during the same time frame. The lack of clarity and overly general tone of Snohomish's resolution leaves ample room for subjective interpretation on the part of residents and city officials, which can lead to unintentional immigration policing incidents.

Brooklyn Park City in Minnesota is another municipality that embodies subtle contradictions in the area of immigration related matters. In February 2017, the City Council adopted a resolution declaring support for refugees and immigrants. The resolution highlighted diversity in the community as a strength and articulated an inclusive vision for the city.

> The City's vision is "Brooklyn Park is a thriving community inspiring pride where opportunities exist for all"…refugees, immigrants, and Muslims contribute every day to the success of the United States and the City of Brooklyn Park…the City of Brooklyn Park stands in support of refugees, immigrants and Muslims. We strive to be a united and welcoming community strengthened by the extraordinary diversity of our residents. ("Brooklyn Park City Resolution Declaring Support for Refugees and Immigrants" 2017)

The resolution is largely a symbolic statement, which is appropriate given that it is a resolution. However, the vision of a thriving community whereby opportunities exist for all is illusionary given the seemingly contradictory stance of Brooklyn Park's police department. Section 413 in the Brooklyn Park PD policy manual addresses how to deal with immigration violations. Though the policy does state that officers should not arrest an individual for the sole purpose of enforcing immigration, there are a number of guidelines in the manual that serve the purpose of immigration enforcement. For example, officers are allowed to enforce criminal immigration violations and can rely on factors like a lack of English proficiency to determine if there is reasonable suspicion that a criminal immigration violation has occurred. There is also a section that lists the agencies that officers can collaborate with to conduct immigration checks. When it comes to information sharing with federal authorities, it is neither discouraged nor encouraged, but it is stated that such activities should not be prohibited.

Brooklyn Park PD Policy Manual Section 413 (2017)

> No member of this department will prohibit, or in any way restrict, any other member from doing any of the following regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual: (a) Sending information to, or

> requesting or receiving such information from ICE (b) Maintaining such information in department records (c) Exchanging such information with any other federal, state, or local government entity. ("Brooklyn Park PD Policy Manual Section 413" 2017).

The lack of consistency and apparent contradiction between Brooklyn Park's municipal government and police department is concerning. Ambiguous and inconsistent policies create addition barriers to information access for members of immigrant communities whose daily routines are dictated by the fear that results from increasingly aggressive immigration enforcement tactics. Municipalities that present themselves as pro-immigrant spaces without enacting concrete measures to support immigrant communities may create a false sense of security while immigration policing by local officials go unchecked. Though this speculation cannot be substantiated by the findings in this study, it is possible that social and political characteristics of the local context determine the presence of sanctuary city policies and shape the scope of local involvement in immigration enforcement. Recent research has found that public opinion on sanctuary cities is becoming increasingly partisan (Collingwood and O'Brien 2019), which inform speculation that local governments may assess decisions related to sanctuary with consideration of the political leanings of their constituents.

Exceptions and Opportunities for Enforcement

On the other side of the spectrum are cities that clearly specify the exceptions to non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies. Again, there is contradiction in this if we assume that all forms of immigration enforcement are harmful to vulnerable immigrant communities. Though there may be specific ordinances that prevent certain forms of immigration enforcement, explicit directions may also exist that permit or support enforcement in other forms. This was not a

common occurrence although it certainly was not rare either. Since the general presumption is that sanctuary cities aim to shield immigrant communities from the reach of immigration enforcement efforts, the intentional exceptions in policy that potentially facilitate enforcement present challenges to the assumptions that sanctuary cities are protective.

A selection of sanctuary cities that stand out in this regard are identified below. By no means are these localities representative of the overall sample of sanctuary cities analyzed but I include this as part of the findings to draw attention to the more ambiguous and confusing end of pro-immigrant policies that result in the identification and classification of a jurisdiction as a sanctuary city. These examples indicate that sanctuary cities may vary in their effectiveness to reduce the impacts of immigration enforcement and that in some circumstances, pro-immigrant practices may be counteracted by anti-immigrant practices implemented by the same governing body that facilitate enforcement and deportation.

The cities of Mesa and Chandler in Arizona are classified as sanctuary jurisdictions by the Ohio Jobs and Justice PAC (OJJPAC), which claims to be one of the first non-governmental organizations to track the development of sanctuary jurisdictions in the U.S. The Chandler government has disputed the listing although close examination reveals that the city, like Mesa, does have an official policy stance that acknowledges immigration enforcement is the jurisdiction of the federal government. In both cities, bias-based profiling, which can be an unintended outcome of immigration enforcement, is prohibited. Yet the policing protocols for dealing with undocumented persons and immigration-related matters encourage cooperation with federal agencies.

> The Chandler Police Department is committed to partnering with federal agencies and others to the extent allowable under federal state and local laws to address

> criminal activity within our community. This policy will not limit or restrict the enforcement federal immigration laws to less than the full extent permitted by federal law. ("Chandler PD General Order E-17 Undocumented Persons/Foreign Nationals" 2012)

Though the text quoted above does not mention ICE, it follows a page-long explanation of IIRIRA and the authority of ICE to deal with civil and criminal immigration violations. Policies with similar language imply that while local authorities will not actively pursue immigration violations, they can indirectly participate in immigrated-related enforcement activities when their involvement is requested by federal agencies. This particular type of orientation to immigration enforcement is likely to be less effective in integrating immigrant residents and less conducive to trust- and cooperation-building efforts. An example from the Mesa police department is presented.

> Consistent with our efforts to protect the safety and well-being of the community and to encourage the public to report criminal activity, department personnel shall not ask a person about his or her immigration status.
>
> MPD recognizes its role in the community to fight crime and the fear of crime by implementing strategies and utilizing all available tools to do so. Our commitment to this mission extends to all persons that engage in criminal activity within our community respective of their immigration status. This policy evidences our intent to cooperate with ICE and others, to the extent permitted by law, on any criminal activity that threatens the safety and well-being of our community. ("Mesa PD Special Order immigration Enforcement Protocol" 2009)

In the case of Mesa, status inquiries as a potential form of immigration policing are prohibited via the police departments protocol on immigration enforcement. Yet within the same

page, the order declares the department's intention to cooperate with ICE and other federal agencies. Further investigation is needed before drawing conclusions about whether restrictions on direct enforcement are counteracted by expectations to indirectly enforce immigration law by cooperation with ICE. However, in comparison to other sanctuary cities in the sample, Mesa's and Chandler's enforcement restriction practices seem relatively half-measured.

Sanctuary cities with policies that allow for certain forms of enforcement while prohibiting other forms have perhaps not been appropriately classified. When the Ames City Council in Iowa approved a resolution stating that the police department would not enforce federal immigration laws, it prompted speculation that Ames was a sanctuary city (Rambo 2017). Yet, within the same resolution, there was a clear intention to work with ICE on immigration-related operations.

> This resolution addresses the discretionary use of legal city resources and does not: a) prohibit, or in any way restrict, any official or employee of the City of Ames from sending to or receiving from ICE information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual; b) affect or limit the enforcement of federal immigration law by federal authorities within the City of Ames; c) affect or limit ICE's Priority Enforcement Program ("Ames Resolution No. 17-427" 2017)

In several cities in Massachusetts, enforcement of immigration law by local authorities is deprioritized and acknowledged as a responsibility of the federal government. Police procedures in Chelsea, Beverly, and Framingham stress that the police department should not undertake immigration-related violations or inquire into immigration status in encounters with resident. However, in situations where a formal request has been submitted by ICE or DHS, assistance

may be provided. The Beverly Police Department permits cooperation in the event of an on-going criminal investigation but does not honor ICE detainer requests.

> The Beverly Police Department may, however, cooperation and assist with federal immigration officials from the Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Agency when formally requested as part of an on-going criminal investigation and may notify those federal officials in serious situations where a potential threat to public safety or national security is perceived. ("Beverly PD Immigration Status and Detainer Policy" 2017)

Close to the exact language can be found in the police procedures for the cities of Framingham and Chelsea. The distinction between civil and criminal immigration-related violations is further specified by the Framingham police department to reiterate that cooperation with federal agencies is only tolerated for criminal investigations.

> Being present in the country illegally is not by itself a crime. Illegal presence without more is only a civil violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act that subjects the individual to possible removal. ("Framingham PD Immigration Enforcement Policy 200-15" 2017))

Decisions on whether to respond to formal requests for assistance and cooperation by federal immigration agencies are likely swayed by state level decisions. Just as there are sanctuary states like California and Oregon, there are also anti-sanctuary states. In 2017, Texas Governor Abbott signed Senate Bill 4 into law which banned sanctuary cities and granted discretion to police officers to inquire into immigration status while Arizona's Senate Bill 1070, better known as the "show me your papers" bill, made it a requirement for officers to inquire and verify immigration status of detained or arrested individuals. The overlap of municipal spaces

within county and state lines with more restrictive attitudes toward immigration could discourage the development of pro-immigrant measures. Pro-enforcement orientations to immigration control are also more pronounced along the U.S.-Mexico border (Lewis et al. 2013), which may help to explain some of the contradictions present in enforcement practices in Arizona and Texas.

States like Arizona and Texas are also more conservative politically. This political context could also be a factor that shapes municipal decisions regarding enforcement and the embrace of the sanctuary city label. In Texas, the label is outright banned under SB 4. It appears that when there is no legal barrier preventing sanctuary cities and non-enforcement policies, localities have the flexibility to exercise more authority in developing pro-immigrant spaces that include the practice of rejecting a formal request by ICE for cooperation and assistance. In Montpelier, Vermont, the sanctuary city resolution stands in contrast to policies in Arizona and Texas with an official embrace of the sanctuary city label and a strong stance on non-enforcement and non-cooperation.

> Montpelier has no formal existing agreements to enforce immigration policy. As a Sanctuary City, the City of Montpelier will have policies that direct employees to refuse the application of any request from a state or federal agency that requires the identification of a resident's immigration status. ("Montpelier Sanctuary City Resolution" 2016)

To reiterate, it is generally not the norm for sanctuary cities, at least at the municipal level, to implement policies that prevent enforcement along one dimension and promote cooperation and indirect enforcement along another dimension. But for the few cities that exhibit these characteristics, it is worth reassessing the classification of them as sanctuary cities. None

one of these cities have officially adopted the label "sanctuary city" and existing policing procedures may reflect default standards that were brought to attention for clarification purposes. Nevertheless, these cities still made it onto publicly listed sanctuary city databases. If sanctuary cities represent pro-immigrant spaces in which vulnerable immigrant residents can access the resources and services of civic life, then enforcement of immigration law and cooperation with federal agencies, however indirect, should preclude localities from being classified as sanctuary cities. For the average individual, interpreting legislative text is not part of the decision-making process, but general knowledge of whether their city of residence is a sanctuary city is likely more pertinent for informing actions and decisions to participate in mainstream life and access municipal services.

An additional point of consideration for thinking about how opportunities for enforcement are created is the function of supportive services. While enforcement and cooperation were prohibited, providing supportive services to maintain order and peace were acceptable in some sanctuary cities. In Issaquah, the police department is permitted to provide "available support services, such as traffic control or peacekeeping efforts, to ICE or other federal agencies" ("Issaquah PD Policy 428" 2016). This is in contrast to Providence's (RI) city ordinance which is quite comprehensive in rejecting cooperation with federal agencies.

> Providence Police are not permitted to comply with requests by other agencies to support or assist in the operations conducted solely for the purpose of enforcing federal civil immigration law, including but not limited to requests to establish traffic perimeters related solely to immigration enforcement. ("City of Providence Chapter Ord-2017-18" 2017)

Supportive services like peacekeeping and traffic control do not technically count as immigration enforcement but providing these services to ICE and other agencies facilitates rather than impedes the anti-immigration agenda. The motivation for offering supportive services is unclear in the analysis and may be a reflection of perceptions on how public safety and public order are best maintained when immigration operations are occurring in local communities.

LIMITATIONS OF SANCTUARY CITY POLICIES

Municipal sanctuary city policies are inherently limited in their coverage because local governments do not have jurisdiction over immigration regulation and control. Federal agencies including DHS and ICE maintain the authority to carry out enforcement activities in local communities, regardless of sanctuary city status.

Most jurisdictions acknowledge these limitations. Common language often specified that municipal employees could not limit or obstruct federal authorities from their enforcement activities. Wording from Salinas City's Welcoming City Resolution (2017) is a standard example: "Nothing in this Resolution allows City employees to limit or to obstruct federal authorities from enforcing federal immigration law."

There are always condition under which enforcement could happen in sanctuary cities in spite of non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies. Conducting operations in a sanctuary city may heighten the risks and costs for federal agencies. To this end, the most effective local sanctuary measures are those that create the narrowest of conditions under which enforcement by federal agencies can occur. This essentially translates into developing a comprehensive set of measures prohibiting cooperation and enforcement from municipal employees to the fullest extent legally possible.

> The Township of Bloomfield supports the establishment and communication of a clear policy that local police and government agents do not enforce federal immigration law nor help facilitate ICE deportations, except when legally required to do so. ("Fair and Welcoming Bloomfield Resolution" 2017)

Why enact policies that restrict immigration enforcement when federal authorities maintain the rights to enforce and police within established sanctuary cities? Aside from being an impediment to immigration-related operations, directives issued from local government officials and authorities can be impactful in molding policing practices (Lewis et al. 2013) and incorporating marginalized immigrants into civic life (Capps et al 2018).

Because police departments are accountable to municipal governments, decisions executed at the city level may help to redirect priorities from that of immigration policing to community policing. Furthermore, as police departments can also be involved in drafting policies and establishing protocols for dealing with foreign nationals and undocumented immigrants, the likelihood of compliance with non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies probably increases as well. Consistency between policies issued by the governing body and police department should also be conducive to increasing compliance by limiting discretion as an outcome of policy ambiguity.

Sanctuary city policies that limit enforcement of immigration law also help to foster inclusion and participation among marginalized immigrant communities. Aggressive immigration enforcement alters daily routines as immigrants seek to avoid interactions with authorities (Correia 2010; Wu 2010; Becerra et al. 2016). Retreating from economic and social life due to fear of detention or removal also impedes access to vital resources and services like education (Capps et al. 2018) and medical care (Roche et al. 2018).

The powers of municipal governments in the realm of immigration law are limited but not ineffective nor merely symbolic. As lives are experienced in cities and towns, local governments and police departments have the potential to utilize pro-immigrant measures and practices to build on the foundations of community policing and expand opportunities for participation and inclusion for legally marginalized and isolated residents.

DISCUSSION: RESTRICTION NOT PROTECTION

This in-depth study of municipalities' orientations to immigration enforcement reveals that sanctuary city polices represent a patchwork both within and across jurisdictions. As federal agencies continue to introduce new strategies of immigration regulation and control, cities have chosen to react, or not, and adapt by developing practices and policies while navigating a complicate terrain of legal boundaries. As Kagan (2018) describes in a legal essay, the term "sanctuary city" is one label applied to many policies. Because of the scope and intensity of the immigration-enforcement apparatus, there are many policies and practices that could be implemented either alone or in combination.

In this chapter, I identified five areas of immigration enforcement that local officials responded to with prohibition or restriction policies: cooperation with federal immigration agencies, information sharing, status inquiries, registration, and surveillance. The most frequent policies prohibited inquiries into immigration status and placed restrictions on assisting federal authorities with immigration enforcement. Municipal responses to federal enforcement utilizing surveillance or registration were mostly concentrated in the years following the September 11 attacks while practices to limit information sharing appeared in sanctuary policies throughout various periods. The findings in this section demonstrate that immigration enforcement tactics evolve with ongoing political and social developments taking many forms and municipal

governments in sanctuary jurisdictions adapt and respond to defend immigrant communities. At the same time, considerable variation exists in the scope and intensity of sanctuary policies which can leave gaps for immigration policing to occur.

In contrast to mainstream discourse, sanctuary cities do not truly offer "sanctuary" which implies protection or a safe haven (Roy 2019; Paik 2017). Immigrants lacking status are not immune from deportation in sanctuary cities. Restrictions on enforcement by local officials do not prevent ICE and other federal agencies from operating in local communities. This is widely acknowledged by local governing bodies that work within the limitations of municipal powers and legal terrain of immigration law to devise non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies.

This chapter examined the enforcement orientations of sanctuary cities, but there are other pro-immigrant policies and practices that are relevant for immigrant integration and participation. In some sanctuary cities, legal funds and dedicated departments to govern immigrant and refugee affairs have been established as additional supports for immigrant residents. Yet, because these actions fall outside the realm of crimmigration, they are not recognized as part of the criteria for qualifying as a sanctuary city. Nevertheless, these pro-immigrant measures are likely highly conducive to incorporating marginalized communities into the social and economic spheres of city life. This is explored in the subsequent chapter which focuses on the broader aims of municipal policymakers to affirm membership and enhance public safety through sanctuary and pro-immigrant policies.

CHAPTER 3: THE INTENDED OUTCOMES OF SANCTUARY AND PRO-IMMIGRANT POLICIES

While each level of government - federal, state, and local counties and municipalities - retain distinct powers and responsibilities, there is an unstated expectation among the entities that they will work collaboratively to govern and uphold the law. However, the aggressive expansion of immigration enforcement by the federal government has been met with corresponding resistance and opposition from sub-federal governments. This resistance from local policymakers has been codified in policies which may impede efforts to enforce immigration laws that fall under the scope of crimmigration. Specifically, in municipalities that fulfill the criteria for being classified as sanctuary cities, police and city departments have enacted measures to withhold assistance to federal immigration agencies and prevent local officials from participating in activities that support immigration enforcement activities. Not surprisingly, these decisions at the local level have been met with resistance and accusations from members of the general public and political opponents that city governments and police are jeopardizing the public safety of communities and defying federal laws (FAIR USA 2022). However, others in local governments and police departments argue the opposite, asserting that enforcement tactics targeting undocumented immigrants can severely compromise the ability of local agencies to promote public safety and effectively serve communities.

This chapter examines the motivations and intended outcomes that inform common sanctuary city policies and practices. Analyses of legislative and policy documents reveal that sanctuary cities, despite the view that they are attempting to support or protect immigrant rights, instead have been established by local policymakers first and foremost as a means of protecting the ability of local agencies to efficiently deliver services to constituents, including those provided by local police departments. By ensuring access to municipal resources, local agencies

also help promote the inclusion of marginalized and irregularized populations, such as those undocumented, in various arenas of civic life. I organize this chapter around two bodies of literatures concerning informal citizenship and public safety.

In the first section, I consider the various dimensions of citizenship and place emphasis on the integral role of cities in challenging conventional understandings of citizenship and membership established by the nation-state. I apply key concepts and theorizations from this body of literature to my study of sanctuary cities. I argue that in some sanctuary cities, enacting pro-immigrant policies is part of an ongoing process of redefining and legitimizing membership and belonging as an insurgent effort rooted in the practice of citizenship. Within these municipalities, sanctuary policies become a means for navigating the ever-changing and increasingly aggressive tactics of the immigration enforcement regime and exercising limited political influence over federal powers. In this context, sanctuary cities should be understood as more than just non-enforcement spaces determined by the boundaries of the local government's authority. Instead, sanctuary cities should be understood more broadly as pro-immigrant spaces that incorporate practices promoting inclusion and participation among populations that have been legally marginalized on the basis of their legal or citizenship status. From an international perspective, sanctuary cities in the U.S. are not all that different than sanctuary cities in other Westernized societies. Despite a public discourse fixated on the enforcement orientations of localities that contest federal U.S. immigration law, affirming membership and belonging of marginalized immigrant communities through local programs and practices is also part of the intended outcomes of pro-immigrant municipalities.

The second section of this chapter examines the public safety narrative that proponents of sanctuary cities often default to in order to justify non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies.

I consider the characteristics that sustain successful approaches to community-oriented policing and discuss how immigration enforcement and the devolution of immigration enforcement has informed local decisions to enact sanctuary city policies. I identify two sub-narratives that inform decisions to withhold participation in immigration enforcement objectives as a way of promoting public safety. First, municipalities and their police departments are invested in community-oriented policing as a way of strengthening trust and cooperation between residents and local authorities, which is vital to crime reporting and solving. Second, due to the finite resources available to perform municipal functions, including those provided by law enforcement to ensure public safety, localities may refrain from immigration enforcement activities that would consume limited resources and time. The findings in this section illustrate that while sanctuary cities have come to be associated with immigrants' rights, there are also very practical and broader-serving reasons that influence policymakers to implement non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies.

This chapter continues the content analyses from the previous section. The same compilation of documents from news media, police departments, and municipal government, are utilized. In coding the data, I focus on themes and meanings associated with the outcomes of enacting non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies.

THE VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

In the present day, formal citizenship in the United States is managed by a division within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security named the Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). Like in other countries, formal citizenship helps to distinguish between the rights and privileges of citizens and noncitizens (Jacobsen 1996). In the United States, citizenship grants rights, entitlements, and privileges associated with voting, working in certain sectors, and

protection from deportation. A simple way of understanding citizenship is as a legal status that grants full membership rights in a society. These rights may enable individuals to participate in many of the social, economic, political, and cultural spheres of mainstream life while also guaranteeing immunity in some contexts (Turner 2001). Of course, the extent to which rights to participation can be exercised despite citizenship can vary in practice due to social location and processes of oppression and exclusion (Glenn 2002).

Citizenship is a complex concept that shapes lived experiences across numerous dimensions. While citizenship is conventionally understood as a formal status conferred by the nation-state through birth or naturalization that is associated with certain rights, literature on informal citizenship and the practice of citizenship in everyday life has been particularly insightful for analyzing immigrant experiences in the era of crimmigration. To this end, it is useful to identify the various dimensions of formal citizenship and consider how they might be integrated into versions of informal and local citizenship that seek to incorporated marginalized and excluded populations.

Membership

Very generally, citizenship can be interpreted as a marker of membership that distinguishes outsiders from insiders. Specifically, those with citizenship are "distinguished by their shared privileged position *vis-à-vis* some particular state" (Tilly 1995: 8). Members are entitled to rights and immunity in certain situations, which distinguish them from noncitizens (Jacobsen 1996; Turner 2001). However, distinguishing citizens from noncitizens may oversimply the reality of immigrant experiences in the United States. There is insight to be gained from Isin and Nielsen's (2008:19) theorization of citizenship which utilizes a "spectrum of intensity" that captures the position of subjects including citizens, strangers, outsiders, and

alien. These subjects are organized along the spectrum ranging respectively from hospitality on one end and hostility on the other. A key argument advanced here and in other understandings of citizenship as membership is that the principle of citizenship inherently otherizes and exists relationally.

The laws surrounding citizenship help to determine who is entitled to membership and membership rights within a society. In the United States, citizenship can be acquired by birth or naturalization although the latter process requires applicants to fulfill certain requirements. As Bosniak (2007: 2451) describes, citizenship is "border-conscious" and entails "a necessary degree of exclusivity and boundedness." This is similar to Brubaker's (1992) argument that formal citizenship is an instrument and object of social closure. Analyzing citizenship from the perspective of membership emphasizes the processes by which individuals are recognized and accepted as members of society. This could be recognized as a form of boundary work that points to the structural and institutional contexts that define the rules and norms surrounding the acquisition of citizenship (Lamont and Molnár 2002; Bloemraad 2006).

Rights and Privileges

Those who successfully acquire citizenship are entitled to rights and privileges within their nation-state (Janowitz 1980). These benefits of membership are found in various spheres of social, economic, and political life. For example, the exclusivity of citizenship is conveyed in the right of citizens to enter territories controlled by the nation state. In addition to exit and entry rights, another significant advantage, especially in an era of crimmigration, is protection from deportation.

Citizenship rights also shape everyday lived experiences that are intertwined with other members of society and embedded in a range of institutions. Marshall's (1949) notion of social

citizenship was perhaps too optimistic in envisioning an equalizing force that would enable the participation of citizen individuals, regardless of differences in social location, in the social, economic, political, and cultural spheres of mainstream life. For example, citizenship grants individuals the rights to political participation and labor market opportunities, some of which may be unavailable for noncitizens. Increasingly, reforms to welfare and immigration law have also meant that rights to access publicly funded goods and services are becoming exclusive to those with citizenship. In practice, however, ownership of these rights because of legal status does not always translate into the ability to exercise these rights. I elaborate on this further in the upcoming discussion of citizenship as a practice.

Citizen Obligations

While the rights of citizenship reveal what individuals gain from membership, the obligations of citizenship inform what the nation-state gains from its members. Marshall's (1949) analysis of Britain's post-war welfare system connects the discussion of citizenship status and membership to rights in the civil, political, and social spheres; of relevance here are the rights within the social sphere which emerged in conjunction with the expansion of the welfare state which gave entitlements to publicly funded social services such as education and health care. Marshall's interpretation emphasizes membership in a society and the associated entitlements as the product of a contract between governments and citizens; specifically, the government ensures social rights and provides resources, while citizens work, pay taxes, and follow the rules of society (Marshall 1977). This is echoed by Janowitz (1980) in descriptions of citizenship as a balance of rights and obligation. More generally, the concept of citizenship can also be viewed as a reciprocal relationship between the state and the individual (Heywood 1994).

While the social context in which Marshall's claims are situated exhibit differences to the contemporary United States, ideas about the social rights and obligation associated with citizenship are relevant to examinations of the role of pro-immigrant governments in shaping immigrant experiences within a broader system of crimmigration

The Practice of Citizenship

While T.H. Marshall's (1949) writings suggested the potential for citizenship status to be a social equalizer for members within a society, this view diminishes how citizenship operates in practice for individuals according to their social location. Scholars that emphasize citizenship as a practice, in addition to a status, contend that processes of exclusion create unequal experiences of belonging for marginalized groups (Beaman 2016). In other words, formal citizenship and the social rights attached to it do not always guarantee individuals the ability to experience substantive citizenship (Glenn 2010). The concept of substantive citizenship posits that the ability to exercise citizenship rights may be limited to some degree and that notions of belonging within a community are shaped by other members of society.

Conceptualizations of informal citizenship, in contrast to formal citizenship, are more closely aligned with and informed by the tenets of substantive citizenship. Greater attention is placed on the production and practice of citizenship. The literature on urban citizenship situated mainly in the discipline of Geography is particularly insightful for examining the central role that cities occupy in generating new meanings about citizenship and belonging.

Urban citizenship frames the production of citizenship as a radical and disruptive bottom-up process in contrast to the trickle-down process of citizenship assigned by the nation-state (Lustiger-Thaler 1993; de Graauw 2021). Among sociologists, there have been examinations of citizenship as an insurgent struggle sustained by ongoing negotiation by and claims-making.

Evelyn Glenn's Presidential Address at the 2010 American Sociological Association highlighted a case of insurgent citizenship within the undocumented student movement that demonstrates how notions of belonging and membership can be affirmed within inclusive and welcoming spaces. Examples like this present citizenship as dynamic and a product of social construction whereby individuals are involved in negotiating claims to belonging within a defined space or community. These processes contribute to the expansion of rights and pave the way for the informal incorporation of marginalized and excluded groups into local spaces (Varsanyi 2008). In this context, the practice of citizenship as a consequence of the processes that produced it is framed as being more consequential than the status of citizenship.

In the case of integrating undocumented immigrants, an urban citizenship approach also classifies undocumented residents as de facto members of a community based on their residence and presence (Bauder 2020; Varsanyi 2006; Purcell 2003; Bauböck and Rundell 1998). This recognition of membership is further justified on the basis that residents, regardless of their citizenship or immigration status, already participate in various aspects of civic life through routine activities like sending their children to local schools, attending church, shopping, and paying local taxes (de Graauw 2014; 2020). Importantly, these various ways of participating in civic life involve the exchange of obligations and rights between the municipal government and its constituents; the government provides access to spaces and services while constituents utilize these spaces and services and pay fees and taxes in exchange. In many situations, such as signing up for a library card or opening a utilities account, proof of residence rather than citizenship is sufficient. In these respects, municipal and local institutions can provide the most immediate spaces for inclusion and participation that generate a sense of belonging and membership.

Creating inclusive and welcoming spaces is likely to facilitate the practice of citizenship among residents who may legally be defined as "alien" or "illegal." In the context of sanctuary cities, non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies intended to eliminate the chilling effect of immigration enforcement are consistent with the tenets of informal citizenship. By recognizing local citizens based on residency and asserting equal access to municipal goods, sanctuary cities help to restructure civic institutions as hospitable spaces. This departs from Isin and Nielsen's (2008) concept of the "spectrum of intensity" whereby hostility is justified for subjects not recognized as citizens.

Rescaling and reimagining citizenship, even in the absence of a formal status, demonstrates that local actors, including those in the policymaking, nonprofit, and advocacy arenas, can be a major force in carving out inclusionary spaces that legitimize belonging and membership for those with lack stable legal status (Menjívar 2006; Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas 2012). This is accomplished in ways that are consistent with Marshall's notion of social citizenship whereby social rights are granted via the expansion of access to public resources and social services. In many sanctuary jurisdictions, "don't ask" and "don't enforce" policies are not simply acts of resistance against the crimmigration apparatus but efforts to facilitate access to and utilization of public resources and services. In the long term, these membership affirming practices may also be supportive of immigrant integration.

The theorizations of alternate citizenship advanced in the social sciences underscore cities as a crucial site for generating new meanings about citizenship and membership. Through practices that incorporate immigrants into mainstream civic institutions, municipal governments endorse the rights and privileges associated with citizenship through city-level initiatives that recognize immigrant residents as full members of their communities. Of course, the reality is

that local citizenship is limited in scope and legally insignificant. Nonetheless, affirming membership rights can be an impactful tool for legitimizing and destigmatizing marginalized identities. Menjívar's (2006) concept of "liminal legality" describes the ambiguous middle ground experienced by Central American migrants with Temporary Protected Status, whereby membership and inclusion in society is uncertain and seemingly temporary. Simultaneously, undocumented immigrants can experience the looming threat of their illegality while seeing that threat diminish temporarily in more inclusion and welcoming spaces such as those carved out at the local level. This points to citizenship as a gradational status that can shift in different contexts rather than a stable dichotomous ones distinguishing between citizens and noncitizens (Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas 2012).

Applying the literature on local citizenship is helpful for understanding some of the motivations behind decisions to enact sanctuary policies. In many ways, sanctuary and pro-immigrant policies are ultimately policies of inclusion and access. Non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies can help convey the intention of local police to serve residents rather than a federal immigration agenda and that residents will not be subject to differential treatment on the basis of their immigration status. Other pro-immigrant initiatives such as language access programs (Wilson 2013), municipal ID cards (de Graauw 2014), and funding for legal representation, direct resources and services to vulnerable immigrant communities in ways that may help minimize the barriers to economic and social participation. These programs need not be framed on the basis of defying hostile immigrant law as they can instead be justified on the basis of promoting the welfare and safety of all city residents.

Marginalization or exclusion of any group at the local level compromises the ability of local governments to serve the community effectively. The chilling effect, described in the

previous chapter, explains how fear of immigration policing and surveillance can drive at-risk immigrants into the shadows. This not only increases the precariousness and vulnerability of affected immigrant residents, but it also potentially compromises the work of municipal agencies due to reduced tax revenue and gaps in information flow that are crucial to maintaining safety and community wellbeing. I discuss this in further detail in the subsequent section which examines the public safety narrative.

Even without jurisdiction over immigration law, municipal governments can exercise considerable influence over the lived experiences of undocumented immigrants through universal programs and policies that promote welfare and safety in local communities. Though these actions are consistent with the formal and legal responsibilities devolved to local governing bodies, they may also constitute disruptive and radical forms of activism that counter federal legal discourse. This has been referred to as municipal activism (Spencer and Delvino 2019) or the new municipalism (Augustín and Jörgensen 2019).

LOCAL CITIZENSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP

Informal citizenship, in its various interpretations, challenges the understanding that citizenship is simply a dichotomous legal category that determines who is a full member of a society. At the local level, membership can be reaffirmed through various practices that are established by legitimate and formal institutions. In this study, many narratives identified could be indirectly traced to motivations to include and integrate immigrants. However, in this section, I identify and organize three main narratives that directly reflect the various dimensions of citizenship and membership.

First, by establishing pro-immigrant spaces via policies restricting enforcement, local agencies endorse an "access-for-all" approach to the provisions of services which encourages

recognition of undocumented members as equal members of the locality. This fulfills an important dimension of citizenship concerning membership and the privileged status associated with it, as realized in the ability to exercise rights.

Second, in justifying why cities should refrain from engaging in immigration enforcement, local officials consistently referenced the contributions of immigrants, and framed these contributions in the context of fulfilling the basic criteria for membership in society. Emphasis on immigrant contributions suggests that citizenship in local spaces may still exhibit similar qualities to formal citizenship conferred by the nation-state in terms of balancing rights and obligations.

Lastly, local officials rejected enforcement priorities on the basis of the inclusive and diverse character of their jurisdictions where everyone regardless of their differences, legal or otherwise, were welcome. This points to the potential of localities as alternative sites of citizenship and membership. More importantly, however, efforts to promote inclusion and diversity demonstrate that informal citizenship at the local level is guided by the notions of substantive citizenship whereby the ability to exercise membership rights supersedes the legal distinctions attached to citizenship.

Social Rights via Access-for-All Policy Frameworks

Access-for-all describes an approach to the provision of services whereby everyone is eligible to access publicly funded resources and is characteristic of the sanctuary movement in Canadian cities (Bauder 2016). As sanctuary cities outside the U.S. are often oriented towards ensuring access to municipal goods, I approached the coding process deductively to examine if and how sanctuary cities in the U.S. used non-cooperation and non-enforcement measures to enhance the delivery of services to immigrant populations. Universalizing access in

municipalities, and urban cities in particular, is often central to anti-colonial activism that frames citizenship as a construct of white settler societies (Johnson 2012). Sanctuary cities can arguably be understood as an extension of this perspective as local officials often work closely with activists and advocates to create a space whereby new meanings of citizenship are constructed and legitimized. By establishing policies that confirm that municipal resources and services are available for all city residents regardless of citizenship or immigration status, local officials help to equalize status and belonging between foreign-born and native-born residents, and between residents of documented and undocumented status.

In this way, while formal citizenship status is downplayed as a condition of membership, residents are nonetheless recognized as individuals with rights and entitlements from the municipal government. Much like Marshall envisioned formal citizenship status as an equalizer that assured members of rights regardless of individual level differences, cities that promote access-for-all could be described as doing something similar in their attempt to divorce immigration status from the rights to access publicly funded services.

In various ordinances and resolutions prohibiting immigration enforcement and cooperation with immigration authorities, local officials emphasized that access to services should be fair and equal, and that immigration status would not be relevant. It is implied that entitlements to municipal services are based on residency or presence in the community and that the efforts to advance local citizenship are organized around the tenets of social citizenship as a practice, rather than a status. The selection of texts below is representative in language and tone with the exception of Albuquerque which is more detailed with examples of basic municipal services included. It was generally rare to see local officials elaborate on what municipal services include.

To the fullest extent allowed by federal and state law, immigrants who live within the city limits of Albuquerque and their families **shall have access to all** City services and programs. The City encourages all public agencies to **facilitate the access** of immigrants and their families to basic services, including but not limited to legal driver's licenses, health care, and education, including Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute and the University of New Mexico, to the fullest extent allowable by law. ("Albuquerque Resolution 00-151" 2001)

Durham has been a city that traditionally is open to and inclusive of all individuals and respects the rights of and provides **equal services to all individuals**, regardless of race, ethnicity, or immigration status. ("Durham Resolution 9046" 2003)

The City of Madison is dedicated to providing all of its residents fair and equal access to services, opportunities, and protections…any City of Madison office, department, employee, agency or agent shall not condition the provision of City services on the citizenship or immigration status of any individual. ("Madison Resolution 45903" 2017)

The City of Daly City seeks to support and enhance the health, safety and well-being of the community by **providing access to quality services for all its residents** on an equitable basis, irrespective of immigration status. It is the policy of the City of Daly City to respect and support every resident of the community in all matters related to civic life irrespective of ethnic or national origin, race, gender,

> religion, sexual. Orientation, economic or immigration status. ("Daly City Resolution 17-30" 2017)

> City employees **serve all residents and make city services accessible to all**, regardless of immigration status…City employees will not require any person seeking or accessing City programs or services to disclose their immigration status. ("Seattle Welcoming City Resolution" 2017)

Access-for-all, in theory, extends to services provided by police departments although this was often not stated upfront, but implied, in the policy text issued by municipal governments. The City of Seattle, prior to the Welcoming City Resolution issued in 2017, adopted Ordinance 121063 which establishes a policy for the police department to ensure access for immigrants to police protection regardless of immigration status. Similarly, in Watsonville, California, Resolution 88 (2004) specifies that "all city services" include police protection.

Police Department Policies

Of course, city services by default, include policing services but additional care to assure this understanding can be helpful for residents who are less knowledgeable about municipal structures or residents who are fearful of interacting with law enforcement. What tended to be more common was for police departments to establish their own access-for-all policies as part of broader decisions to turn down opportunities to enforce immigration law.

> The City and the Chelsea Police Department are committed to promoting safety and providing proactive **community policing services to all** who are located in our community…We as duly sworn police officers are responsible for providing

> effective policing services to everyone in the City of Chelsea in an equal, fair, and just manner. ("Chelsea PD Department Manual Policy 1.33" 2015)
>
> A person's right to file a police report, participate in police-community activities, or otherwise benefit from police services is **not contingent upon citizenship or immigration status.** ("Bothell PD Policy Procedure Manual BPD-0714" 2017)
>
> The Police Department is responsible for providing effective police services to **everyone** in the Town of Framingham in **an equal, fair, and just manner**. ("Framingham PD Policy 200-15" 2017)

Compared to the policy text issued directly by city governments, police practices and policies less frequently reference "immigrants." It was more common to see wording that was universally inclusive such as "everyone" or "all."

Another interesting observation is that not every police department with an access-for-all orientation is situated in a municipality where the local government has issued a sanctuary city policy. This does not necessarily mean non-policing municipal services are off limits to undocumented immigrants as access-for-all may be established de facto. Nonetheless, it is likely that when there is clear messaging on the matter from the local government, either independently or in concert with the local police department, knowledge is likely to be more widely disseminated and absorbed by service providers. Prior work has found that policing practices are greatly influenced by policy of the city government (Lewis et al. 2013).

In theory, access-for-all in the provision of policing services would translate into undocumented and other often criminalized populations being beneficiaries of policing rather

than subjects of policing. In practice, however, it is common knowledge marginalized populations are regularly stigmatized and criminalized even in the most progressive of cities (Weitzer and Brunson 2015). This can discourage access to and utilization of law enforcement services and other municipal services. Therefore, it is important to consider that access-for-all policies are limited in their application and reducing information asymmetries for service providers and residents alike is a vital step in improving the underutilization of services by underserved communities. Additionally, municipalities and police departments that publicize that their services are available for all may be perceived as more welcoming and inclusive by residents who are apprehensive about establishing contact. Aboii's (2016) investigation of inclusive health practices in sanctuary cities finds that perceptions of undocumented immigrants are shaped by the tone of public policies and whether their inclusion is reflected in political rhetoric. While formal citizenship may be dictated by boundedness and exclusivity (Bosniak 2007); informal citizenship in sanctuary cities is guided by inclusivity. In combination with access-for-all policies, these actions at the municipal level may help to establish the parameters for substantive citizenship to be enacted in the everyday life of residents, regardless of immigration or legal status.

My analysis also observed evolving language surrounding immigration and references to undocumented residents. Access-for-all policies pertaining to immigrant communities were present throughout the early years of the sanctuary movement in the 1980s but the tone inherent in the text always portrayed undocumented immigrants as the "other." Of course, this in part reflects the conventional political and social discourses of the time. However, in the present period, even as immigration law continues to frame foreign-born individuals as "alien," local governments have shifted to more inclusive language as demonstrated in the selections provided

above. Below, I include early examples of access-for-all initiatives in Los Angeles and New York City that utilize language that otherizes undocumented immigrants.

> Police service will be readily available to all persons, including the **undocumented alie**n, to ensure a safe and tranquil environment. ("Los Angeles PD Special Order 40" 1979)

> Any service provided by a City agency shall be **made available to all aliens** who are otherwise eligible for such service unless such agency is required by law to deny eligibility for such service to aliens. Every City agency shall encourage aliens to make use of those services provided by such agency for which aliens are not denied eligibility by law. ("New York City Executive Order No. 124" 1989)

This earlier language is especially interesting in the context of access-for-all because the policy text simultaneously includes and excludes undocumented immigrants. They are included in the sense that they are eligible to access resources, but they are nonetheless excluded because of their label as "alien" residents in the community. Unsurprisingly, both New York City and Los Angeles have incorporated more inclusive language and dropped the term "alien" from their policy vocabulary. Sanctuary city policies developed from the 2000s onwards generally use the terms "undocumented" or "immigrant" even though official immigration policy at the federal level continues to classify the foreign-born as "alien." This shift in language by local governments, combined with access-for-all, endorses immigrants as equal and full members of their local communities with entitlements to the opportunities of civic life.

Recognizing Immigrant Contributions

In addition to being a privileged legal status, citizenship is also a contract between members and the society in which they hold membership. More specifically, membership rights granted because of citizenship are balanced alongside obligations (Marshall 1977; Janowitz 1980). In practical terms, citizenship entails the exchange of goods and services between constituents and the governing body. Within sanctuary cities, officials consistently emphasized the various social, cultural, and economic contributions of immigrants in justifying decisions to refrain from immigrant enforcement. This conveys that the process of constructing local citizenship is insurgent and active, requiring active participation and involvement from members. Interpretations of immigrant contributions might also point to local citizenship as one that entails struggle and ongoing negotiation between actors within a municipality. This view is echoed in Glenn's (2010; 2011) arguments that the boundaries of citizenship are dynamic and responsive to the interests of political actors and constituents.

Statements highlighting immigrant contributions were often included very early on in the text and which helped to establish that the policy was a direct response to hostile immigration policing in which the municipality would not partake.

> Immigrants, both authorized and unauthorized, **contribute significantly to the economic growth and cultural vitality** in Washington State and locally. ("Bellingham Ordinance 02-008" 2017)

> All people, including immigrants, are **valued contributors** and are **vital to our shared prosperity**. ("Lake Forest Park Resolution 1606" 2017; "Salem Sanctuary for Peace Ordinance" 2017)

> Both immigrant and American-born individuals and their families **contribute greatly to the economic and social fabric** of the City of Long Beach. ("Long Beach Values Act" 2018)

> Pittsburgh's growing and thriving immigrant and refugee populations **enhance the city's social and cultural fabric and boost the city's economic growth and overall prosperity**. ("Pittsburgh Resolution 1151" 2017)

Emphasizing and recognizing the economic contributions of immigrants, particularly those who are undocumented, is especially meaningful in the face of popular discourses that frame immigrants as "lazy," "dependent" and detrimental to our economy (Andrews 2017). By elevating the economic role immigrants play in their communities, local officials send a strong message about the ways immigrants contribute to the collective wellbeing and success of their cities, thereby fulfilling the obligations of citizenship. In some resolutions, officials stressed that their communities have benefited from the contributions of immigrants. This wording simultaneously regularizes immigrants as members of societies while acknowledging that immigrants are involved in shaping the future of their communities. The ability of immigrants to participate while contributing demonstrates how informal citizenship can be practiced in ways that resemble dimensions of formal citizenship – such as those concerning the balance of rights and obligations.

> The City of Syracuse **greatly benefits** from the many different **cultural and spiritual contributions** of its highly diverse population. ("Syracuse Resolution 37" 2003)

> The City of St. Louis **greatly benefits** from **the many contributions** of its diverse population, including working people, students, immigrants and refugees. ("St. Louis Resolution 273" 2004)

> The City of Madison and the United States have **benefited from the repeated waves of immigration**…it is important to reaffirm the value of immigrants because they **contribute to Madison's cultural, economic, and social well-being**. ("Madison Resolution 48735" 2018)

> The City of **Troy values the social, cultural and economic contributions** that have been made by immigrants for the benefit of the City. ("Troy Resolution 113" n.d.)

By recognizing the many ways immigrants contribute and enrich communities as a preface to policy directives on non-enforcement and non-cooperation, local officials help frame immigrants as members and insiders that are invested in the wellbeing of a community. Specifically, immigrants are fulfilling their civic duties as members of the community. There also seemed to be the sense that immigrant contributions were regularly emphasized, not necessarily for the purpose of identifying deserving individuals, but more so as a way of recognizing how local communities have benefited. The notion that citizenship entails the balance of rights and obligations can be applied here to understand local citizenship in sanctuary cities. In addition, recognizing immigrant contributions may also be interpreted as a process of regularization whereby individuals labelled as outsiders and "alien" are active in shaping the

civic society. Local responses to enact sanctuary city policies that serve the interests of immigrants might be perceived as one way that local governments engage in the creative assignment of rights.

These interpretations are similar to Marshall's (1949; 1977) concept of citizenship that extends from the social contract established between a government and its citizens, as well as Janowitz's (1980) emphasis on the balance of rights and obligations. The notion that local citizenship is insurgent is also evident in the analyses, especially when immigrants are framed as active participants and contributors in their communities.

Inclusive and Welcoming Spaces

Municipalities that are committed to improving local public spaces and services to meet the needs of a diverse constituency are involved in the production of citizenship at the local level. This marks a departure from the aims of immigration enforcement and the nation-state's exclusionary definition of citizenship. However, despite these contrasts, there are parallels to be drawn from informal local citizenship and formal normal-state citizenship. At the local level, the privileges of citizenship, however informal, grants entitlements to public services and political representation. The protection and expansion of localities as inclusive spaces constitute a form of representation by local officials that affirm that immigrants, including those lacking status, belong here. Furthermore, by rejecting enforcement priorities, local officials help to preserve and sometimes create opportunities for immigrants to participate in the various arenas of civic life.

Consistent with the notions of urban citizenship, membership entitlements derive from residency rather than other criteria. While there is no legal status to be gained from local citizenship, efforts to facilitate the inclusion and participation of all residents in civic spaces

demonstrate how substantive citizenship can potentially be experienced by immigrants residing in sanctuary cities situated within broader hostile contexts that are criminalizing and exclusionary to non-U.S, citizens.

> The purpose of this Executive Order is to establish Denver **as a safe and Welcoming City for all** by:…Offering everyone the opportunity to enjoy Denver's economic, cultural, political, and social life and providing the ability to succeed and thrive freely without fear. ("Denver Mayoral Executive Order 142" 2017)

> The City of Boise is committed to being a Welcoming City and creating a community where all of our residents feel welcomed, safe, and **able to fully participate in**, and contribute to, our city's economic and social life. ("Boise Welcoming City Resolution 71-17" 2017)

One of the unique aspects of local citizenship is that it is an insurgent product of ongoing struggle and negotiation at the grassroots level. This process facilitates creative ways for non-US citizens to participate informally in the political sphere. In some resolutions, this sentiment was echoed in statements that invited residents to play an active role in shaping their communities. Richfield and Seattle are examples of cities that fit this description.

> We believe in and stand for values of inclusion, equity, and justice…We welcome all people and recognize the rights of individuals to live their lives with dignity, free of discrimination and targeting because of their faith, race, national origin, disability, or immigration status…We are **ready to work together with partners**, staff, and residents to create a safe, welcoming, equitable, and inclusive community for everyone. ("Richfield Resolution 11300" 2016)

> Seattle fosters a culture and environment that makes it a vibrant, global city where our immigrant and refugee residents **can fully participate** in and be integrated into the social, civic, and economic fabric of Seattle…Seattle is committed to continue building a welcoming, safe, and hate-free environment in communities, where all immigrants and refugees are welcomed, accepted, and integrated; and to encourage business leaders, civic groups, community institutions, and residents to **join in a community-wide effort** to adopt policies and practices that promote integration, inclusion, and equity. ("Seattle Welcoming City Resolution" 2017)

Inclusive and diverse spaces are often identifiable because they are seen as "welcoming." This is reflected in the language of sanctuary city policies but also in the poignant and intentional decisions of policymakers to identify themselves as "Welcoming Cities" rather than Sanctuary Cities, even though the policies and practices themselves are more or less the same in terms of opposing immigration enforcement. Of the 209 municipalities analyzed in this study, 30 cities officially claimed the label "Welcoming City." These cities range in population and span different regions of the country. A complete list of these cities is available in the appendix.

This section of the analyses identified different components of cities' sanctuary city statutes that centered concepts such as providing access for all, recognizing all immigrants'' contributions, and the need to create inclusive and diverse communities. The characteristics of these ordinances appear to challenge the federal definition of citizen. In contrast to the federal policies of strict enforcement that centers legal permission and documentation from the nation-state to be a citizen, sanctuary cities at the municipal level highlight how inclusive practices and policies can be implemented into civic institutions to affirm belonging and promote participation.

Through strategies to increase utilization of municipal services, statements that recognize the contribution of immigrants and establish goals for inclusive communities that are conducive to participation, local leaders engage in the production of local citizenship. This is deeply meaningful and poignant in a time when the discourse on immigration is increasingly hostile, racialized, and exclusionary.

This investigation of sanctuary city policies also provides additional insight into the processes by which cities construct and define local citizenship as a practice that can be incorporated into civic life. By offering alternative interpretations of citizenship and what it means to be a member of society, cities have been a significant force in contesting the traditional notions of citizenship granted by the nation-state. Sanctuary cities are one avenue through which alternatives discourses of citizenship, membership, and belonging are realized and put into practice. Specifically, by incorporating practices and policies that promote inclusion and participation, local governments in sanctuary cities effectively grant privileges and rights to residents that affirm them as equal members of the locality. While these advantages are confined by the boundaries of local jurisdictions, the impact on the day-to-day routines of marginalized groups is potentially substantial.

TRUST, COOPERATION, AND PUBLIC SAFETY

The primary argument in support of sanctuary cities is that non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies are important for the public safety and welfare of localities (Lyons et al. 2013; Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2017). This narrative complements broader efforts for promoting inclusion and affirming membership among marginalized residents. For example, the City of Seattle explains on its municipal website that the city is committed to "equity and inclusion" and that cooperation with federal agencies, such as the ICE detainer requests,

"undermines the ability of local jurisdictions to build community trust that is tantamount for public safety." (City of Seattle 2021).

The mechanisms that explain how public safety is enhanced by non-enforcement and non-cooperation are uncomplicated and occur primarily along two dimensions, both of which are observed in the content analyses. The first dimension, which is present in much of the literature on sanctuary cities, has to do with community-oriented policing which is built along pillars of trust and cooperation between law enforcement officers and residents. The assumption is that when residents trust local police, they are more likely to report crime and work cooperatively with police to solve crime (Waslin 2011; Martínez-Schuldt and Martínez 2021). In contrast, when residents distrust police, they may refrain from reporting crime or working cooperatively with police because of fear of unfair treatment (Menjívar and Bejarano 2004; Armenta and Alvarez 2017). The second dimension, identified as part of this content analyses, concerns the depletion of limited municipal resources which could jeopardize policing responsibilities and other municipal functions. The concern over how municipal resources are expended is less prominently featured in the literature as a factor shaping decisions to implement sanctuary policies.

Building Trust and Cooperation

The expansion of immigration enforcement over the past thirty years has encouraged feelings of mistrust in law enforcement by immigrant and Latino communities (Pew Hispanic Center 2007). Furthermore, the devolution of immigration enforcement responsibilities to local police has threatened the foundations of community policing that many municipalities have invested in for years. Relationships of trust and engagement between police and residents are undermined when police also become an extended arm of the immigration enforcement

apparatus, which intensifies the fear experienced by undocumented and other vulnerable immigrant communities.

In the policies analyzed, two interrelated priorities concerning public safety were articulated through the lens of community-oriented policing. First, alleviating fear and the chilling effect was a priority for increasing engagement with immigrant communities targeted by measures related to crimmigration. Part of this has to do with improving impressions of local law enforcement and removing barriers that prevent members of the immigrant community from seeking public safety services or interacting with police officers. Second, boosting trust and cooperation to ensure open lines of communication was emphasized as key to fighting and solving crime and only possible when fear among residents and perceptions of unequal treatment were addressed. The importance of meeting these two objectives was often tied to prior efforts and successes to establish positive relationships between local police and immigrant communities. The encroach of interior immigration enforcement and devolution of immigration policing were perceived to be threatening and destabilizing to the investments of the municipality in community-oriented policing.

When residents are fearful or distrusting of police, crime goes unreported and solving crimes becomes a more arduous task. Heightened and aggressive immigration enforcement exacerbates conditions of fear and distrust because these measures often result in the over-policing of immigrant and racialized communities. The devolution of immigration enforcement from federal to sub-federal entities also blurs the distinctions between law enforcement agencies at different levels and complicates the allegiances these agencies have to each other and their constituents. This is not conducive for solving crime and overall public safety. In Los Angeles, arguably one of the most well-known sanctuary cities with a comprehensive set of pro-immigrant

policies, the LAPD had been notorious for policing immigrant communities and routinely inquiring into immigration status and sharing this information with immigration authorities. Evaluation of these policing practices have showed that residents were deterred from engaging with LAPD and numerous crimes went unreported (Maya 2002; Gorman 2017). Over the past decades, the LAPD, like other police departments across the nation, have reassessed their focus and established strong non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies for local officers.

Nevertheless, even with sanctuary policies established, there may still be individual or group-level factors that potentially contribute to unreported crime or weakened community-police relations. Negative perceptions and negative experiences can be magnified when the dominant discourse about immigration is hostile and exclusionary. Immigrants, primarily those with precarious status, may perceive interactions with police officers as potential pathways to deportation (Theodore and Habans 2016; Becerra et al. 2016). Accordingly, immigrants who are also victims of crime refrain from seeking assistance due to fear that they may be treated differently because of their immigration status, which further intensifies crime victimization (Menjívar and Salcido 2002). Individuals who have had negative experiences with law enforcement may also avoid contact with police or officials due to perceptions of discrimination or unequal treatment (Menjívar and Bejarano 2004).

Prior work has found that efforts to enforce immigration law can encourage racially biased policing (Romero and Serag 2005). Language barriers can also discourage engagement with police especially if individuals fear that they are unable to effectively communicate or have their report taken seriously by members of law enforcement (Theodore and Habans 2016; Culver 2004; Davis 1985). There is also concern that interactions with police might involve the excessive use of force (Becerra et al. 2016). These factors can be present even within strong pro-

immigrant environments, especially if there are information asymmetries regarding non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies. Therefore, it is not surprising that in many localities, police departments have devoted time and resources to building and strengthening ties with immigrant communities.

In some localities, the concept of community policing was emphasized in policies highlighting the desire of police departments to develop positive relationships between police departments and local residents. Many policy documents signaled the value localities placed on the relationships between police departments and the community.

> The Boise Police Department **has worked tirelessly** to develop a Community Policing program to build **solid relationships** between immigrant communities and law enforcement, that are a foundation for a safer and stronger community. ("Boise Welcoming Resolution 71-17" 2017)

> Any perception that the local police are involved in the enforcement of immigration law will **undermine** the police-community relationships that have been built up over the years, and thereby undermine the ability of the police to keep the community safe. ("Carbondale Safe and Welcoming Community Resolution" 2017)

Examples of representative language from Boise and Carbondale highlight localities' emphasis on community policing as a way to promote public safety. The City of Ames uses the exact same wording as Carbondale's Resolution in their 2017 Resolution 17-247 which also condemns the imposition of immigration law enforcement on local law enforcement. Because positive police-community relationships rely on the willingness of residents to report crime and

work with police, the language expressed a sense of urgency in addressing the fear of law enforcement within immigrant communities.

Quelling Immigrant Fear

Heightened immigration enforcement in the interior of the United States exacerbates the already-present fears immigrants have regarding law enforcement officials. The participation of local police departments in immigration enforcement further erodes trust and confidence and magnify the chill effect that shrouds vulnerable immigrant communities (Becerra et al. 2016). Implementing non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies appears to be a strategy used by local policy makers to quell the fear experienced by those in vulnerable immigrant communities. In several cities in California, including Alameda and Coachella, sanctuary resolutions directly state that the city "desires to address the fears and concerns of its residents in relation to a person's immigration status" ("Alameda Resolution 2017-52" 2017; "Coachella Resolution 15225" 2017). Similar language is present in a number of other municipal documents that restrict immigration enforcement.

> Waves of fear have swept through immigrant communities in California and within the City of San José. **The City of San José has a strong interest** in assuring that legal and undocumented immigrants do not fear interacting with local governmental authorities. ("San José Resolution 73677" 2007)

> Immigrants report they are **fearful** that any contact with the police or other City services could jeopardize their own security or that of their family members, and are **reluctant to report crimes** or serve as testifying witnesses. ("Philadelphia Resolution 11053600" 2011)

> The (Northglenn) City Council further finds and determines that it seeks **to combat the fear and divisiveness** associated with the perception that the City through its Police Department may be asked to enforce federal immigration laws. ("Northglenn Resolution CR-131" 2016)
>
> All people within the city **need to feel safe** to contact local law enforcement or city government and be able to freely access critical public safety services **without fear**. ("Beaverton Resolution 4429" 2017; "Forest Grove Resolution 2017-16" 2017)

Local jurisdictional refusal to enforce immigration law or cooperate with ICE is rooted in a desire to alleviate fear among immigrant communities, which in turns helps to strengthen trust and confidence in local law enforcement agencies. This discourse of alleviating fear is especially apparent in the past few years due to anti-immigrant rhetoric amplified by President Trump's repeated efforts to demonize and criminalize undocumented immigrants. Ordinances, resolutions, and executive orders implemented since 2016 often react directly to President Trump's attack on undocumented immigrant populations to acknowledge the fears and anxieties experienced by this group.

A declared sanctuary city since 1986, the city of Oakland reaffirmed its position in 2016 to recognize that "since the presidential election, there has been a sense of uncertainty and fear among many immigrant communities" ("Oakland Resolution 86498" 2016), with Councilmember Kaplan declaring that "the presence of ICE in Oakland is causing trauma in the community and causing a chilling effect that weakens cooperation with local law enforcement ("Oakland Resolution 87346" 2017). Similar sentiments were expressed by the Philadelphia City

Council in a more straightforward manner: "Donald Trump has advanced xenophobic foreign policies by stoking an irrational fear of immigrants and proposing to build a wall that would divide our country from Mexico" (Philadelphia City Council 2016). The Mayor of Greenfield, Massachusetts reacted in an Executive Order stating that "I have issued an Executive Order that directly relates to our community sanctuary status and President Donald Trump's Executive Order of January 27, 2017" ("Greenfield Executive Order 2017-3" 2017). Numerous municipalities across the country acknowledged the heightened fear as a consequence of anti-immigrant policies enacted since President Trump was elected and used this event to implement new policies or update existing policies.

Ultimately, alleviating fear and maintaining standards of unbiased policing help to strengthen community-oriented policing, which operate on trust and cooperation between police departments and their constituents. When residents trust and have confidence in police to effectively and fairly carry out their responsibilities, residents will be more likely to report crime and cooperate with police to solve crimes (Armenta and Alvarez 2017). Fostering trust and cooperation as a way of ensuring public safety was almost a universal narrative present in every non-enforcement and non-cooperation policy text analyzed. This is succinctly summarized in Los Angeles' Ordinance 185600 (2018): "Our communities are safer when there is a strong trust between immigrant communities and government." Other examples of representative excerpts are provided below for reference to highlight the similarities and differences between municipalities in describing the relationship between trust, cooperation, and public safety.

> The **trust** of immigrants to communicate with law enforcement to report criminal activity is a necessary component of effective law enforcement and public safety as

affirmed by the legislative intent…the City endeavors to establish policies which safeguard public safety and tranquility. (“Pomona Ordinance 4244” 2017)

The City Council recognizes that fostering a relationship of **trust**, **respect**, and **open communication** between City employees and City residents is essential to City departments’ core mission of ensuring public safety and serving the needs of the entire community. (“Salinas City Welcoming City Resolution” 2017)

The maintenance of a safe environment is a primary City responsibility and one that can only be secured with absolute **trust** between its Police Department and citizens including immigrant residents it serves and comes into contact with, and that trust is threatened when local agencies are involved in immigration enforcement. (“Seaside City Resolution No. 17-25” 2017)

Because partnership with Vermont residents is the most effective way to ensure public safety, **maintaining the public’s trust** is a primary concern. To secure this trust, personal characteristics, or immigration status, should have no adverse bearing on an individual’s treatment in custody. (“Colchester PD General Order 36” 2018)

Local enforcement of immigration law makes everyone less safe. When local law enforcement voluntarily works on behalf of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to facilitate deportations, significant gaps in trust and cooperation between

> immigrant communities and the police…undue collaboration between local law enforcement and ICE will make immigrants less likely to report crimes, act as witnesses in criminal investigations and prosecutions and provide intelligence to law enforcement. The **cooperation of Hoboken's immigrant communities is essential** to prevent and solve crimes and maintain public order, safety, and security in the entire City. ("Executive Order Declaring Hoboken a Fair and Welcoming City" 2018)

In terms of frequency, the "trust and cooperation" code appeared almost consistently in every policy that addressed decisions to not enforce immigration law. Obtaining the trust of constituents was described as essential to public safety and effective policing overall, and the overreach of immigration enforcement into local agencies was seen as an interference and detriment.

From the standpoint of the literature on local citizenship, the ability of residents regardless of their immigration status to safely engage with police and local officials can also serve as one way that inclusion and membership is realized. Police departments operate much like a department of the municipal government and exist with the manifest function to protect and serve local residents. Alleviating fear and promoting positive interactions were seen as strategies for not only increasing access to policing resources but also improving public safety. In sanctuary cities, strategies to strengthen community policing and reject immigration enforcement pressures are part of the foundations of fulfilling a broader vision of establishing inclusive and diverse spaces.

Conserving Municipal Resources

Putting aside the politics of immigration, there are practical reasons for police departments and local governments to refrain from immigration enforcement. The material and immaterial costs of enforcing federal immigration law are not negligible and police departments that take on this task exhaust precious resources that could otherwise be dedicated to promoting public safety. This is a lesser explored area in the literature but nonetheless constitute an often referenced reason why local governments have refrained from deputizing police as immigration officers.

In many resolutions, it is explicitly stated that municipal or city resources are not to be used for the purpose of immigration law enforcement except when legally necessary. Representative language and text from several municipalities is presented below.

> City employees, including members of the Santa Rosa Police Department, shall not enforce Federal civil immigration laws and **shall not use city monies, resources**, or personnel to investigate, question, detect, or apprehend persons on the basis of a possible violation of immigration law, unless required by State or federal law. ("Santa Rosa City Resolution No. 2017-017" 2017)

> Oregon **law prohibits the use of state and local resources** to enforce federal immigration laws. ("Corvallis Sanctuary City Resolution" 2016)

> An agency or instrumentality of the City **may not: (1) use State, County, or City resources or institutions** for the enforcement of federal immigration matters,

> which are the responsibility of federal government. ("Elko Community Resolution" 2004)

Placing emphasis on local resources highlights the scarcity of these resources while also implying that immigration law remains a federal responsibility. Corvallis' Sanctuary City Resolution references Oregon State law which actually already prohibits state and local resources to be used for immigration enforcement purposes. Oregon is one of the few sanctuary states in the United States; therefore, county, cities, and towns are bound by the same standards when it comes to enforcement. Corvallis' policy is similar in tone and framing to other municipalities in Oregon that have chosen to assert and further clarify their status as pro-immigrant localities. Though Nevada is not a sanctuary city, it appears that the City of Elko has prohibited the use of any sub-federal resources for federal immigration activities at the municipal level.

Setting Jurisdictional Boundaries

Discussion about the appropriate use of municipal resources was often advanced in conjunction with the reminder that immigration law is the jurisdiction of the federal government and that there is no inherent responsibility on the part of local governments to partake in matters concerning immigration law.

> The investigation and enforcement of federal laws relating to illegal entry and residence in the United States is **specifically assigned to** the US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) of the United States Department of Homeland Security. ("Chandler PD General Order E-17.100" 2006)

> The Anaheim Police Department is not charged with enforcing immigration laws; that **responsibility and function lies with the federal government**. ("Anaheim PD Policy 428" 2017)
>
> The U.S. Federal Government has **exclusive jurisdiction** over immigration laws and their enforcement within the United States. ("Chula Visa PD Policy Manual" 2017)
>
> The City of Madison is **not an agent of the federal government** and established law provides that the federal government **cannot commandeer or compel local officials** to enforce federal law. ("Madison Resolution 45903" 2017)
>
> Immigration enforcement **is not a local law enforcement matter**. It falls under the **jurisdiction** of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). **LMPD officers lack the jurisdiction** to enforce federal immigration law. ("Louisville Metro PD SOP 10.1" 2017)
>
> The enforcement of federal immigration laws is the **prerogative of federal enforcement agencies**, not local law enforcement agencies. ("Resolution Affirming the City of Troy as a Sanctuary City" 2018)

By asserting the responsibilities of the federal government and federal agencies to manage immigration, municipalities provide legitimacy to decisions at the local level to not overstep their powers in matters concerning immigration enforcement. Rather than deflecting

responsibility, sanctuary policies are framed as a way for local agencies exhibit deference to federal powers. Establishing immigration enforcement as a chiefly federal issue also provides weight to decisions that police departments and municipal governments about how and where municipal resources should be allocated.

As immigration law has always been the jurisdiction of the federal government, police departments are by default unequipped to effectively enforce immigration law. Police officers may lack a comprehensive understanding of the complexities of immigration law and many do not have the formal training and experience to carry out the duties of an immigration enforcement officer (Arnold 2007). The finances, time, and training materials required to prepare police officers may simply not exist or be utilized at the expense of other priorities at the municipal level. Though the Immigration and Nationality Act specifies that training is available for local officers to enforce immigration law, conducting activities in the interest of federal agencies nonetheless takes away from the goals of local agencies that have a vested interest in maintaining inclusive and safe communities. These costs extend to involvement in immigration enforcement, including cooperation with immigration enforcement agencies. Within police departments and city departments, the task of enforcing immigration law can come at significant costs and require substantial resources as implied by some of the policy text analyzed. Diverting limited funds to support federal objectives compromises the efficiency and effectiveness of local agencies to deliver services for their communities.

Centering Services over Enforcement

Unlike the federal government, which is responsible for citizenship and immigration matters, the primary function of municipal governments is to promote the wellbeing and safety of its communities via the delivery of basic social and economic services (Liebert 1974). An

excerpt from Daly City's Resolution No.17-30 makes clear that local officials prefer to utilize local resources for delivering services rather than fulfilling enforcement objectives on behalf of the federal government. Accordingly, there is an incentive for municipalities to conserve monies and resources especially when the task of enforcement remains the jurisdiction of the federal government. This sentiment is conveyed often through language that describes local resources as "limited" and immigration enforcement as not being in the best interests of local communities.

> It is morally appropriate and **fiscally prudent** to focus our **finite City resources** towards addressing and resolving discrete **community concerns** that are governed by the applicable local laws. ("Virginia Resolution No. 2246" 2007)

> The federal government cannot commandeer the government of the City of San Carlos to do its work. **City resources are limited** and should only be used in service of the **goals and values** of the City of San Carlos. ("San Carlos Welcoming City Resolution" 2017)

> The identification and reporting of immigrants who have been charged much less convicted of any crime **unduly burdens and diverts municipal resources**; **disrupts and interferes** with the City's due to **basic municipal services such as health care, education, and police protection.** ("Jersey City Executive Order" 2017)

> In order for the City of Daly City to **effectively deliver essential services** that promote a safe quality of life, it must be made clear and communicated openly to

> residents that it is the City's policy position that enforcement of federal immigration law is the sole responsibility of federal authorities and **that local law enforcement and other resources** will not be used to enforce federal immigration law. ("Daly City Resolution No. 17 – 30" 2017)

Other localities also implied in more subtle ways that municipal resources were limited and should be dedicated to meeting municipal-level objectives. For example, the excerpts shown below demonstrate how some city officials alluded to better uses of limited resources or described the burden of immigration enforcement.

> The enforcement of federal civil immigration law **will distract** local and state law enforcement from their **primary mission** of ensuring public safety and preventing crime in our community by having them focus on the apprehension of immigrants instead of criminals and by adding **burdensome** paperwork and reporting requirements. ("Albuquerque Resolution 04-87" 2004)

> The City of Carbondale devotes resources to law enforcement for the purpose of assuring the safety of all persons who reside in or visit our community and should be used for **local priorities** and not for participation in federal immigration enforcement. ("A Resolution for Establishing Carbondale as a Safe and Welcoming Community" 2017)

> It is the sense of the Mayor and Council that it is **not a proper utilization** of the City of Hyattsville's resources to enforce federal immigration laws. ("Hyattsville Ordinance 2017-02" 2017)

As a sub-federal entity, municipal governments are inherently limited in their administrative and governing capacities. The primary function of local governments is to promote and maintain the wellbeing of communities through the provision of various services and resources (Liebert 1974). Taking action to support a federal objective can be constraining on financial and personnel resources. Moreover, involvement in aggressive immigration policing that targets immigrants contradicts and undermines the functions of local governments by diverting time and resources towards a federal agenda that has no immediate widespread benefit at the local level. Conserving limited policing resources at the municipal level is also ultimately a matter of public safety in the end. Investments in supporting a hostile and aggressive immigration agenda deplete precious and limited resources that local agencies could otherwise dedicate to strengthening community engagement and public safety.

This section analyzed how officials in sanctuary cities justified non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies on the basis of public safety. There were two dimensions to this argument. The first had to do with the devastation that immigration enforcement would have on the pillars of community-oriented policing and subsequently the positive relationships police departments worked hard to establish within their communities. The second concerned the costs of immigration enforcement that would certainly deplete the already limited resources of municipal governments to carry out local functions including those related to public safety.

DISCUSSION: PUBLIC SAFETY AND LOCAL CITIZENSHIP

The findings on local citizenship and public safety as they pertain to decisions to prohibit and restrict immigration enforcement reveal the multifaceted ways through which sanctuary cities facilitate pro-immigrant spaces. Arguably, the interest of local governments to enhance public safety through non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies are supportive of the aims

of local citizenship to create inclusive and diverse spaces. As a publicly funded good, the services provided by law enforcement are included in access-for-all initiatives that encourage undocumented communities to utilize civic resources. In addition, investing resources into community engagement can help create informal political opportunities for residents who are ineligible to participate in formal political processes. The mainstream discourse on sanctuary cities in the United States has centered around local enforcement decisions and framed them as an obstructive to community-oriented policing which is built on trust and cooperation. However, the analyses in this section indicate that policies prohibiting enforcement and cooperation stem from various objectives that prioritize the wellbeing of municipalities and their residents.

This is not to say that sanctuary cities and pro-immigrant spaces are not without their limitations. Even the strongest and most comprehensive sanctuary policies are not foolproof and information asymmetries and subjective interpretations are likely to produce inconsistent practices that negatively affect immigrant communities. As discussed in the previous chapter, sanctuary cities lack the legal capacity to protect immigrants from federal immigration authorities but the policies implemented at the local level can potentially mute the impacts of hostile federal immigration law. However, as ICE continues to adopt new missions and strategies, the effectiveness of pro-immigrant policies and practices in sub-federal jurisdictions must also be reassessed with attention to the communities most affected. Recent enforcement and surveillance activity from ICE has specifically targeted sanctuary cities and bypassed local agencies (ICE 2020). Municipal governments that are vested in protecting immigrant communities must be committed to sanctuary cities as a long-term project.

The next chapter presents a case study using in-depth interviews with civil servants and immigration advocates in the City of Seattle to examine how policies on paper are put into

practice by individuals who interact regularly with members of the immigrant community. The data from the interviews provide additional insight into the role of specific municipal agencies, including the police department, in creating immigrant-friendly spaces in a time of heightened enforcement and surveillance.

CHAPTER 4: THE WELCOMING CITY OF SEATTLE

While any sub-federal jurisdiction with at least one policy of non-enforcement or non-cooperation is considered to be a sanctuary city in the United States, not all jurisdictions that meet this definition have embraced the label "sanctuary city." One of these jurisdictions is the City of Seattle. Despite a comprehensive range of pro-immigrant policies and practices that are shared by other well-established sanctuary cities, the City of Seattle has opted for the label "Welcoming City" instead of "Sanctuary City."[2]

In chapter four of my analyses, I examine what it means for Seattle to be a Welcoming City. Building upon my findings in the previous two chapters, I use a case study approach to analyze how local pro-immigrant policies and practices are implemented to meet objectives that extend beyond the public safety narrative that is often associated with sanctuary cities. To this end, I consider how the policies and practices of Seattle's Welcoming City framework might shape local contexts in ways that influence immigrant experiences and civic life. I conduct interviews with civil servants employed by the City of Seattle and individuals working for local immigrant-serving non-profit organizations to generate new insights about how municipal pro-immigrant policies might facilitate immigrant inclusion and integration. Moreover, I examine how municipalities attempt to counter restrictive and hostile immigration policies and policies and practices that affirm membership and belonging in civic institutions. I organize my analyses into two sections.

[2] While officially, the City of Seattle has adopted the label "Welcoming City," it is still referred to as a "Sanctuary City" generally in mainstream discourse by proponents and opponents of sanctuary cities. In this research study, I occasionally also refer to Seattle as a sanctuary city in acknowledgement of the non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies that are consistent with the general definitions of "sanctuary city." City employees I spoke to did not disagree that Seattle was a sanctuary city but emphasized it was important to think of the city's immigrant-oriented policies in broader terms in the context of a Welcoming City.

The first section explores Seattle's 2017 Welcoming City resolution as a contemporary and practical rebrand of the traditional Sanctuary City. Though the city had enacted limited enforcement policies prior to officially becoming a Welcoming City in 2017, the municipal government has refrained from official adopting the term "Sanctuary City." Though both terms evoke pro-immigrant attitudes, I find that in Seattle, civil servants regularly prefer to call the city "welcoming" rather than a "sanctuary" due to both symbolic and pragmatic considerations. To this end, I organize my analyses around three insights that have received less attention in the existing literature. To begin, I explore the meaning and perceptions that civil servants and staff members at non-profit organizations associate with being a Welcoming City and how this differs from being a Sanctuary City. Second, I explore how pro-immigrant policies in a Welcoming City exert inward and outward pressures to simultaneously incorporate immigrant communities into civic life and deter immigration enforcement from federal agencies. Third, I assess the shortcomings of pro-immigrant policies and the unintended consequences of Seattle's pro-immigrant practices.

The second section builds upon the previous chapters to further explore the processes of building trust and cooperation with immigrant communities. However, rather than examining these processes as a means to improving public safety, I focus on how they can affirm membership and facilitate alternative understandings of citizenship. Drawing on the experiences shared in interviews by city employees and community advocates, I highlight established programs, practices, and scenarios that encourage participation in mainstream civic institutions. In order to consider the social and political implications implied by municipal policies I examine the experiences of individuals working for the city or non-profit organizations. Despite the limited powers of municipal government in matters of immigration, the findings from this

analysis reveal the potential of local agencies to challenge traditional notions of citizenship by granting immigrants local access to rights and privileges that facilitate integration into civic life.

The analyses in this chapter and the next are informed by two bodies of literature – the sociological literature on contexts of reception and the sociological and geographical literature on informal citizenship. I argue that, despite the limited powers of municipal government, pro-immigrant spaces can still be carved out within broader restrictive spaces in ways that afford immigrants with marginalized status rights and privileges that are traditionally restricted to citizens. To this end, the pro-immigrant stance and actions of municipalities are not merely symbolic but a potentially forceful counter to restrictive federal immigration policies that often constrain the lives of immigrants.

Seattle as a Case Study

Seattle is a fast-growing metropolitan city, nested within King County and Washington State, both of which are sanctuary jurisdictions. In 2020, the U.S. Census reported a population of 737,015 of which about 20% is foreign-born. About a fifth of residents aged 5 and older speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census 2020). The City of Seattle was selected for this case study because of its range of policies and practices that represent the ideas and values attached to sanctuary cities. Because there is no official standard or definition for a sanctuary city, it is difficult to select any city to be representative of all sanctuary cities in the United States. However, Seattle's has demonstrated a consistency in responding to anti-immigrant legislation at the federal level and enacting policies and practices to restrict immigration enforcement. In this respect, Seattle embodies the tenets of what a sanctuary city might look according to general and academic conceptualizations. The range of the city's pro-immigrant policies today is comprehensive, including restrictions on cooperation with federal immigration

agencies, local enforcement of immigration law, and status inquiries. These robust measures are similar in scope and intensity to other notable and established sanctuary cities such as Los Angeles and San Francisco.

One of the most important policies, Ordinance 121063, was enacted in 2003 and prohibited police officers from inquiring into immigration status. Policy frameworks that prohibit status inquiries are not unique and are standard in sanctuary counties and cities. Since 2003, the City of Seattle has continued to enact several resolutions and ordinances to strengthen this original policy while also broadening the range of policies to prohibit local enforcement of immigration law. In similar fashion as other cities, these policy developments reflect the contentious interplay between federal and municipal priorities regarding immigration and immigrant communities.

Despite a comprehensive range of pro-immigrant policies and practices similar to other major sanctuary cities in the United States, Seattle also stands out in that, unlike its counterparts, the municipal government has embraced the label "Welcoming City" and avoided the use of "Sanctuary City" in municipal documents. Though there was a brief moment in the mid 1980s when Seattle was declared to be a "City of Refuge" with the passage of Resolution 27402 in 1986, current pro-immigrant efforts and practices are packaged under the ongoing project of making Seattle a "Welcoming City." This is of particular interest as decisions about labels may signify that policy officials are cognizant of the symbolic significance and controversies that surround the term "Sanctuary City" which could heighten political divides and tensions that impede policy development. While the city is certainly not alone in representing itself as a Welcoming City, it departs from other major urban cities with comprehensive policies that have claimed the label "Sanctuary City" officially. This point of differentiation offers a unique

opportunity to examine the meanings and assumptions attached to sanctuary cities, and the alignment of such meanings and assumptions with local policies and practices.

Another unique characteristic of the City of Seattle is that it is one of the very few municipalities that has established a department dedicated to immigrant and refugee affairs. In 2012, Seattle created the Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs as part of Ordinance 123822 with the intention of improving the lives of immigrants and refugees in Seattle. With close connections with other city departments and community groups, the office plays a vital role in directing residents to services and programs. Municipal offices or departments dedicated singularly to immigrant and refugee affairs remain the exception rather than the norm but represent a significant and major step forward in creating pro-immigrant spaces.

Findings from this case study may not necessarily represent the typical sanctuary city in the United States but insight can be drawn to understand how pro-immigrant policies and practices can facilitate immigrant integration and inclusion. This is an important finding that could reveal ways in which local governments can exercise their limited powers to shape immigration matters in ways that are supportive for marginalized immigrant communities.

SANCTUARY CITY VS. WELCOMING CITY

As previously mentioned, a sanctuary city in the United States refers to any jurisdiction that has at least one policy that limits local agencies from participating in the enforcement of federal immigration law. This criteria within this definition have informed the creation of several unofficial databases of sanctuary jurisdictions in the United States, such as those compiled by the Ohio Jobs and Justice PAC (OJJPAC), FAIR USA, the National Immigration Law Center (NILC), and Center for Immigration Studies (CIS). In creating these databases, "sanctuary city" is a label that outsiders attach to a jurisdiction. However, not every jurisdiction that refrains from

or restricts immigration enforcement has adopted the label of "Sanctuary City"; some jurisdictions have adopted alternatives such as "Welcoming City" or "Freedom City", while some jurisdictions have no official label to capture their pro-immigrant policies and practices. These labels, or lack thereof, are arguably insignificant relative to the actual policies and practice that guide service providers, yet, that some jurisdictions dispute certain labels while embracing others suggests that the names used to describe local orientations to immigration enforcement are not just empty words void of meaning.

At the very least, sanctuary city status, whether embraced in name by local officials or not, is recognized to be symbolic. Inherent in the name, a sanctuary city is often perceived to be spaces of sanctuary for immigrants at risk of enforcement. The term also is a nod to the early days of the sanctuary movement in which churches provided refuge and protection from immigration officials. This practice was modelled after the "cities of refuge" described in religious texts whereby asylum was granted to individuals who accidentally took another's life (Bauder 2016). Today, entire counties and cities are sanctuary spaces, but rather than providing protection, they offer solidarity to immigrants through limited cooperation and non-enforcement policies and practices.

In contexts with high levels of anti-immigrant hostility, sanctuary cities can stand out as a display of inclusivity and hospitality (Mofette and Ridgley 2018). Inclusivity is reflected in the assertion that immigrants belong in local spaces even if their existence is deemed illegal within a broader geography. The concept of hospitality can be understood as an openness to the other, exhibited by a host population (Derrida 2000; Mofette and Ridgley 2018). Like a guest in a host's home, immigrants welcomed into sanctuary cities are expected to abide by the rules of the host. These ideas of inclusivity, hospitality, and solidarity are ideas at best and may be reflected

in local policies and practices, but contrary to popular belief, do not confer protection from immigration enforcement and deportation.

Some jurisdictions have officially adopted the term "Welcoming City" as an alternative to "Sanctuary City" even though there is little differentiation in terms of the policies and practices. The Welcoming America Network offers cities and counties that promote immigrant inclusion and participation to be certified as welcoming cities. Certification is based on demonstrating seven principles: government leadership, equitable access, civic engagement, connected communities, education, economic development, and safe communities (Welcoming America 2021). All twelve cities and counties that are currently certified by Welcoming America as of the year 2021 also appear in at least one of the several databases that compile information on sanctuary cities (Aspen Law 2017; OJJPAC 2020; CIS 2021). More generally, even without the certification from Welcoming America, cities and counties that are committed to immigrant inclusion and participation could join the network; a combined total of 122 counties and cities are currently members of the network (Welcoming America 2021). Affiliation with Welcoming America and membership in the network provides local governments an opportunity to engage in cross dialogue about pro-immigrant policy and initiatives that support social integration and economic growth. Membership, in the absence of certification, is a "relatively low cost and highly visible act" which could be an effective way for cities and counties to express support for immigrant communities (Huang and Liu 2016:3). It does seem that local governments, in their adoption of the Welcoming City status, aim to present more than a symbolic gesture which has been the main criticism of sanctuary cities.

The differences between a Welcoming City and a Sanctuary City are not always apparent as a city or county as similar policies and aims exist under both labels. However, the term

Welcoming City offers a more contemporary perspective on immigrant rights that departs from the religious roots that shaped the early Sanctuary movement. More importantly, the meanings conveyed by the term "Welcoming City" are detached from the safe-haven imagery that falsely promises protection. Not surprisingly, the term "sanctuary" has become politically controversial in recent years, which may explain the decision of some jurisdictions to avoid the label. This is certainly the view held by some city officials in Seattle, but there are also other reasons that inform the city's decision to be recognized as a Welcoming City. In the following section, I combine perceptions from civil servants and staff members working at local community non-profits to explore what it means for Seattle to be a Welcoming City.

Seattle: A Welcoming City

Seattle is often referred to as a Sanctuary City because it has enacted policies and practices that limit municipal agencies, including the local police department, from enforcing federal immigration law (Beekman 2016; OJJPAC 2021). However, officially, the City of Seattle has opted for the term "Welcoming City" to describe its pro-immigrant policies and practices. City employees and elected officials have refrained from describing Seattle as a Sanctuary City. The 2017 Welcoming City Resolution makes clear the city's name preference in addition to reiterating prior commitments to non-enforcement and non-cooperation and established new commitments to making the city more immigrant friendly.

In-depth interviews with community advocates, immigration lawyers, and municipal employees reveal that differences in interpretations of the terms "sanctuary" versus "welcoming" are most salient for civil servants involved in shaping policy because of the distinctive meanings attached to each term. For individuals that serve immigrant communities outside the sphere of

municipal government, the differences between "sanctuary" and "welcoming" are less noticeable and in some cases, the terms represent two sides of the same coin.

Despite a long history of supporting immigrant communities and resisting anti-immigrant hostility from the federal government, the City of Seattle has opted to call itself a Welcoming City, as opposed to a Sanctuary City, which has been the official term adopted by comparable municipalities like Los Angeles and San Francisco. Close analyses of local resolutions and ordinances in the previous chapter suggest that policies and practices concerning immigration enforcement and cooperation with federal immigration officials are very similar in wording and intent. Yet, it also appears that city officials in Seattle were intentional in adopting "Welcoming City" as opposed to "Sanctuary City." Declaring Seattle a "Welcoming City" created an opportunity for the city to develop a contemporary framework for imagining pro-immigrant spaces based on inclusion, access, and participation. This approach marks a turn from the traditional notions of sanctuary that implied protection and refuge.

Branding the City of Seattle as a "Welcoming City"

In addition to developing a more practical framework around policies of inclusion, access, and participation, adopting "Welcoming City" also provided an opportunity to clearly define the goals of a pro-immigrant city without the controversy and misleading assumptions associated with "Sanctuary Cities." The lack of official definition for "sanctuary city" despite widespread usage of the term seemed to be one reason why employees with the city preferred the term "Welcoming City" officially. Interviews with city employees illustrated a concern about the controversies and connotations attached to the concept of "sanctuary" and several interviewees emphasized the need to rebrand.

Teresa, who is a director of a municipal office, described the term "sanctuary city" as "populist vocabulary" that provided no real direction in the way of policy development. The populism that is described here is in reference to the dominant discourse of immigrants and migration that has been advanced by the Trump administration and some media outlets ("Remarks by President Trump on Combatting the Opioid Crisis" 2018). A punitive and hostile narrative emerged through words and phrases that became commonplace: "illegal immigration," "build the wall," and "criminal aliens" among others. In this narrative, sanctuary cities were framed as lawless spaces ridden with crime that offered shelter to undeserving immigrants. Rather than a name to be claimed, "sanctuary city" was a label and a reputation attached to cities by opponents who claim to be concerned about public safety. Teresa elaborated:

> I'll say sanctuary is a made-up term. It is not a real thing. It was created by our opponents to cast the work that we do as somehow skirting the law or hiding people who are law breakers. It fits the narrative of immigrants as criminals.

While "sanctuary city" remains the preferred term in mainstream discourse, the meanings attached overpromise and mislead. Sanctuary cities are not protected spaces that are off limits to federal immigration enforcement agencies and the risks of immigration policing and deportation remain real. Calling Seattle a Welcoming City creates some distance from the haven imagery that has long been associated with sanctuary cities while maintaining the role of a hospitable host. Rather than guaranteeing protection for immigrants with precarious status, a Welcoming City aims to welcome immigrants and support their integration into civic life. Rebecca, a staff assistant, and workshop organizer in a city department, provided her definition of "Welcoming City":

> Being a Welcoming City means we have programs, initiatives, and city priorities that are very specific to the needs of immigrants and refugees. We need to make immigrants and refugees a priority, and do things to help them integrate, not assimilate, into our city's cultural and civic life.

In talking about immigrant integration, it was rare for employees of the city to talk uniquely about undocumented status as the subject. Though refugees and undocumented persons have traditionally been the groups of interest within the sanctuary movement, Seattle's position as a Welcoming City is encompassing of all immigrant groups and other marginalized communities. This was evident in the groups referenced when interviewees were asked to define Seattle's Welcoming City status. Facilitating integration and a sense of belonging was seen as a priority for "anyone that comes into the city." Creating a city that reflected its diverse population was important for Jessica, a policy specialist in the finance department. As someone who works in community engagement and policy development, Jessica likened visiting Seattle to visiting someone's home:

> It's a sense of belonging, like coming into someone's home. I know home is very individualistic but when we say Welcoming Cities, it's like the larger community that is the individual. If people come here, and they're indigenous and see native art, and Black art, to me, that's a sense of belonging.

Fostering a sense of belonging was echoed by several other city employees. Several civil servants reflected on their own immigrant experiences. Jessica recalled her experience of moving to the United States might have been different if the receiving context at the time had made her feel more like a resident rather than an outsider. She elaborated that "when the welcoming part is not there, then the immigrant always thinks of themselves as being a passenger, like they are just

here for a short time." The temporal aspect of the immigrant experience as described here aligns with the long-term outlook of integrating immigrants rather than simply shielding them from immigration authorities in the short term. This long-term perspective imagines a future in which once marginalized immigrants are members in society with equal rights and access to participation.

"Welcoming" as Protection

Jane, a policy specialist with community outreach experience, shared that the concept of sanctuary may contribute to a false sense of security among members of the community, especially in the presence of language barriers and information asymmetries. In a context of heightened surveillance and enforcement of immigration communities by federal agencies, Jane believed that referring to Seattle officially as a sanctuary city would imply that the local government could offer protection from deportation.

> I think "sanctuary" can give a false sense of safety. Seattle police can refuse to in any way participate or assist in immigration enforcement and they've done that for a really long time. But we can't prevent people from getting arrested by ICE. We can't protect people from removal. We can do things that make it harder for ICE. Call it what you want but I think to say sanctuary just seems like kind of false in terms of what the city can actually do.

This perspective is echoed by an elected representative who explained that the city's aims today are different than those of the religiously led sanctuary movement in the early 1980s: "The sanctuary city movement was founded in churches, in temples, and synagogues, that brought people in, hid them from the authorities. They actually actively protected people." As a newer term in the immigrant rights vocabulary, a blank slate exists for cities to define the objectives of

a Welcoming City and establish the framework for implementing inclusive policies and programs. Resolution 31370 affirms Seattle as a Welcoming City. This resolution was referenced by a civil servant as a document that provided a clear definition of what it means to be a Welcoming City as opposed to a sanctuary city:

> It's defined and everybody understands what it is. I spend a lot of time communication with constituents and explaining to people, this is what a sanctuary city is, and that's not what Seattle does. Our law enforcement does not keep people hidden from immigration authorities. That's what a sanctuary city is.

Additionally, several employees of the City of Seattle also expressed aversion to the term sanctuary because of how the meanings attached to the concept have evolved or been lost altogether. Specifically, there were concerns that anti-immigrant groups had co-opted the term to support other interests while also demonizing immigrants and refugees.

> The sanctuary term is something that has been a misnomer. It has been effectively used by anti-immigrant segments of the discourse to disparage the vision that we have in cities like Seattle. What we are trying to do is refashion. Take back some of these terms or shift them so that they don't demonize a particular vulnerable group.

These perceptions reflect an unusual phenomenon that has taken hold in smaller and typically more conservative municipalities. In addition to inaccurately condemning sanctuary cities for harboring criminal aliens (DHS 2018), various interest groups have also co-opted the term "sanctuary" to assert their claims to perceived rights. Over the past few years, sanctuary cities for the unborn and second amendment sanctuaries have been established to respectively condemn abortion and oppose gun control (Kaur 2020; SPLC 2021). As these interests differ

greatly politically and socially from the immigrant rights movement, this connection has magnified the controversy that underlies sanctuary cities. Seattle's status a Welcoming City was not viewed as a break from the sanctuary city movement, but rather a strategic move for "reclaiming power"; "it's a continuum of work and everything builds on the previous work."

A director of a city department that connects constituents to community services, explained that "sanctuary" was an "old school term" that felt "temporary and paternalistic." This was a reference to early waves of the sanctuary movement during which churches sheltered vulnerable immigrants and provided them with necessities, fulfilling a protector role. Because churches are considered sensitive locations, this was an effective way to shield immigrants from deportation albeit only in the short term. In Seattle, while there was certainly opposition from civil servants against immigration enforcement, the bigger picture was to increase civic engagement among those with precarious immigration status. Whereas "sanctuary" defines the city as a shelter and immigrants as passive and transient, "welcoming" defines the city as a place of residence in which immigrants can actively shape their social and economic lives. Moreover, if we consider the earliest interpretations of sanctuary, including those presented in religious texts, spaces of sanctuary were established to contain those who had committed a wrongdoing. The contemporary view that the City of Seattle embodies moves away from inferences of wrongdoing and towards recognition of membership and belonging based on presence and residency.

With limited powers to legalize immigration status, Seattle engaged in attempts to regular immigration status by fostering a sense of "inclusiveness and belonging, so that anyone that comes into this city can look and see that this is a place that they can call home." Other

employees of the city emphasized more generally the controversiality and divisiveness of the term.

> It's tainted. Using the terminology of welcoming is more kind of appropriate for the municipal level, to avoid any controversy. I think it's to avoid this red herring and to avoid potential headlines that are misleading in the way that creates more conflict in the community, rather than unites us.

Public support for pro-immigrant policies and programs was perceived to be easier achieved from the framework of a Welcoming City, as the alternative was "too loaded of a term" and perhaps avoided in official municipal language "for political reasons." This is similar to Kaufmann's (2019) assessment of pro-immigrant policies which finds that it is the concept of "sanctuary" rather than the pro-immigrant policies it encompasses that generates controversy.

While the perspectives of civil servants with the City of Seattle indicate a strong preference for and agreement with the term "Welcoming City," interviewees from the non-profit and immigrant advocacy sphere differed in a nuanced way. In general, the latter agreed that the concept of sanctuary implies protection, safety, and freedom, and represents the ideal endpoint for envisioning a pro-immigrant space. Therefore, to this end, whether Seattle was referred to as a Welcoming City or a Sanctuary City was of little significance in the long term as the development of pro-immigrant spaces was a continuous process. An intake assistant at a legal aid organization remarked that he often "combines the two terms together as sanctuary city and Welcoming City seem kind of interchangeable."

Despite the indifference, there were clear understandings that those in the non-profit sector attributed to "sanctuary" versus "welcoming." The concept of a sanctuary city was described more narrowly in reference to law enforcement activities, while the concept of a

Welcoming City was described more broadly and generally in terms of hospitality and solidarity. A staff member, at a legal defense fund differentiated between the two terms:

> I guess I think about sanctuary as being something specific to an immigration context. It implies that there's no active attempt to detain immigrants but that doesn't necessarily mean that there's also an active attempt to welcome people. "Welcoming" probably encompasses a lot more than just that and includes a broader population.

One respondent from the non-profit sector, Matthew, shared his thoughts on why Seattle adopted the name "Welcoming City":

> They use the words Welcoming City advisedly in the city. The city has been cautious about using the word "sanctuary" because they didn't want to get, you know, caught up in the Trump administration's biases, and you know, cutting off funding.

Matthew is an executive director of a non-profit with a long history of organizing for immigrant rights including during the early days of the sanctuary movement in the 1980s. Though he does not object to city's status as a Welcoming City and acknowledges that there have been "positive steps taken," Matthew remarked that "sanctuary is a very important word that people understand."

Overall, while there were differences in meaning attached to the terms "Sanctuary" and "Welcoming," individuals in the non-profit sector were less insistent on Seattle being referred to as a "Welcoming City." Among civil servants with the City of Seattle, opinions were much stronger about why it made more sense to adopt the term "Welcoming City." Removing the controversy, confusion, and assumptions that cloud the concept of sanctuary and branding the

city as a welcoming space helped to set the foundations for building a pro-immigrant space around the objectives of inclusion, access, and participation. Although ambitious, it is at the same time practical, especially in comparison to the alternative of offering protection and safety from immigration enforcement.

Moreover, as a description of pro-immigrant spaces and objectives, the term "Welcoming City" was viewed by interviewees as a contemporary alternative to "sanctuary city." It is an invitation for the city and its residents to create inclusive spaces through civic engagement. This contrasts the protector role of the municipal government that is implied by "sanctuary city." Whereas the sanctuary movement historically advocated for different segments of the immigrant population by appealing to asylum and human rights (Gzesh 2006), present day efforts to support immigrant communities in welcoming cities extend beyond the right to belon, by also asserting rights to participation and inclusion.

In the following section, I continue my examination of Seattle as a Welcoming City. If not for the purpose of protection as is implied by the term "sanctuary" then what do the pro-immigrant policies and practices accomplish? As interviewees shared, designating Seattle as a "Welcoming City" is not merely a symbolic gesture nor is it simply about opposing an aggressive immigration enforcement agenda. Pro-immigrant policies and practices framed as part of the Welcoming City agenda were also implemented to support immigrant integration in civic life.

MORE THAN SYMBOLIC: THE FUNCTIONS OF PRO-IMMIGRANT POLICIES IN SEATTLE

Matters concerning immigration are the jurisdiction of the federal government. Nevertheless, since the late 1970s, state and local jurisdictions have utilized their limited powers

to develop policies and practices to support immigrant communities and resist anti-immigrant efforts from the federal government. The most common policies and practices include those that prohibit municipal employees from cooperating with ICE or collecting data on immigration status. These state and local efforts cannot stop federal immigration enforcement from taking place in pro-immigrant jurisdictions and vulnerable immigrants can still be at risk of deportation. Because of the limited powers of sub-federal governments, it has been argued that jurisdictions that attempt to facilitate a pro-immigrant environment merely produce a symbolic gesture of support (Klingbeil 2017). However, in several more established pro-immigrant cities, such as the City of Seattle, designation as a "Welcoming City" in combination with pro-immigrant policies appear to perform two important non-symbolic functions: facilitating access to support resources and deterring immigration enforcement from federal agencies.

Facilitating Access to Services and Resources

The welfare reforms in the 1990s disqualified many non-citizens from accessing federal public benefit programs. Despite a substantial population of immigrants, rates of naturalization remain low in the United States compared to its peer nations (Bloemraad 2002; Yasenov et al. 2019). Consequently, a relatively large number of immigrants in the U.S. have limited or no access to crucial health care, nutrition, and cash assistance programs. Confusion or fear of deportation also effectively prevents immigrants from utilizing services and resources for which they are eligible (Capps et al. 2002). In general, immigrants, including those who are naturalized U.S. citizens, utilize public benefit programs at similar or lower rates compared to native-born citizens. For instance, in 2011, 2.0% and 2.7% of naturalized and noncitizen adults respectively received cash assistance through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program versus 2.9% of native-born citizen adults (Ku and Bruen 2013). Similarly, 32.5% of native-born

citizens received Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program compared to 25.4% of naturalized citizens and 29% of non-citizens (Ku and Bruen 2013). As these programs often serve as temporary economic and social safety nets, disqualification or underutilization could potentially magnify hardships and marginalized statuses.

In the following section, I examine the symbiotic relationship between the city and community non-profit organizations in facilitating access to immigrant support services. Although there has been extensive research on the role of non-profits in improving immigrant integration experiences, there has been little attention paid to the political environments in which non-profits are situated. In a city such as Seattle, where the municipal government is favorable to immigrants, the pro-immigrant context that is created bolsters the ability of non-profits to delivery services and engage in community advocacy.

Operating as a Non-Profit in a Pro-Immigrant Context

Non-profit organizations have helped to narrow the welfare gap for immigrant communities otherwise ineligible for public programs (Łukasiewicz et al. 2021). Furthermore, non-profits also participate in advocacy, legal defense, and community building efforts. In hostile contexts of receptions, immigrants with precarious status are marginalized due to exclusion from mainstream institutions that affirm membership in a society. At the civic level, non-profits can potentially generate opportunities for marginalized populations to "claim rights or fulfil obligations of citizenship" (Trudeau 2008: 2808). When the efforts of non-profits are endorsed by city governments in the form of financial support, this may help to provide legitimacy to claims of membership.

As many non-profit organizations also depend on government grants, in addition to private donations to support their work, it is logical to expect that positive relationships between

non-profits and government agencies will produce more productive outcomes. Prior theorizing and research suggest an important relationship between non-profits and the state. In some contexts, non-profits are described as "partners" of the government that aid with the provision of services (Salamon 2002), existing in a "shadow state" whereby governments influence organizational decisions and functions (Wolch 1999). The relationship between government agencies and non-profits is influential, shaping the range of services delivered and populations served (Austin 2003; Brinkerhoff 2002), and ultimately impacting the lived experiences of individuals. An analysis of non-profits in Minneapolis-St Paul finds that government funding can affect the ability of non-profits to provide services immigrant and refugee communities due to expectations to coordinate and abide by regulations (Trudeau 2008). This suggests that non-profits occupy a junior rather than equal partner role in their partnerships with government agencies.

The ability of non-profits to deliver services effectively and to the intended populations is likely to be determined, to some extent, by the political and social orientations by the government. Non-profits serving immigrant communities that help to narrow the gap in service delivery may see their organizational capacities energized or dampened depending on the receptivity of local governments to immigrant communities. In Seattle, a Welcoming City, where immigration enforcement is restricted and civic engagement is prioritized, non-profits engaged in improving immigrant lives benefit from the financial and political support of municipal agencies.

All the non-profits included in this study had partnerships with the Seattle municipal government and several had partnerships with the Washington State government. Ensuring that there was a partnership or contractual relationship was not a condition to participation, but it was certainly interesting to learn that these connections were present. Although the case study

approach does not allow for comparative conclusions, there does seem to be consensus among staff members working at non-profits that Seattle's pro-immigrant policies and practices have been conducive to the goals of serving immigrant communities. Specifically, funding from the city was consistently cited as the most significant form of support for non-profits. For example, Martha, a legal assistant, explained in an interview that funding from the city and state is "one of the reasons that our organization can exist." She elaborated that legal representation resources are few and far between and receive no federal funding:

> There aren't many similar organizations in other places. We get so much state and local funding. Because there's no federal funding for legal representation for immigrants, if the state or local community doesn't provide that funding, it's really hard for organizations like ours to exist.

Perhaps more important than just existing, are the programs and services non-profits deliver to immigrant communities. The extent and scope of work that community organizations can carry out are influenced by the degree of support, often financial, provided by the city government. When asked about what it is like to work in a Welcoming City, Janice, an attorney, was quick to remark that the city "definitely plays a major role" in helping them "provide more help to people in Seattle":

> Because we receive funding from the City of Seattle, that definitely has to play a role in how much work we carry out and also what we're able to do. Obviously, the more funding we have, the more opportunities that we have, and the higher quality of our work, and the more people we can help.

Community organizations, including legal defense funds and immigrant support networks, are key actors in the immigrant rights movement. They play a crucial role in serving

immigrant communities affected by hostile immigration policies by connecting clients to services and resources. Not having to worry as much about fundraising and financial support frees up resources and time to the actual work of serving immigrant communities. Another attorney, Susan, working at a legal defense fund, both with prior legal experience in other cities, credited the city's pro-immigrant status as having a positive impact on their work. Susan described her work as "definitely easier in Seattle"; she reflected on her experiences prior to moving to Seattle and remarked that "it's a lot harder to work in a community where there is a lot of hostility towards immigrants":

> I was previously doing some of this work in Europe, which is a very different context with different policies. But I think Seattle is sort of comparable to some of the cities in Europe, which isn't the case for a lot of other cities in the U.S. It's eye opening to see what kind of resources are here and it's comparable to countries that are way more forward progressive than the U.S. as a whole.

The environment in which organizations operate is important. Susan's comparison of Seattle to European cities and other U.S. cities suggests that non-profits operating within contexts friendlier to immigrants are more likely to see support for their work. It was not uncommon for staff members at non-profits to reference the city without being prompted, especially when asked to describe the specifics of how their efforts reach intended immigrant populations. Legal representation is a fairly new service that a few sanctuary cities and non-profits have begun to provide for at-risk immigrant populations. In Seattle, the city recently established a legal defense program which provides low-income immigrants facing deportation with free legal assistance; the actual legal work is contracted out to community partners. Bella, who manages the program for the City of Seattle, explains the program is quite simple: "we have

funding that we give out to legal service providers, and they represent people who are facing deportation."

Aside from providing crucial funding support, the city's position as a Welcoming City was also perceived favorably by individuals in the non-profit sector. In particular, elected councilmembers and their legislative assistants were referred to as allies that were part of the same social movement. Matthew, an executive director of a non-profit that offers accompaniment services to immigrants intertwined with the court system, described the impact of his organization's as "a benefit that is in concert with the city" that can only be realized when there are "real resources and support from elected officials." When asked to elaborate why he thinks the organization has received support from the municipal government, Michael explained that public and civil servants are "allies in the struggle, and so they too are working hard for change and creating a pathway."

These perspectives from staff members at non-profits suggest a coordinated and mostly equal partnership with the city whereby the municipal government can enhance the ability of non-profits to provide services to and advocate for immigrant communities. Rather than being a "junior partner" operating in the shadows of the government as indicated in previous work (Wolch 1999), insights from this case study paint a more equal and mutually enforcing relationship between government and non-profit organizations. Of course, these findings are hardly generalizable and are confined to the cause of immigrant rights in one city. But the experiences shared by staff members who work directly with immigrant communities indicate that a city that shares similar values towards immigration and immigrants is certainly to the advantage of non-profits dedicated to helping immigrant communities. These similarities in

values were recognized by non-profits to be embedded in the city's Welcoming City Resolution, and other pro-immigrant policies that have been implemented and expanded over the years.

I asked Teresa, the director of a municipal office, about how services are delivered to constituents:

> We don't provide direct services. We contract community-based organizations to do that, and it's really a model that we think that is best to support what already exists. We are a funder. We are a collaborator. We want to work with community-based organizations, because everybody has got ideas about how to solve common partners. We're also a partner. There are many organizations that have experience with city contracts, like with the Human Services Department on aging and disability, for example. Lastly, we're a convener. Sometimes there's tension and competition among community groups. The city plays a role in pulling people together, facilitating and getting folks to work with each other.

Teresa's response reveals four roles of municipal government in their partnership with non-profits: funder, partner, collaborator, and convener. All these roles, but especially that of the collaborator, imply some degree of autonomy for non-profits to make decisions about how best to support immigrant communities. One employee, Elnaz, with the city interestingly referred to non-profits as "stakeholders" when describing the need to build "really good connections and close relationships" with them. To strengthen these bonds, Elnaz reported attended meetings with the organizations bimonthly "just to kind of see what the issues are and what people are talking about."

The partnership between the city and non-profit organizations exhibited the traits of symbiosis, with interdependency between the two parties interested in supporting immigrant

communities. From a functionalist perspective, how the different components in a Welcoming City fit together is quite straightforward. Municipal agencies and community organizations work together to support immigrant communities. The city supplies funding and helps with finding clients, while the organizations do the groundwork of serving immigrants. The policies and programs that make Seattle a Welcoming City, such as the Welcoming City Resolution and the Don't Ask Don't Tell Ordinance, provide the structural framework to reinforce the pro-immigrant leanings of the municipal government which can create an atmosphere of trust. This, in turn, helps to bridge information gaps by situating the city in a position to redirect residents to the proper support services even if not available through municipal agencies. This is explained by a city employee:

> If we receive those inquiries from immigrants, we connect them to external services. Often, people go straight to the organizations that provide those services through word of mouth. But some people research and they reach out to us, then we provide that referral as well.

There appeared to be an understanding that non-profits may have the ability to reach the intended populations more effectively because of their non-government status. For example, Rita, a city employee, shared that many undocumented constituents tend to "lump government with the police" which can undermine service delivery. Community organizations, on the other hand actually "already have the trust of those communities." When the city developed a cash assistance program to support immigrants barred from federal benefits, non-profits took on the role of ensuring the monies reached the intended groups. Adding in a middle-agency between the recipient and the city, was seen as a reasonable step that would ensure delivery of resources to specific immigrant groups, since city employees themselves are prohibited by an ordinance from

inquiring into immigration status: “A bunch of funds that have been going to our clients, like gift cards to grocery stores and that was through the City of Seattle. That was specifically focused on immigrant and refugee communities.”

For faith-based organizations, relationships with community members were fostered and strengthened at religious events which also served as an avenue for disseminating information about resources and services for new immigrants. Tony, a director of a Catholic faith-based immigrant-serving organization, described the significance of events scheduled around Peace Day in January: “We do a bunch of anti-human-trafficking and slavery awareness to raise advocacy around Peace Day.” During these events, staff members were on site providing and promoting a range of services including “legal services, elder integration services, tutoring programs, citizenship interview preparation, and English learning.”

The close connections between municipal government and non-profits can also be fruitful for disseminating information about programs or policies to marginalized populations. Amir, a case manager with an organization primarily serving Latinx immigrants, described his job responsibilities to include “learning information and communicating it to my clients” because “in the Latinx Community, when you have information, you pass it along, and it just keeps going.” When the city developed a cash assistance program for immigrants excluded from federal support, Amir observed that the number of applications he helped process went up quickly: “They talk and it’s great because we’re helping with more applications, and it’s like – oh someone gave me your number, and I’m like – oh that’s great. They’re sharing the information and that’s how people are going to learn.”

As access to publicly funded benefits becomes increasingly off-limits to immigrant populations lacking citizenship or regular status, non-profit organizations are playing a vital role

in closing the services and resources gap. In line with the goals of being a Welcoming City, the municipal government of Seattle has enacted pro-immigrant policies and practices that support the work of non-profit organizations serving local immigrant communities. While the most crucial form of support is often funding, the immigrant-friendly environment fostered by the municipal government was often also noted as a factor that aided rather than impeded the goals of non-profit organizations. Even though critics of sanctuary cities argue that pro-immigrant policies enacted by local governments are at best a symbolic gesture, observations from service providers and municipal workers in Seattle suggest that such policies are intended to be and have been impactful in facilitating the work of community organizations to support immigrant communities.

Increasing the Costs of Immigration Enforcement

Sanctuary policies are typically enacted to resist immigration enforcement despite the limited powers of municipal government. With no jurisdiction over immigration law, sanctuary policies at the municipal level can only influence municipal-level agencies and actors. As described in the previous chapters, sanctuary cities usually have policies that limit restrictive and hostile immigration law along the following dimensions: status inquiries, cooperation with federal agencies, surveillance, registration, and information sharing. Confined to the boundaries of a municipality, pro-immigrant policies in a city such as Seattle may appear to be easily dismissed by enforcement agencies backed by federal powers. In addition, considering suggestions that sanctuary city policies are merely a symbolic gesture (Klingbeil 2017), the case for sanctuary cities as a safer environment for immigrants is not particularly convincing. Even when local agencies are prohibited from engaging in immigration enforcement, the risk of deportation remains as does the risk of encountering federal immigration enforcement agents.

However, in several interviews, participants suggested a potential deterrence effect based on personal observations and experiences. Specifically, a few participants speculated that Seattle's non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies, which apply to local agencies, may deter enforcement activity from federal agencies such as ICE and DHS as well. As a case study relying heavily on qualitative interview data, the analysis presented here cannot be used to establish or predict a deterrence effect of municipal level policy on immigration enforcement. Nonetheless, the insights shared by participants provide a strong basis for future research to statistically assess this connection.

Seattle's pro-immigrant policies and practices are comprehensive and comparable to that of other established sanctuary cities such as Los Angeles and San Francisco. Patchworked and layered, the opportunities for local agencies to enforce immigration law directly or assist with the enforcement of immigration law are extremely limited. With regards to the latter, the devolution of immigration enforcement to subnational entities has created new and exclusive roles and responsibilities for local police departments and other local agencies. For example, the 287(g) program, which was activated in 1996 as part of the IIRIRA to identify and remove noncitizens with criminal charges, depends on partnerships between local and federal law enforcement agencies. Local enforcement agencies that participate in 287(g) fulfill the vital function of helping to identify removable persons and facilitating the deportation process for ICE. Cooperation and support from local officers and agencies help to reduce the time and resource costs of immigration enforcement for federal agencies. Conversely, lack of cooperation and support from local officers and agencies potentially increases the costs for federal agencies to conduct enforcement activities within the area.

Organizational protocols to guide interactions with immigration officials were also cited as a factor that lowered the incentives for federal agencies to involve themselves in established sanctuary spaces. Specifically, employees with the city shared two main organizational policies that were developed to raise the hurdles of immigration enforcement: centralizing responses to ICE and the designation of private spaces.

Seattle's limited cooperation policy already prohibits city employees and agencies, including police, from cooperating with federal agencies to enforce immigration law. These local policies exist within a broader context consistent at the county and state levels that restrict the resources that federal agencies can utilize in the course of immigration enforcement activities. Despite these layers, as enforcement activities in the area intensified due to increasingly restrictive immigration law in the last few years, there was consensus that additional protocols were needed as contact with ICE became more frequent. The apparent precipitating event took place in January 2018 when employees in the utilities department reported that ICE had attempted to obtain personal information through the utilities department. The director of a city office explained that she pushed for the city to develop a centralized response in the event a city employee encounters ICE; employees are required to channel requests from ICE through several parties eventually reaching the mayor, who then decides if the request will be approved. This procedure, intertwined with the bureaucracies of government, can be inefficient, taking hours to days, which "effectively delays ICE's ability to conduct enforcement activity." The time between the request and mayor's decision is also valuable for the city to attempt to "get into the crux of the issue" and anticipate intentions. This strategy to buy time was seen as a way for the city to "maximize their ability to protect residents and workers" while working within the scope of the municipal government's rules and responsibilities. It would only be two weeks later that ICE

contacted utilities again attempting to obtain information about a resident, which was unsuccessful because of the newly implemented centralized response strategy.

Requiring approval or permission from the mayor is a time-buying strategy that was further enhanced by the designation of public and private spaces within each city department. Private spaces were identified and distinguished from public spaces to further limit potential interactions between city employees and ICE agents. Teresa, who was involved in shaping this development, observed that ICE had started to conduct enforcement activities in the public spaces surrounding City Hall and the Municipal Tower, which triggered concern:

> What do you do if ICE shows up? We talked about the need for each city department to very clearly designate private spaces. It is very clear that ICE is not allowed into those private spaces unless they have permission. This just means hanging up a sign that said "this is a private space beyond this point." That way, it was very clear the distinction between public spaces where ICE can conduct its enforcement and private spaces where we can essentially protect people. We were trying to be clear with folks that if ICE comes in, there are things that we can do to delay their enforcement activities, but we cannot deny them access to public spaces.

By increasing the hurdles for conducting enforcement activities, the time, resource, and PR costs for ICE and federal agencies interested in initiating enforcement activities also increase. This makes its simply not worth it for ICE to get involved, especially considering the existing policies embedded in Seattle's municipal code preventing city departments and local police officers from cooperating with immigration enforcement agencies. Teresa specified that this was "maybe less dissuasion and more deterrent."

> They know that we are just not going to roll over, that we are going to do everything that we can. It is a deterrent, I think. I do think that there is a difference between probably how they would approach police in Seattle versus police in other parts of the state that might be more inclined to cooperate or to do things that they are asked to do without question.

The designation of private and public spaces as a way of limiting the areas available for immigration enforcement by federal agencies represents another example of how municipal governments attempt to create pro-immigrant spaces by carefully navigating the complexities of federal immigration law: "Above all, we are in compliance with federal laws and regulations, but we also do it in a way that is consistent with our welcoming values." These strategies, which govern the internal procedures of the city's employees, also demonstrate the interplay between local and federal agents with conflicting aims. Just as ordinances and resolutions are developed in response and reaction to federal immigration policies, protocols were also developed internally in response to the evolving strategies of federal agencies to conduct enforcement activities.

The comprehensive range of policies and practices that make Seattle a Welcoming City seemed to be more than just symbolic for those working for the city. Certainly, there were no illusions that being a Welcoming City was sufficient for protecting affected immigrant groups but there was confidence that the pro-immigrant policies in place did have the impact of at least reducing the frequency and impact of immigration enforcement by ICE and other federal agencies. There was also strong belief that the strategies implemented by the city were necessary to uphold the values of being a Welcoming City. In promoting the values associated with being a Welcoming City, several respondents emphasized that pro-immigrant policies may deter

enforcement, but they are not intended to "prevent ICE from doing their job" and that the city was not actively "harboring anyone." Strategies implemented to buy time or increase the costs of enforcement were justified on the basis that the city has an obligation to all its residents, and not ICE: "We're not just going to proactively share information with them; they can have it from the ways they've always been able to get it." These conclusions about the impact and necessity of pro-immigrant policies and practices were guided by city employees' personal observations and experiences interacting with immigration officials, which were unexpectedly and fortunately infrequent.

Rebecca, an employee with the city who helps with organizing workshops for immigrants, revealed that in anticipation for a naturalization event planned for over 1000 immigrants, she reached out to ICE directly to inquire if they had plans to conduct enforcement activities. The response she received from ICE agent was, "we can't say no, but we can tell you that it's unlikely because of your sanctuary policy." Rebecca was quick to clarify that she "doesn't trust the information from ICE, but for practical reasons, we have to use what information we have." This interaction between Rebecca and the ICE agent is interesting; although anecdotal, it does provide insight into the rationalities that perhaps inform decisions to enforce immigration law in pro-immigrant spaces. The naturalization event that Rebecca planned proceeded without incident or interruption from federal immigration enforcement agencies.

As previously mentioned, there is not a strong basis for drawing generalizable conclusions from the data presented here on the potential deterrent effect of pro-immigrant policies and practices. However, it will be important to conduct further analyses on a larger scale to examine whether there is a link between pro-immigrant policies at the local level and the likelihood of enforcement by federal immigration authorities.

SHORTCOMINGS OF SEATTLE'S PRO-IMMIGRANT POLICIES

Despite a layered and multifaceted approach to combat federal immigration enforcement, there was consensus among this study's participants that there were shortcomings associated with the current policy framework in Seattle. There were two chief concerns that were expressed by the interviewees. First, regarding the current state of political and social affairs concerning immigration, the majority of those interviewed believed that the city could be doing more to promote pro-immigrant values and rejecting anti-immigrant hostility. Second, many employees with the city shared that while they had confidence in the pro-immigrant policies and practices in place, these very policies and practices also prevented the city from collecting data that could be used to assess impact and outcomes. This shortcoming, however inconvenient, was accepted by employees as necessary, nonnegotiable, and in the best interest of the city's immigrant community.

Still Not Enough

Adapting to the everchanging landscape of immigration law demands is characterized by action and reaction by sub-federal agencies interested in supporting immigrant communities. Houston (2019) conceptualizes "sanctuary" as a process whereby policy creation and application drive the development and evolution of pro-immigrant spaces. Rather than a binary distinction between sanctuary and non-sanctuary spaces, this process-oriented interpretation recognizes that sanctuary cities and pro-immigrant spaces in the U.S. vary in their policy framework and that many local agencies revise and implement policies over time to move closer to embodying the values and ideals of a sanctuary city. The endpoint is inevitably vague as each step forward can only be determined based on the latest developments at the federal level.

As a pro-immigrant space, Seattle has a comprehensive set of policies and practices that shifts the city closer to the concept of a sanctuary city. Over the years, Seattle's pro-immigrant policies have expanded to include the major categories of sanctuary policies identified in the earlier analyses: non-cooperation with federal immigration enforcement agencies, non-enforcement, and prohibitions on status inquiries. As immigration enforcement intensified and devolved to sub-federal agencies, the city reacted by revision of existing policies and implementation of new policies. As a result, the seams holding together the patchwork of pro-immigrant policies in Seattle are tighter, likely leaving less room for unintentional enforcement by local agencies and less incentive for federal agencies to get involved. Yet, advocates in the non-profit sector and municipal government believed that there was still more work to be done in Seattle, not simply in the way of being proactive about future developments in immigration enforcement, but in the way of expanding and diversifying support systems to incorporate immigrants.

In line with the meanings attached to being a Welcoming City, there was a strong belief that creating a pro-immigrant space entailed much more than simple restricting immigration enforcement and limiting cooperation with federal agencies. Immigrant integration and incorporation into mainstream economic and political life were cited as priorities that deserved more investment. Though city-funded programs to support language assimilation and accessibility to public services exist, many participants pointed out that the benefits are unevenly distributed across immigrant groups and that gaps persisted despite well-meaning policies.

Community non-profits recognized funding to be a main factor limiting the scope and impact of their work. Although the city awards generous contracts to many organizations, the

funding is often directed to a particular cause, which means non-profits are unable to provide other much-needed services and programs.

Within the city, funding for pro-immigrant programs and services was also on the wish list for a few individuals. Jessica, despite working for the city, expressed disappointment that current municipal programs do not sufficiently close the gaps in the immigrant community and despite many promising proposals, "there just isn't funding for these programs to come into fruition."

Lack of Evaluation Data

The second shortcoming identified, which was more apparent among city employees, concerns the lack of data available to inform potential policies and programs to support immigrant communities. Seattle's Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) ordinance prohibits city employees from inquiring about immigration status and collecting any data about someone's immigration and citizenship status. The motivations for this are twofold; first, by prohibiting status inquiries, city employees don't inadvertently engage in immigration policing and second, by not collecting data in the first place means that there is no data available to be shared with federal agencies or in the event of a public disclosure request. An employee in a city office that connects immigrants to services explained that there was no database tracking anyone who calls for assistance, because "if this information that somebody called us for help was saved, that could potentially be dangerous for that person if somebody asked for that information." The consequences of the ordinance are advantageous for members of the immigrant community with precarious status, but these advantages also present a conundrum when it comes to assessing impact and planning future programs.

The Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) ordinance also makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the city to directly provide immigrant-specific resources and support to the intended population. Delivering services to immigrants without being able to identify them is challenging: "The DADT did have some unintended consequences. For example, if we want to create a program that's specifically designed to aid the most vulnerable undocumented immigrants, it's difficult because we can't ask who they are, so we can't target our work in a laser-focused way." However, this problem was addressed through the partnership between the city and community organizations. While the city does is prohibited from verifying someone's immigration status, community organizations and non-profits are not bound by this ordinance and can in many contexts successfully fulfill the function of delivering services. But there are services provided and programs run by the city that are not as easily externalized, and the absence of data makes it difficult to evaluate outcomes and assess the extent of utilization by immigrant communities. For example, general municipal institutions such as libraries and recreation centers are open to all residents regardless of immigration or citizenship status, but the Don't Ask Don't Tell Ordinance makes it a challenge to analyze whether the city's access for all policies have had the intended outcome of encouraging immigrants to utilize libraries and recreation centers. Even when programs are designed with immigrant communities in mind, the challenge to serve the most at-risk and vulnerable among immigrant groups is magnified in the absence of data-driven interventions. Alison, an employee who has been employed by the city to strengthen community engagement, elaborated on the challenges: "if we can't learn more about who you are, then it makes it hard for us, then, to build a program or service. Without these data points, it makes it really hard to plan."

There was no solution proposed to the shortcoming of limited data. All participants who brought up this issue agreed that no data at all was better than some data that could be leaked or shared. The risks were considered much too high in the current climate in which the actions of immigration enforcement agencies are often driven by data obtained from sub-federal agencies. Even though Seattle has an ordinance that prohibits information sharing for the purposes of immigration enforcement ("Ordinance 121063" 2003), there was still the concern that sensitive information could be obtained through other means.

> In Washington, we have one of the strongest public disclosure laws in the country. Therefore, pretty much the data that the city has could be discoverable by an interested party, but we work to build this barrier between the city and the providers. It is crucial, of course, for a legal representative or attorney to know your legal status. It's all confidential however attorney client privilege is handled.

The above quote comes from Teresa. Her explanation highlights the various considerations at the state and local level that make it necessary to limit the city's access to confidential information about its immigrant residents. Strong public disclosure laws in Washington State made it too easy for outsiders to obtain information which could contribute to the vulnerability of some members of the immigrant community. At the local level, if it is necessary to identify a specific subgroup of immigrants, then this task was better left in the hands of an external provider.

Data collection and analyses are central to policy development and improvement. But as a Welcoming City that has developed policies around increasing access to services and deprioritizing immigration enforcement, any attempts to collect data about immigration and citizenship status, however well-intentioned, were just not seen as worthwhile in the long run.

Jarvis has been with the city for over two decades and reflected on Seattle's progress over the years to become a Welcoming City. Despite the clear limitations in the absence of data, the guiding principle for the city, according to Jarvis, should be to "do the right thing" and make sure that "all residents deserve an equal chance to get resources from us." Doing anything that could misconstrued as enforcement was not worth it especially if it was to identify a resident based on their migration history: "We stand with everyone who calls Seattle home. It's not our job to enforce immigration law. We have our job which is to make the lives of residents in the city better."

When I asked respondents about how they would address the data issue, everyone was quick to accept this shortcoming if it reduced the opportunities for information sharing and subsequent immigration enforcement. In the interviews, the lack of data because of the DADT ordinance was described as unfortunate, but this perceived shortcoming in a way is another strategy implemented by the city to increase the costs for federal agencies to enforce immigration law. If information about the city's immigrant residents don't exist in to begin with, the risks of any one within the municipal government inadvertently sharing information are nonexistent.

As a Welcoming City, Seattle has developed a comprehensive set of policies to support immigrant communities and aid the work of community non-profit organizations. However, employees of the city and non-profit organizations both agreed that there were limitations to Seattle's pro-immigrant policies. First, insufficient funding prevented promising initiatives and programs from being implemented thereby limiting the ability of both the city and non-profits to meet the current needs of Seattle's immigrant communities. Second, prohibitions on status inquiries in the municipal code produced the unintended consequence of the city not being able to collect insightful data to evaluate the impact of programs and policies designed to support

immigrant communities. Neither of these shortcomings were identified to be so severe as to hamper the broader goals of fostering integration and inclusion at the local level. More generally, respondents described these shortcomings more like inconveniences; in the interviews, a few respondents mentioned that having more funding or being able to collect data as items on their "wish list" that would be help them improve their work.

DISCUSSION: A WELCOMING CITY IS A PRO-IMMIGRANT CITY

With policies prohibiting status inquiries, immigration enforcement, and cooperation with federal immigration agencies, Seattle fits the description of a typical Sanctuary City. However, officially, the municipal government has rejected the term "sanctuary" in favor of "welcoming." In embracing the label "Welcoming City," the City of Seattle has centered its goal of creating a pro-immigrant space around the values of inclusion and integration. Accordingly, pro-immigrant policies and practices are implemented primarily to incorporate immigrants into civic life and less emphasis is placed on protecting and harboring immigrants from immigration officials.

Efforts by municipal agencies and community non-profit organizations demonstrate that the contexts in which they operate matter; in Seattle, pro-immigrant policies and practices facilitated and magnified local efforts to support immigrant communities while also potentially increasing the costs for federal agencies to engage in enforcement within the city. In coordinated symbiosis, non-profit organizations and the City worked together to deliver services to immigrant communities while collectively constructing the city as a Welcoming City. Internal protocols and practices established by the City, in line with the tenets of the Welcoming City resolution, were speculated by municipal employees to increase the costs of immigration enforcement which potentially may deter federal agencies from conducting enforcement in cooperation with the city

The observations shared by interviewees challenge the assumptions that sub-federal governments do not have influence over immigration matters and that actions to establish sanctuary or similar pro-immigrant spaces are merely symbolic gestures. In Seattle, pro-immigrant policies and practices have had real outcomes that have changed how service providers carry out their day-to-day duties to support immigrant communities.

CHAPTER 5: CONSTRUCTING LOCAL CITIZENSHIP IN SEATTLE

Social scientists who study sanctuary cities have traditionally assessed whether local pro-immigrant policies impact public safety and crime. Less attention has been devoted to the study of how pro-immigrant policies in sanctuary cities potentially promote integration and incorporation into local mainstream spaces. Despite a lack of jurisdiction over immigration law, sub-federal governments and agencies are nonetheless involved in shaping the lives and experiences of immigrants. Cities have emerged as key players shifting the conversation on immigration and immigrants, often in ways that contest the position of the federal government. These developments in local spaces have encouraged a closer look at the role of cities and municipal agencies in advancing new perspectives on immigrant integration and citizenship.

Building upon the analyses in the previous section, I use interview data with civil servants and employees at immigrant-serving non-profits in Seattle to examine the intended outcomes associated with being a Welcoming City. Although pro-immigrant policies at the local level are often perceived to be merely a symbolic gesture often in opposition to restrictive or hostile immigration legislation, the findings from this analysis reveal the motivations for becoming a Welcoming City and implementing pro-immigrant policies are driven by values of equity and inclusion. In day-to-day practices, these values are realized through efforts that promote immigrant integration and participation, such as civic engagement and improving access to municipal services. The social and political incorporation of immigrants into formal municipal spaces subsequently pave the way for an excluded and marginalized group to enjoy some of the rights and privileges associated with citizenship, albeit at a local level.

To examine this process of constructing local citizenship, I focus on three pro-immigrant policies and practices that the City of Seattle has implemented. First, the Language Access

Program is spotlighted as a city-wide effort to affirm membership and belonging via language justice and accessibility. Second, strategies for improving civic engagement are assessed with attention to the ways municipal and community actors have adapted procedures and spaces to incorporate marginalized voices into decision-making arenas. Third, the city's access-for-all framework for distributing municipal services and resources is discussed with regards to the implications this has for participation in civic life. From these observations, I argue that local citizenship does not have to be constrained to a symbolic and informal status but instead can serve as a significant marker of membership that is associated with political and social rights.

REIMAGINING CITIZENSHIP VIA PRO-IMMIGRANT POLICIES

Formal citizenship, conferred by the nation-state, not only grants rights and privileges but also membership in mainstream society. Restrictive immigration policies without pathways to citizenship contribute to the irregularization of immigrants by the assignment of outsider status (Calavita 1998). Despite existing on the margins of society, immigrants with irregular status, including the undocumented, are still intertwined and embedded within social, political, and economic institutions. This is similar to Menjívar's use of the term "liminal legality" to describe Central Americans in the U.S. with Temporary Protected Status (TPS) who are suspended in a precarious state of legal uncertainty. While TPS grants access to status-affirming institutions such as the labor market, pathways to permanent residency and citizenship are not guaranteed. These experiences of simultaneous exclusion and inclusion highlight the complexities and tensions of the immigrant experience in the absence of full citizenship rights.

While sub-federal governments do not have jurisdiction over immigration and citizenship matters, I argue that they can nonetheless have considerable influence over the extent to which immigrants are incorporated into the day-to-day activities of civic life. This is especially so for

municipal agencies that have responsibilities and control over how services are distributed. To this end, municipal governments and departments have the ability to utilize their limited powers to enact policies and practices that affirm membership in local contexts while contributing to the regularization of immigrants, especially those with irregular status.

Access to various economic, social, and political institutions is often determined based on citizenship. For example, entry into formal labor markets and the right to vote and run for political office are privileges associated with citizenship acquired by birthright or naturalization.[3] Individuals without citizenship and individuals without pathways to citizenships are therefore excluded from participation in many mainstream institutions. Yet many of the day-to-day routines of our lives are experienced locally within our communities, which our managed by local governments and agencies. Sanctuary cities, and in particular, pro-immigrant policies, represent one channel through which the lived experiences in communities can be shaped in ways that promote inclusion for groups that are excluded due to their lack of citizenship.

Cities are commonly a site of study for examining the production of citizenship, although insight into how this process overlaps with the goals of sanctuary cities is only just gaining traction. The literature on urban citizenship provides a helping starting point for thinking about alternatives to formal nation-state citizenship. One defining feature of urban citizenship is that it is automatically granted based on residency or *jus domicili*. In contrast to formal citizenship, which is acquired through naturalization if not by birth, urban citizenship is easily accessible and available to all, making the membership status attached to it somewhat of a public good (Bauböck 2003). Furthermore, while formal citizenship creates boundaries that justify exclusion

[3]Citizenship by birthright, or jus soli, applies to individuals born in certain U.S. territories including Puerto Rico, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Individuals born in the unincorporated territory of American Samoa do not acquire U.S. citizenship automatically by birth and are instead considered U.S. Nationals.

from public rights and benefits, urban citizenship bridges these cleavages to assert the right of all members to access these goods.

Allocating the Rights and Privileges of Citizenship

A valid criticism of urban citizenship is that it is largely informal and therefore, fairly insignificant for changing the circumstances of individuals lacking formal nationality-based citizenship. There are no passports nor any formal procedures to navigate to signify your status as an urban citizen; the process of becoming a citizen in local spaces is rather passive and detached from ceremony. But urban scholars have pointed out that cities are still political communities (Held 1995; Bauböck 2003), and that urban citizenship is a promising starting point for realizing the various dimensions of being a formal citizen in a localized setting (Varsanyi 2006). This process would include the assignment of rights and responsibilities of residents, which can facilitate access to political, economic, and social inclusion for groups that have traditionally been excluded. In addition to affirming the membership of residents within a local community, municipal governments and agencies simultaneously also assert their own powers in the process.

The ongoing sanctuary movement is an expression of municipal autonomy. By contesting federal positions on immigration, local governments are asserting their own abilities to shape outcomes over a matter in which they have no jurisdiction. Theorizations of urban citizenship emphasize the potential of cities and municipal governments to rescale citizenship (Bauböck 2003; Purcell 2003; Varsanyi 2006) and "challenge national monopolies in immigration, trade and foreign policy" (Bauböck 2003: 142). These perspectives, perhaps intentionally, overestimate the autonomy and political power of cities which occupy the smallest unit of

government within the nation-state. Nevertheless, recent developments in sanctuary cities suggest that local citizenship can over time exhibit qualities of formalization.

In several long-established sanctuary cities, urban citizenship is not merely a status of membership but has evolved to include entitlements to rights and privileges that mirror those associated with formal citizenship. For example, in December 2021, the New York City council passed a bill that grantes non-citizens voting rights in local elections. As a consequence, 800,000 residents without formal citizenship will be incorporated into the municipal voting arena (Ashford 2022). A few years earlier in 2015, New York City also launched its IDNYC program. Emphasizing that "immigration does not matter", IDNYC provides residents of New York City with a municipal identification card for accessing city services (NYC.Gov 2022). This attempt to legitimize membership in the form of government-issued identification has also seen success in other cities including New Haven, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. In these cities, the implementation of the program was motivated by concerns that undocumented residents lacked the adequate proof of identification to access services and participate in community affairs. The expectation associated with municipal ID cards was that it would lower the barriers for undocumented residents to access municipal facilities and interact with frontline city workers (De Graauw 2014). In 2018, Chicago launched CityKey, its own version of government-issued ID for residents (City of Chicago 2022). These examples illustrate how cities can be important sites for legitimizing membership and assigning the rights and privileges associated with citizenship.

Another method for immigrant incorporation at the municipal level has been documented as bureaucratic incorporation, which spotlights the role of non-elected municipal actors to develop policies and practices that represent the interests and needs of immigrant residents

(Jones-Correa 2005). Actions may include city departments providing language translations to address limited English proficiency and local police departments shifting towards community-oriented policing to build trust and cooperation with immigrant residents. Though legislative action from elected officials is important for establishing the city as a pro-immigrant space, civil servants tasked with the responsibilities of managing departments and delivering services are also embedded in decision-making processes that influence the lived experiences of residents. Bureaucratic incorporation capitalizes on the potential that these decision-making processes can meaningfully incorporate the interests of groups excluded from the formal political process.

Bureaucratic incorporation disrupts the traditional political processes by which the interests of a marginalized group are advanced while opening new avenues for civic engagement and political representation. Amplifying the interests of a marginalized and excluded group within formal municipal institutions softens the distinctions between those with and without formal citizenship in the local sphere which in turn helps to legitimize claims to membership and belonging. Though the benefits of this membership are confined, they are nonetheless consequential, especially considering that the day-to-day routines of our lives take place within local communities.

The strategies described above, ranging from legislative action to bureaucratic incorporation, are largely due to the pressures of grassroots organizations and movements. This insurgent approach to affecting change has always been at the core of the sanctuary movement (Darling and Bauder 2019). To this end, while cities may be an important locus for constructing citizenship, it is important to recognize that the momentum for ensuring that the rights accompanying citizenship is encapsulated in an ongoing and sometimes contentious negotiation between activists and public officials.

In Seattle, I find that the notion of local citizenship has evolved over time in conjunction with the assignment of rights to noncitizen residents. Despite its status as a Welcoming City and a robust set of non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies, the process of formalizing local citizenship has not been without struggle. For example, in 2014, with strong push from grassroots organizations, city officials considered but subsequently rejected a municipal ID program to ease access to municipal services for immigrants and refugees. Surprisingly, opposition came from the director of the city's Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs who, along with the then-mayor, expressed concern that the ID cards could be stigmatizing and an inadvertent marker of undocumented status (Barnett 2014). Despite this setback, other forms of progress have occurred, contributing to the formalization of local citizenship.

Fostering a Sense of Belonging and Membership

In addition to the allocation of rights and privileges, another goal of constructing citizenship to foster a sense of belonging and membership among residents who are excluded and marginalized due to their immigration or citizenship status. There are several factors that contribute to marginalization and exclusion, whether real or perceived. For undocumented immigrants and those in mixed-status networks, persistent fear and anxieties associated with the threat of deportation and contact with immigration officials lead individuals to deliberate avoid city officials and public spaces. Structural barriers, such as limited English proficiency, can also limit the ability of immigrants to participate fully in various aspects of civic life. Accordingly, efforts to incorporate immigrants into civic life might converge around the goals of alleviating fear and restructuring spaces to be more welcoming for a more diverse constituency.

Several studies have found that undocumented status and irregular status can have a profound effect on the daily routines of immigrants, creating a "chilling effect" (Curry et al.

2012; Menjívar and Abrego 2012; Nguyen and Gill 2015; García 2019). Increasingly restrictive immigration policies and the expanding reach of immigration enforcement have been linked to heightened fear and anxiety within immigrant communities (Pew Hispanic Center 2007). In these hostile contexts, immigrants may adopt avoidance strategies to reduce contact with government authorities and police officers (Correia 2010; Wu 2010; Becerra et al. 2016). This often results in immigrants underutilizing services to which they are entitled. Lower rates of attendance and enrollment in schools (Wald et al. 2017) and delaying use of health care services (Berk and Schur 2001) have been linked to the constant fear experienced by undocumented and mixed-status families. The impact of restrictive immigration law and the threat of deportation on the lived experiences of immigrants have been documented, described as "living in the shadows" by (Enriquez and Saguy 2016) and "existing on the margins" by (King and Punti 2012; Bloch and McKay 2016).

The chilling effect of hostile immigration policy might be somewhat countered by municipal governments through policies and practices promoting inclusion that help to affirm membership and belonging in local communities. Access-for-all policies capture the range of sanctuary policies that promote inclusion via the expansion of services to all residents based on their residence in the community. Designed to encourage immigrants to access municipal services and resources, access-for-all policies also help to establish the boundaries within which local citizenship rights are recognized. For example, Aboii's (2016:10) finds that inclusive health care policies in sanctuary cities prioritizing access to public help to "foster a view of undocumented immigrants as persons belonging to communities rather than strangers." There is also some recent evidence to suggest that local level orientations on immigration shape the extent to which the chilling effect is absorbed by undocumented immigrants which subsequently

influence perceptions about the function of sanctuary policies. Wong et al. (2022) find that in California, a sanctuary state, undocumented immigrants in localities that had policies contradicting the state-wide sanctuary legislation were less likely to place trust in pro-immigrant policies. This observation informs speculation that cities with pro-immigrant policies consistent with county-level or state-level sanctuary policies might be conducive to alleviating fear among immigrant populations.

In addition to irregular or undocumented status, another barrier that may prevent participation and access to services is the organization and structure of civic institutions. Assimilation is the expected pathway for immigrants to the United States, which requires foreign-born individuals to adopt the dominant cultural traits of their host society, including proficiency in the English language in the U.S. Although the proportion of the U.S. population with limited English proficiency has decreased over time, from 44% in 1980 to 40% in 2015, a substantial segment of individuals is still limited from full participation due to language constraints especially in immigrant-destination states where there are higher concentrations of individuals with limited English proficiency (Batalova and Zong 2016). Lack of English proficiency is associated with a decline in civic participation and a weaker sense of belonging with the host society (Boyd 2009). English proficiency is also a strong predictor of access to health care services (Yu et al. 2006, Shi et al. 2009), access to public benefits (Nam and Kim 2012), political participation (Brown 2014), and inclusion and mobility in labor markets (Rivera-Batiz 1990).

While English language assimilation, and specifically progress to becoming multilingual or English-dominant, remains an important marker for participation and inclusion in U.S. society, it is an uneven process that varies across different immigrant populations based on age,

generation, educational attainment, and country of origin (Carliner 2000; Bleakley and Chin 2010; Landgrave 2019). Earlier approaches to encouraging immigrant assimilation include publicly funded English learning programs, which continue to be popular today. The Ready-To-Work program in Seattle provides free training to residents to improve their English skills for the labor market. In recent years, a few cities have experimented with new strategies that do not condition participation on the acquisition of English skills. Language access, sometimes known as language justice, reorganizes cities as multicultural and diverse spaces by making translations of the most spoken languages readily available in civic institutions and documents.

Language access programs are arguably a unique and even radical way for constructing and reimagining citizenship. Assuming high levels of visibility, language access provides cities and residents the tools for interaction which facilitates access to services and civic participation. More importantly, however, in line with the notions of local citizenship, language access restructures civic spaces to be representative of the members of the community. Translations provided through municipal efforts also help to establish the local context as a welcoming space that invites participation and involvement from all regardless of their immigration or citizenship status. The conventional trajectories of immigration assimilation and integration are also contested; rather than immigrants adapting to the cultural structures of the host societies, structures of the host societies are redesigned to adapt to immigrants.

Multiculturalism, rather than assimilation, becomes the dominant intercultural management strategy. Key to multiculturalism is the "recognition and accommodation of cultural minorities" which often involves political actors to implement policies and practices that promote integration trajectories that allow immigrants to remain connected to their cultural traditions (Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul 2008: 160). Applying this perspective to the

local level produces no conflicts with the notion of local citizenship which can be assumed early on based on residency. Whereas assimilation is a largely linear and stepwise process of shedding outsider status and becoming a member of the receiving society, envisioning membership at the municipal level through the lens of multiculturalism asserts that immigrants already belong and have the rights to participation within a localized political and geographic community.

Being that the daily routines of most individuals are experienced within the boundaries of the city they live in, the role of local governments in shaping the boundaries of participation should not be underestimated. Fostering a sense of belonging and prioritizing immigrant incorporation through inclusive policies and practices are not only conducive to promoting public health and wellbeing at the community level, but they are also important in times of heightened immigrant policing and hostility.

Encouraging participation in the various spheres of civic life helps contribute to the development of an urban identity that connects immigrant residents to their receiving societies (Bauböck 2003). A sense of belonging is also likely to make immigrants feel like they have a stake in their local communities which may in turn motivate further civic engagement and political participation. As Varsanyi (2006: 235) describes, "struggles over belonging are central to the daily practice of individuals as citizens." Despite lacking jurisdiction over immigration law, local governments nonetheless play a pivotal role in incorporating immigrants into the contours of civic life. This task involves integrative and inclusive responses that soften the lines differentiating immigrants and citizens.

Continuing my case study of Seattle, I use interview data to examine three policies and practices associated with the Welcoming City Resolution: the language access program, practices to strengthen civic engagement and political participation, and access-for-all. I explain how these

municipal efforts strengthen local citizenship and describe the specific dimensions of citizenship that are fulfilled as an outcome of these policies and practices. In my analysis, I also pay attention to processes of bureaucratic incorporation and consider the extent to which historically marginalized voices can be incorporated into municipal decision-making arenas.

LANGUAGE ACCESS

In 2017, Executive Order 2017-10 was passed by then Seattle mayor Tim Burgess as a commitment to making city departments more equitable and inclusive. More specifically, the Executive Order established several priorities to support the efficient implementation of the Language Access Program, including devoting a portion of each department's budget towards the development of a Language Access Plan. In addition to recognizing that over 50,000 residents in Seattle have limited English proficiency, the urgent need for language access was also motivated by concerns about barriers to inclusion and participation experienced by under-represented and under-served communities, and the consequences of this exclusion for public health, safety, and welfare.

The Language Access Program requires that communications to the public about city programs and services are available in at least seven of the most spoken languages, aside from English, within the city. Data-informed recommendations are reviewed every three years to identify the languages that should be included. In 2020, the top seven languages were Traditional Chinese, Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Amharic, Korean, and Tagalog ("City of Seattle Top Tier Languages" 2020). In addition to translations, the program also aims to provide training to city employees who interact directly with the public on how to address situations when there is language barrier. Language access in Seattle was designed to be a visible endeavor and reflected not just on the city's webpages, but in municipal buildings and mailed correspondence, including

utility bills.

Language assimilation has traditionally been a key predictor of immigrant integration and has been described as a "necessary but not sufficient condition for social and cultural assimilation" (Akresh, Massey, and Frank 2014: 207). Seattle's language access program disrupts the traditional processes of immigrant integration by providing a direct line of access to city services and programs via translations and accessible languages. In line with the goals of being a Welcoming City that focuses on inclusion over protection, the language access program invites and encourages residents without English proficiency to utilize city programs and services.

I had not initially included questions in my interview protocol on language access[4], but the program was repeatedly brought up by employees of the city when asked to describe why and how Seattle is a Welcoming City for immigrants. Despite an existing policy that affirms city services and programs are available for all regardless of immigration status, the language access program was seen as a natural and necessary progression in a Welcoming City that seeks to "increase and promote a sense of belonging." By providing translations, immigrant experiences are oriented towards integration rather than assimilation, whereby city departments are adapted to become welcoming and multicultural spaces. Wendy, a program director in a public-facing city department described the goals of language access and how it serves Seattle as a Welcoming City:

> It is making sure that all residents can have meaningful access and equitable access to city programs, services, and information, regardless of the language they

[4] My interest and discussion on the Language Access Program emerged during the inductive coding process. Though I did not alter my interview schedule to incorporate more questions during the interview stages, the program was brought up frequently enough by participants to generate a rich body of coded data.

> speak. We're a country that does not have an official language, so can we really argue that people have to learn English? If someone who doesn't speak English, or if they speak English but with an accent, they are perceived equally as a native American speaker and English speakers – that, for me, is a true Welcoming City.

These sentiments convey that in a Welcoming City, the society in which immigrants are integrating into should be dynamic and responsive to the needs of its residents. Language access helps to narrow the participation gap by arming city officials and new immigrants with the necessary tools to take part in civic life. This process reflects contexts of receptions that are perceived as open and welcoming, rather closed-off and exclusionary. Another city employee in the same department, Rebecca, placed importance on making service-providing departments more welcoming and inclusive for immigrant communities:

> A huge part of being a Welcoming City is about integration and this happens when we make city services and departments become more in tune with immigrant and refugee communities. One of my colleagues does language access and does a lot to help other city departments because we are trying to make language access a first line priority. If there's some big community meeting, or if you're mailing something out from public utilities or parks and rec, you need to know your neighborhood. Language access can't be an afterthought.

Rebecca clarified that language access as a "first-line priority" rather than "an afterthought" meant that the city should be proactive in making all residents, regardless of their language abilities or citizenship status, feel included. Moreover, Rebecca stressed that the city must adopt this attitude internally as well, and that being a Welcoming City cannot simply be a superficial display:

> You have to make it [language access] something that you plan and budget for from the beginning, for internal city departments but also outward facing ones as well. I think that's a big part of what it means to be a Welcoming City – not thinking of people who are not U.S. citizens or people who are not native speakers as kind of an afterthought, but thinking that they are members of the community.

Jane, an elected official, agreed that the language access program is a push in the right direction for the city. She shared that, as part of her job, she advocated for preferential points in hiring that would prioritize applicants with proficiency in a second language. The motivation behind this was to recognize the strength and value of residents who had proficiency in a non-English language.

> We need to make sure that we're hiring from within the community. People who are representative of the community can help relations. One thing that I advocated for, and it took two or three years to get in place, is something called preference points in hiring. When grading applicants who are proficient in a second language, it must be the five top spoken languages in the city. This not only helps somebody who speaks a second language proficiently to get a leg up when applying, but I think even more importantly, it tells potential applicants before they even apply that your skills as a non-English speaker are valued and might make people think differently about a career in law enforcement.

Jane's description of the preference points approach is similar to the overall aims of language access which emphasize city spaces as inclusionary and welcoming. Specifically, proficiency in another language other than English is valued and worthy of membership and participation. Affirming membership without any expectations of meeting traditional

assimilation markers also alters the meanings attached to the process of integration in the United States.

One interviewee, explaining the significance of language access in Seattle, questioned what "American culture" represented and whether this dominant culture immigrants are expected to assimilate into embodied Seattle's status as a Welcoming City.

> In our office, I do lots of presentations showing what it means to have a kind of culture where different ethnicities and language groups are supported. You know, how can we truly allow immigrants to bring their culture and have their culture be just as American as my culture. You know, my great grandparents were born in the U.S. and American culture doesn't have to just be a white-centered culture. The idea of assimilation is like, "oh yeah, we'll help immigrants, but they have to all learn English, leave behind their traditions, customs, and foods or whatever."

In contrast to the expectations of immigrant assimilation into mainstream American culture, the city's approach to immigrant incorporation, as evidenced in its Language Access Program, celebrated multiculturalism, and the possibility that immigrant integration could take various trajectories. Instead of a one-way process of immigrants adapting to the city, the city also adapts to the needs and interests of its immigrant residents. This is conveyed in the stories shared by city employees to change municipal spaces and open channels for interactions in languages other than English.

Ensuring accurate and reliable translated content is at the core of language access but there was also attention to what interviewees referred to as "language justice." Wendy explained that it was important that translated content would be "simple enough for readers with an eight-grade reading level or lower." In privileged spaces such as municipal offices where many

employees are highly educated or professionally socialized, there was recognition that material produced for the public could be difficult to understand. Wendy described language access as a matter of "justice and equity." Wendy shared that the language access program provides a checklist for departments to ensure that the material translated met the standards established to ensure accessibility.

> People love to use acronyms and jargon, or if they have a brilliant program name, they think they can just put it out there without giving any explanations. There's a translation checklist to follow before someone submits a project.

The endeavor to ensure language access and justice for all immigrants blurs the distinction between deserving and undeserving immigrants that may derive from assumptions about the willingness to learn English. Certainly, no-cost English language lessons are available and encouraged for residents in Seattle and many other cities, but institutional changes to require translations in local spaces illustrate how local governments can creatively exercise their limited powers to foster pro-immigrant spaces in ways that deemphasize differences that are often used to determine entitlements to membership and its associated rights.

The language access program in Seattle is an example of a local pro-immigrant practice that indirectly challenges the traditional expectations associated with formal citizenship. Rather than conferring citizenship in response to language assimilation, the city of Seattle's attempt to ensure language access and justice signals that local citizenship is a matter of residence in the city rather than a privileged status to be earned and obtained. Ensuring that translations are available to new immigrants who are not proficient in English was perceived as a way that the city could fulfill its obligations as a Welcoming City. Language access was implemented to improve access to city programs and services, but also to promote a sense of belonging and

inclusion among non-English speakers.

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

While establishing pro-immigrant policies and practices can facilitate immigrant participation into decision-making arenas, members of the immigrant community also play an important role in establishing initial claims to membership and belonging. This may be exercised through various means of community engagement. Of course, in the absence of citizenship by birth or naturalization, there are no formal rights to popular modes of political participation such as voting and running for office. Furthermore, formal political participation may even be criminalized such as indicated in the IIRIRA in 1996 which stated that noncitizens voting in federal elections was a criminal offense.

In Seattle, close to 30% of residents in Seattle are ineligible to participate formally to shape the makeup of the municipal government because of their non-U.S. citizen status (OIRA 2016). However, opportunities can be widened to amplify immigrant voices into political decision-making processes regardless of legal or residency status.

One example of this is via bureaucratic incorporation which shifts attention to the abilities of civil servants and bureaucratic institutions, as opposed to elected officials, to incorporate and represent the interests of a politically marginalized group (Jones-Correa 2005; Marrow 2009; de Graauw and Vermeulen 2021). Bureaucratic incorporation often manifests as administrative policies or organizational norms that serve the interests of a marginalized or disenfranchised group. One example of this includes local police departments that adopt non-cooperation or non-enforcement policies to support immigrant communities without guidance from the municipal government. For example, in the analyses presented in Chapters 2 and 3, my review found that police officers in San Antonio and Orlando are guided by procedure manuals

that prohibit immigration policing but there are no accompanying city-wide sanctuary policies that explicitly express support for immigrant communities. While immigrant interests may not necessarily be represented through local electoral politics, they are, in this case, incorporated into everyday policing practices, at least in theory. Just as police departments may attempt to represent immigrant interests through policing practices, city departments can attempt similar methods of representation by adapting internal policies and procedures to incorporate immigrants in decision-making processes.

Traditional platforms such as town halls, council and board meetings are public spheres in which residents can engage directly with elected officials and civil servants. Sullivan's (2021) analyses of civic engagement among mobile park residents in three U.S. states reveals that individuals with marginalized status can strategically utilize civic spaces to "perform citizenship" by adopting roles such as the advocate or the watchdog. Individual participation in such forums is likely to be influenced by the extent to which local institutions are open to engaging with residents. While immigrants without citizenship or legalized status are a marginalized group that lack access to traditional forms of political participation such as voting and running for political office, the City of Seattle has attempted to center civic engagement as a right for immigrants with marginalized status by adapting city spaces and procedures in ways that amplify immigrant interests. For example, translations and daycare services are sometimes offered at public meetings to reduce the barriers for attending and participating.

One of the overarching goals of being a Welcoming City, as previously discussed, is to promote a sense of belonging. Both city and non-profit employees emphasized the ability to engage and participate in policy and program development as activities that affirm the city's support for immigrant communities. In expanding the grounds for civic engagement, there was

an expectation of mutual support between immigrant communities and the city; this is evident in a department director's reasoning for why noncitizens should be included in municipal decisions: "We welcome immigrants without question. We've supported them from the standpoint that they're going to support our city." Expecting the support to be returned by immigrant communities, in the form of civic engagement, is embedded in the notions of "good citizenship", which when fulfilled; reduce some of the illegitimacy attached to marginalized and excluded groups.

In contrast to a paternalistic attitude that dominates the traditional notions of sanctuary, the City of Seattle's approach to civic engagement provides a platform for cross dialogue by asserting the political agency of its immigrant residents. For Jessica in the City's finance department, her own immigrant experience informed her perspective on how local governments can create more effective policies and programs: "People should always be at the forefront, especially those who are most impacted or touched by any project, program or policy – they should be the first to be able to give input so that these programs will benefit them." Of course, how local governments function and policy development unfolds often depart from idealistic expectations, and even in the most welcoming of cities, the balance of power between municipal agencies and residents is often to the advantage of the former. Jessica agrees that the "city has good intentions of really trying to center community engagement, but we're just not there yet" but she was optimistic that inclusive practices can begin internally at the department level even in the absence of guidance from elected officials.

> I think it is really important to be inclusive, especially to those who have historically been excluded and never had access. They've never been aware and don't always have knowledge about what the city does, and they need to be

> included. In my department, we talk about equity, but we also know that certain groups get left out. There's intent versus impact, and I think the city has good intentions, but we are still working on how to have impact in the community. We are working on coordination between different departments.

With over ten years of experience in the city's finance department, Jessica has witnessed her own department and others attempt to strengthen community engagement. That there is a lack of coordination and no standardized approach suggests the autonomy of individual city departments to experiment with strategies to support immigrant communities. In line with bureaucratic incorporation, departments can implement their own procedures and practices to better serve and represent immigrants. Jessica provides the example of public utilities and Seattle City Light which have their own community engagement and outreach plans, "they serve the public, but they are also profit revenue-making department, so their approach to engaging with the community is different."

The role of the city extends beyond providing the spaces for civic engagement to take place. In such spaces and perhaps even outside of them, the city also has an obligation to listen to and learn about the residents. With close to a decade of experience with the city, Teresa reflected on how the city's embrace of the Welcoming City label has shifted the relationship between the municipal government and its constituents: "Being a Welcoming City is about listening and taking people's suggestions seriously. It's about always being connected to community and always trying to find solutions to problems." The emphasis on listening and taking seriously suggestions from residents again orients the creation of pro-immigrant spaces as a collective effort requiring negotiation and collaboration between residents and political agents.

Jarvis conveyed a similar sentiment, when I asked about how Seattle's pro-immigrant

efforts have affected his work as a director. He stressed that "first and foremost, we need to be able to hear them and we need to understand them; I always tell folks that we support them by hearing" Jarvis suggested that his department has a responsibility not just to consult with constituents but to learn about them as well: "we need to understand their customs and traditions, because some people don't want or they're not used to going to a public meeting."

Much of Jarvis' work is centered around designing and improving parks and recreation facilities in the city. Even though this sort of work is not directly within the scope of immigrant-related policy, recent efforts have attempted to "consider recreation from other ethnicities." Public spaces and structures belong to the public and accordingly should reflect the diverse backgrounds of the community.

> Seattle has a lot of people coming from across the globe and we're designing these parks with American recreation stuff…which I don't even, I don't know but I question this a lot. I think when you're working in a community that is, you know, very diverse, then you have to kind of pull that in. We can't continue to force these American recreational elements.

The notion that "American recreational elements" cannot be forced in a diverse community of immigrants again echoes the contemporary aims of pro-immigrant spaces which promote integration and inclusion over assimilation. Meeting these aims is achieved by receiving input from immigrants on the elements of parks and recreation that are most important to them.

> Enriching our public open spaces brings in new traditions and customs and forms of recreation. There's no greater pleasure than walking through the parks during the weekend and seeing families around the picnic tables barbecuing all different types of food. That's really neat to see and that's kind of how I see a Welcoming

> City. We're trying to create a sense of belonging in the parks for all different types of immigrants. That's key, right? I mean we don't know what might be offensive to another ethnicity and that's why the public process is so important because we really want to create a sense of belonging the parks.

The influence of the Welcoming City resolution and associated pro-immigrant policies extend beyond into other spheres of civic life. Alison advises the city on community engagement and racial equity; she describes her job as helping the city to "bring a better equity lens" and "paying attention to people." In our interview, she recalled the timeline of opening the city's first COVID-19 mass vaccination site as a "participatory process" and "democratic process":

> Early on, we engaged and continued to engage, with our immigrant and refugee communities. Hearing from them and receiving feedback. That is what democracy is and what I think the democratic process should be. In all these various ways, it means there's a voice, it means there's an opportunity to press and to express concern about how something should go. It's supposed to be a participatory process. One of the first things I did on the first day of opening the vaccination clinic was I brought the community in to walk through and really tell me everything that you think. Do we need anything else that will make your grandmother, your children, your family members feel safe and comfortable to be able to come in and get their vaccinations? For me, it was really about centering the people that are really most harmed in in most of what government may have to do in a pandemic like this. We spend what needs to be spent and we involve the people that are necessary, and that to me is putting the community first.

Much like how Jarvis envisioned parks and recreation facilities, Alison's task of helping

to launch the city's mass vaccination site was driven by the principles of inclusion, equity, and belonging. Hosting a walk-through with members of the community gave Alison the chance to "receive feedback and actually execute on that feedback." One such piece of feedback from the community concerned being denied vaccination due to immigration status or perceptions that sensitive information about immigration and citizenship were being collected. As a result, the city held trainings daily for volunteers and medical personnel to remind them of the broader goal at hand: "We're not here to ask a bunch of questions. We're here to serve. Keep in mind that many people are coming here to get a vaccine and it can be really scary after being home for six months to a year, and not having stepped out."

Another piece of feedback received was about the general impact of the pandemic on small businesses. Being that the mass vaccination site was expected to draw heavy foot traffic, the city worked with small businesses to have food trucks available outside of the venue: "We had food trucks, and not your classic hot dogs. We wanted to support small businesses that had been really damaged. Recommendations from the community enabled us to identify what other things such as this could be done."

In mid-March 2021, I visited the mass vaccination site and observed ADA and language access lines organized from outside of the arena to the exit signs. Pamphlets on the available vaccines were provided in several languages, likely as a requirement of the Language Access Program. Signage in the building also included translations or universally understood symbols to help with navigation. There was no request to see identification when it was time to receive the vaccine, only a request to verbally confirm your residential address.

It's important to note that there were no illusions on the part of interviewees that the city government had perfected civic engagement and political participation. Bureaucratic challenges

and ideological tensions aside, however, there was optimism that the framework of being a Welcoming City helped to "set the stage of what successful democracy truly looks like." Alison expressed dissatisfaction that sometimes municipal decisions are more "transactional rather than transformative" but that programs like Language Access and the racial equity toolkit help "bring about the kind of change of what the democratic process looks like." Emphasis was also placed on amplifying voices from those "communities that don't see that level of democracy." In Seattle, efforts to expand civic engagement to incorporate marginalized groups including immigrants require a multi-faceted effort of adapting spaces, initiating dialogue, and learning about these groups.

Political Participation and the Role of Community Organizations

The partnership between the city and local non-profits also serves as a conduit for civic engagement. Community organizations have a long history of increasing political engagement among marginalized populations. In the context of immigration rights, non-profits and religious institutions have served as sites of organization and mobilization (Kotin et al. 2011; Beck and Shklyan 2021). Non-profits, in their work of serving immigrant communities, also represent the interests of immigrants, which are voiced directly or indirectly to the city. To this end, advocacy is often at the forefront of a community organization's agenda, alongside the other services and resources they may provide for Seattle's immigrant communities.

The intermediary role of non-profits in the civic engagement process has been an emerging area of interest (Beck and Shklyan 2021) as individualized modes of civic engagement have declined considerably in recent decades (Putnam 2000). Non-profits and other community organizations also act as interest groups that engage in lobbying efforts to influence legislation and as activists and allies in broader social movements (Suárez and Hwang 2008). Though my

study does not directly assess individual involvement in non-profit organizations as a form civic engagement, my conversations with members of non-profits suggest that the civic actions led by community organizations are in part a consequence of a politically engaged base of individuals. More importantly, the context of a Welcoming City provides a receptive environment for organizations to simultaneously provide services and engage in advocacy.

Deborah is the lead pastor at a faith-based organization that helps new immigrants find shelter and coordinates a meal delivery service for immigrants experiencing food insecurity. In the average week, the organization delivers over 60,000 meals, which is made possible thanks to funding from the city and private donors. Though issues of housing and food security inform the services provided, Deborah believes the bigger picture has to do with immigration reform. In the immediate aftermath of the 2016 election, Deborah and her team organized drives to protest anti-immigration policies at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, which paved the way for talks about establishing the organization's headquarters as a sanctuary.

> Right away there were all these policies and so we drove people to protest at airports and all that sort of stuff. Our folks were doing that. One woman came to me one day, and said, "But what can we actually do, pastor? What can we do?" And I said, "Well, you know, I don't think it's a small thing that we go and protest, so I think that's something that you're doing yeah…" But she continued to ask, "What can we do?" And I said, "Well, you know there's this ancient practice in the church of sanctuary and there are some folks who are doing the same."

In 2017, Deborah and members of the organization participated in the historic women's march following inauguration day. Borrowing strategies from the march, the organization

implemented "huddles" to identify and assess the key issues for Seattle's immigrant communities: "We started this thing called huddles to gather people. We invited people and to our surprise, quite a few people showed up. Our first huddle – we had 10 topics identified as things that people were really worried about." At the top of this list of topics was the fear of deportation which energized the organization to network with other faith-based and non-profit organizations to take a vocal stand in support of the DREAM Act and immigration reform to protect undocumented immigrants.

The pastor highlighted that Seattle's status as a Welcoming City and Washington's status as a sanctuary state conveyed the "values and priorities" of local government and lowered the obstacles to civic action: "it wasn't something I had to add to my list, because thank you, it's already done – it makes it easier for us to do what we need to do." Deborah explained that in her experience working with the city and the state, she "didn't have to go and convince an elected official that immigration reform is important." This freed up resources for the organization to tackle more specific issues facing immigrant communities in Seattle such as homelessness and food security.

Speaking on the organization's relationship with the city, Deborah says that she is in regular and direct contact with the Office of Immigration and Refugee Affairs: "When Seattle adopts new policies, the director of immigration concerns or something like that, and the City of Seattle, write me regularly. It's because we are engaged in both advocacy and direct services but also, we've told them, we care about these things so make sure you tell us what's happening." Deborah's organization as well as many others, through their position as the intermediary between the city and its constituents, act as representatives for those who have been excluded or may be hesitant to directly engage with government officials. Organizations that adopt this

representative identity in their lobbying efforts are sometimes referred to as "citizen groups" (Suárez and Hwang 2008); the receptiveness of the city to the advocacy and activism of non-profit organizations representing the interests of a noncitizen and legally excluded base may contribute symbolically to the regularization of nonregular immigrants at the local level.

Community organizations can also encourage civic engagement among immigrants and other marginalized groups by empowering them with the knowledge and resources to participate in political processes. Emma is a project coordinator at a Seattle-based immigrant's right organization dedicated to racial and economic justice. She is responsible for planning workshops to "inform, train, and educate the immigrant community about the legislative process." Most recently, Emma coordinated with Seattle's Latino communities to identify the key issues affecting essential workers during the pandemic. The outcome resulted in partnerships with other non-profits to launch a campaign advocating for health equity for undocumented immigrants. This initiative, among others, is seen as a way of moving the city forward in becoming the Welcoming City it has claimed to be. For Emma, a Welcoming City is also a "civil society" in which "organizations can do great work for things to change in Seattle." She added that the process "is like building a movement to improve the situation for immigrant communities in Seattle."

Where Seattle currently stands with respect to immigration issues also largely reflects the political efforts and civic actions of its residents. The Welcoming City resolution and each pro-immigrant ordinance and resolution are the products of ongoing advocacy and activism. Mara is a project coordinator at a community organization that provides tutoring service to Latino youth; the organization is also involved in advocacy. She is quick to dismiss the notion that the city is by-default a Welcoming City: "These policies aren't just born out of, you know, kindness. It's

undocumented people and their allies that built those policies." Mara acknowledges that funding from the city to support their educational services frees up resources for the organization to invest in civic engagement. With many of their clients being undocumented, workshops are organized to "empower immigrants" to participate in various campaigns and initiatives. For example, back in March 2021, the organization scheduled "legislative week" which was for "immigrants to learn about different bills." Attendees were then encouraged to sign up for phone banks and use social media to raise awareness.

Employees with the city reciprocated the positive relationships forged with the community organization and praised their ongoing efforts of advocating for immigrant communities. Legislative assistant Elnaz shared that her work often is informed by her consultations with community organizations and that members of these organizations also could reach her directly with concerns about any legislative developments.

> We want to provide access for every single legislation that we work on but sometimes this a bit difficult. I think that's why we have stakeholders in the community that we work with and they know how we work. It's really important for us to stay connected and if there's something in the legislation that is going to impact someone negatively, then they know to call us right away.

In 2019, the city passed the Domestic Workers Ordinance (Municipal Code 14.23) which led to the creation of the Domestic Worker Standards Board. Elnaz was heavily involved in this effort and recalls that this legislative process continues to resonate with her because of the level of participation and engagement from community organizations and residents: "This legislation was made stronger because it was inclusive of people who typically are not part of the process in creating legislation." Elnaz admits that not every piece of legislation she works on involves the

same level of external input although she wishes the same formula could be "replicated for every single piece of legislation in Seattle."

> Working in City Hall on the Domestic Worker Standards – it's a piece of legislation to support domestic workers…we had so many people go and provide public comment. They sit at the table and give their experience. They were very open, even those without legal status. Thinking about how this legislation was going to help them was so inspiring to me and I loved helping to organizing all of that. It's something I've never seen anything like this before and I've worked at the State and County level. I never seen that amount of people willing to share.

Elnaz's reflections on the Domestic Workers Ordinance provide insight into a form of political participation that does not require legal or citizenship status. Through "many, many communities listening sessions", domestic workers and their allies began to attend and share experiences to help guide policy development. Furthermore, working with community organizations helped to establish stronger connections and reach a wider audience. Elnaz believes strongly that there was "empowerment provided through the process" and that individuals, despite their marginalized status, "are moving the needle through legislation." Elnaz added that now, even two years since the Domestic Workers Standards Board was established, many of the original attendees from the community continued to provide updates and remain "very engaged."

Civic engagement through community organizations has been documented in prior work (Kotin et al. 2011; Beck and Shklyan 2021) and how this plays out in Seattle is not unique. However, the context established by the city through its Welcoming City resolution and associated pro-immigrant policies helps to legitimize the claims asserted by a legally

marginalized constituency. By opening avenues for influencing municipal decisions through city-led initiatives and community-based advocacy and activism, opportunities are expanded for immigrants to exercise the political dimensions of urban citizenship.

The modes of civic engagement and participation highlighted in the above examples reframe the concept of citizenship as more than just a legal status granted to naturalized citizens and individuals born in the U.S. Through inclusive practices that deemphasize immigration and citizenship status defined by the federal government, the City of Seattle has attempted to carve out spaces in which the rights and privileges of local citizenship can be performed by a traditionally excluded population. The form of citizenship that exists in this context is like Chauvin and Garcés-Mascareñas' (2012:243) argument that illegality and undocumented status "do not typically function as an absolute marker of illegitimacy, but rather as a handicap within a continuum of probationary citizenship." Even though these rights and privileges dissolve at the ballot box and outside the jurisdiction of municipal politics, the consequences of affirming this limited form of citizenship at the local level are nonetheless meaningful and found in the everyday structures of civic life.

ACCESS TO MUNICIPAL RESOURCES AND SERVICES

In addition to political rights, urban citizenship also confers social rights and access to other resources. For example, in the context of a municipal space, the ability to access public transportation, utilities, and municipal facilities are basic entitlements for a city's residents (Varsanyi 2008). Both directly and indirectly, access-for-all policies help to reaffirm membership and belonging by providing the resources that serve the basis for social and economic participation in mainstream civic life. Furthermore, the implementation of these policies also helps to assert and empower municipal governments as key players in shaping the

discourse on immigration and citizenship.

Before proceeding, it is worthy to note that by default, municipal services are typically available for all residents regardless of immigration status and that up until the recent decades, municipal agents did not engage in the practice of verifying immigration or citizenship status. Access-for-all policies may seem redundant then at the municipal level. However, as subnational governments become increasingly incorporated into the immigration enforcement apparatus, perceptions of immigration policing by local agencies are likely to develop among affected communities. Access-for-all policies operate like a non-discrimination clause that prevent service providers from discriminating based on nationality, citizenship, or immigration status. The visibility of policies prohibiting status inquiries and promoting access to municipal public goods may be helpful for reassuring immigrant communities that municipal resources and services are available to all residents.

Access to city services represents one policy framework that affirms urban citizenship for residents with precarious immigration status. Several cities, including New Haven, New York City, and Oakland, have attempted to legitimize urban citizenship by issuing municipal ID cards which can act as proof of identification when trying to access municipal level services and institutions (de Graauw 2014). As these municipal ID cards are issued to individuals based on their local residency rather than their immigration or legal status, immigrants with precarious and undocumented status are recognized as equal members of the community, thereby contributing to their regularization. This form of belonging at the local level that incorporates individuals otherwise labelled as "illegal" is also known as local bureaucratic membership (de Graauw 2014; Kaufmann 2019).

While the City of Seattle does not currently have a municipal ID program, the

Welcoming City Resolution passed in 2017 and the Don't Ask Don't Tell Ordinance (DADT) in 2003, underscore the city's commitment for ensuring municipal services and those contracted by the city are accessible to all regardless of immigration status. An elected official explained that the conditions of access-for-all apply to organizations that receive funding from the city.

> For instance, we fund the human services department to provide resources for an organization that provides rent assistance funds for people who are at risk of being evicted. Those funds, when they come from the city – that organization that we're contracting with, since they're spending our dollars, are prohibited from asking about somebody's immigration status as a prerequisite of getting those rent assistance dollars.

There are rare exceptions when disclosing immigration status might be necessary. For instance, non-profits that provide legal representation services, even if they receive public funding, usually need to know the immigration status of their clients. This was confirmed by interviewees working at non-profits that provide legal services. Interviewees at non-profits providing other services report that they do not inquire about immigration status when providing services.

Access-for-all policies are intentionally disruptive and even controversial because they defy social expectations about the social contract established between governments and the constituents. In times of high immigrant hostility, pro-immigrant actions taken by municipal governments could represent a form of disobedience against national policies that challenge the federal government as the main authority on matters of immigration (Gebhardt 2016). Cities that grant an outsider group access to publicly funded services essentially legitimize members of this group as insiders with urban rights and privileges. Within a sanctuary city, or a Welcoming City

like Seattle, such policies actively contradict federal efforts to exclude immigrants from resources afforded to those with formal citizenship.

Even with limited powers, municipal governments, through access-for-all policies, can greatly shape the contours of civic life to equalize the rights and privileges enjoyed by its constituents. For some interviewees, access-for-all was seen as a duty and responsibility of the city and not simply a gesture of kindness. As Amir, a case manager at a non-profit, states, "the feds should focus on their jobs and the city should focus on their job" which for the latter, was not enforcing immigration law but ensuring adequate services for its residents.

Access-for-all policies are also sometimes referred to as access-without-fear policies. It has been well documented that fear of deportation and heighted hostility afflicts immigrant communities (Pew Hispanic Center 2007) which has implications for integration (Abrego 2011). Anticipated negative encounters with law enforcement also alter the day-to-day lives of undocumented immigrants forcing an existence on the peripheries of the mainstream (Correia 2010; Wu 2010; Becerra et al. 2016). Another study finds that immigrants, regardless of documentation status, with concerns about immigration enforcement were also less likely to utilize public benefits (Capps et al. 2018). A report from Ontario, Canada reveals "uncertainty and fear of being deported" are part of the "defining experience for those without legal immigration status" (Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants 2012: 73). Much of the fear documented in these studies stems from concerns about immigration policing and has been linked with various outcomes including fluctuations in school attendance (Capps et al. 2018), and reluctance to utilize police services (García 2018).

In Seattle, the framework for access-for-all or access-without-fear is sustained primarily by the Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) ordinance previously discussed. In combination with

policies that restrict immigration enforcement and cooperation with immigration enforcement agencies, the DADT is intended to connect marginalized immigrant communities to municipal services, including those provided by the local police department. Specifically, the DADT ordinance prevents Seattle Police Department and municipal employees from inquiring into immigration status. The broader goal, Elnaz explains, "is to have people just feel more or less safe in this city." The ordinance erases distinctions between the city's residents based on immigration or citizenship status and asserts that the basic eligibility for municipal services is based on residence.

Although the DADT ordinance was passed in 2003, preceding the Welcoming City Resolution in 2017, it is arguably the most important and consequential policy affecting immigrant communities in Seattle while forming the foundations of access-for-all. Nevertheless, the ongoing efforts to enact pro-immigrant policies and respond to restrictive immigration policy at the federal level highlight the project of sanctuary as dynamic. In addition to devising new policies and strategies to counter immigrant hostility, reaffirming and strengthening existing policies and practices can also heighten the visibility of a city's pro-immigrant status and endorse bureaucratic incorporation. One interviewee noted that in his role providing services through a non-profit, "the concept of the Welcoming City resolution helped people to feel that they can get resources without fear or repercussions from the government." Even though the Welcoming City resolution was not in itself a policy about access to services, it reiterated the goals of the DADT ordinance and renewed the push for establishing Seattle as a pro-immigrant space. By continuously building upon the DADT ordinance, it is likely that information asymmetries will even out over time thereby facilitating access to and utilization of municipal services by immigrant communities.

The concept of "access-for-all" in Seattle is rooted in the cultural values and beliefs associated with civic life and the immigrant experience. Emphasis was placed on the city's responsibility to bring equity and expand access in how services were distributed within the community. This was accompanied by a shift in language in official municipal publications; where appropriate, references to "citizens" are replaced with the "residents." Symbolically, this subtle shift in language signals that membership in the City of Seattle is conditional on residence in the city rather than migration history. That said, acknowledgement of the immigrant experience was accentuated in discussions of the cultural and economic contributions of immigrants. In this context, the city's commitment to access-for-all was framed as an obligation part of the social contract, whereby the city provides services to all residents who contribute meaningfully to civic life. On the one hand, the push for equity and access downplayed the significance of immigration and citizenship status while on the other hand, there was also attention placed exclusively on the immigrant experience as defined by its challenges and accomplishments.

Elnaz, an employee of the City of Seattle, reported that the motivations for an access-for-all approach is driven by the civic culture of Seattle, which is the product of diverse cultural backgrounds and migration histories. Access to municipal services was implied to be a resource facilitating integration, rather than assimilation:

> There is a civic culture or a Seattle culture which is made up of the cultures of all people in Seattle. Everyone should have access without having their own personal culture or their background devalued. People should be truly allowed to bring their culture and have their culture just be as American as my culture. The idea of assimilation requires people to learn English and leave behind some of traditions

> and customs. But there is no American culture – I think. We try and focus on integration which is the complete opposite, and you know, I believe we all should have access to the same resources.

Similar to the meanings attached to being a Welcoming City, the beliefs underlying an access-for-all approach to municipal services is centered around values of inclusivity and self-determination. Rather than the traditional notions of sanctuary with undertones of paternalism that encourage a singular path of assimilation, access-for-all in Seattle encourages diverse trajectories for its immigrant residents. In contrast to formal citizenship which is strictly determined by legal criteria across a number of dimensions, the access-for-all framework legitimizes claims to urban citizenship via a multiculturalist approach.

In a different city department that works closely with Seattle's immigrant population, Rita echoed similar sentiments about civic culture and the values that inform the city's commitment to ensuring municipals services are available to all: "It's the culture – like these are our values and we're going to live by them and keep ourselves accountable. How are do we uphold these values and commitments? Our responsibility is to unite as a city, instead of having to isolate our immigrant neighbors." Excluding certain residents from municipal services violated the core values of civic culture, generating division between immigrants and non-immigrants.

Alongside inclusivity, equity was also a widely shared value that motivated support for an access-for-all framework. More than just ensuring that services were accessible, attention was also placed on the quality of services. Reflecting on how parks and recreational spaces are distributed and organized throughout the city, Jarvis underscored the importance of "bringing equity into the distribution of our services." Specifically, it was recognized that there were

"underserved communities that have experienced less maintenance in their parks" and that their park spaces "have less assets, like play fields, comfort stations, or water sprays." With over two decades of experience working for the city, Jarvis observed that the turn towards equity and recent Welcoming City resolution have also inspired a "social justice standpoint" in decision-making processes:

> We discuss social justice at every meeting and it's definitely a priority. I don't think we would be so focused on equitably distributing our services had that initiative (The Welcoming City Resolution) not been in place. This Thursday, we have our all staff meeting at 6:20 in the morning and then 2 o'clock in the afternoon, that's my division. I give my announcements and they we have an equity talk and someone speaks on any topic associated with social justice. In the past, a lot of people have spoken about coming into the country, you know, as an immigrant, and how they saw Seattle then, and how they see it now, and how things have changed.

As a librarian in South Seattle, Walter agrees that equity and access have become especially important these past few years as he and his colleagues develop programs to reach underserved communities:

> One of the main barriers of people not coming in to the use the library is that they don't have transportation. We have communities where public transportation is not reliable and we had to find a creative way to serve those communities that have limited physical access to the library. So we thought of the bookmobile library on wheels and worked with community leaders to get the word out.

The strategy behind the bookmobile library mirrors the way the city has partnered with

external organizations to deliver services to immigrants. One advantage of this is that services can reach groups that are less integrated into civic life. Access-for-all, from Walter's perspective, was not simply an announcement by the city that services would be available for all residents, but an active effort to ensure that services were being delivered. The library, like other municipal institutions, prints materials in different languages and strives to provide language options for video resources as well.

Walter notes that "this helps a bit" but the most effective strategy, at least in expanding access to library services, was to connect with community leaders: "Community leaders can help you connect with communities, especially the immigrant communities. You know, growing up in Seattle, I came to the realization that Seattle is really divided physically as well." Much like how the city has developed new strategies to enhance civic engagement and political participation, the effort to increase access to municipal services is also guided by action from different municipal departments and offices to connect directly with underserved communities, including immigrant populations.

Although access-for-all frameworks are one of the most common types of policy found in sanctuary cities, it is certainly not the case that all cities that have access-for-all see the intended results of alleviating fear and increased utilization of services by immigrant communities. Lack of awareness and understanding of the policy by immigrant communities continues to be a barrier that prevents immigrants from accessing resources that they are rightfully entitled to. Efforts in Seattle over time to engage communities directly and consider distribution from the lens of equity have helped to make the original DADT ordinance more impactful in meeting the intended outcomes.

As one of Seattle's most notable pro-immigrant policies, the DADT ordinance establishes

that the rights to access and utilize municipal services rests on the sole basis of residency. Despite limited powers and a lack of jurisdiction over immigration law, the City of Seattle has managed to expand rights and access for a population that has over time, become increasingly excluded legally through restrictive immigration policy. Through sustained and varied efforts to engage underserve communities, and an orientation towards social justice and equity, Seattle, as a Welcoming City, has demonstrated that the basic social rights and privileges associated with formal citizenship can be granted and practiced at the local level. It is critical to remember that pro-immigrant policies, such as those embedded in the Welcoming City framework, are crafted by people who share certain values, and that turnover of elected officials and employees may mean that the boundaries of local and informal citizenship may expand and contract over time.

DISCUSSION: FORMALIZING INFORMAL CITIZENSHIP AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

In sanctuary cities, the policies that are enacted to support immigrant communities also contest the restrictions and policing imposed by the federal government. But these actions taken at the local level are not merely symbolic, especially if there is some level of visibility and awareness of these policies among immigrant residents of the city. Policies that prohibit enforcement of immigration law, restrict cooperation with federal agencies, and encourage access to municipal services should have the effect of bringing immigrants into public civic spaces where conventional modes of social, economic, and political engagement unfold.

In this analysis, I used Seattle as a case study to examine three programs and practices through which the rights and privileges associated with formal citizenship are granted to noncitizens who are residents of the city. First, the language access program established via an Executive Order is intended to foster a sense of belonging through the creation of multiculturally

inclusive spaces. City officials expect this program to encourage participation in and utilization of city spaces. Second, the Don't Ask Don't Tell Ordinance establishes the framework for access-for-all which affirms that all residents of Seattle regardless of U.S.-citizenship status have a right to utilize municipal publicly funded services. Third, independent of any direct guidance from elected officials, there was a growing practice within city departments to create channels for political participation and engagement; this was accomplished by proactive efforts to connect with immigrant populations and the adaptation of spaces and procedures to accommodate potential participants.

The overall outcome of these programs and practices is a shift towards the formalization of local citizenship whereby the boundaries of civic engagement and participation are widened. Efforts to promote a sense of belonging and address the chilling effects of immigration enforcement were perceived to be conducive to facilitating immigrant integration and participation in civic institutions. Expanding the rights to political participation, asserting the right of all residents to utilize city services, and establishing a framework for language access and justice represent three ongoing efforts by the City of Seattle to legitimize local citizenship.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Sanctuary cities in the U.S. have generally been described as jurisdictions that limit or restrict the enforcement of federal immigration law. Lacking an official definition, most academic attempts to study sanctuary cities have also utilized the position of local law enforcement as a starting point for classifying sanctuary jurisdictions. Many of these studies, perhaps due to the emphasis on law enforcement, examine public safety and crime as outcomes. There are also ongoing claims by political figures that sanctuary city policies are symbolic gestures at best and that localities that adopt these pro-immigrant measures have little impact on matters concerning immigrants and immigration.

Using a combination of content analyses, semi-structured interviews, and a case study of the Welcoming City of Seattle, this dissertation is a comprehensive in-depth analysis of sanctuary city policies at the municipal level in the U.S. This study was motivated by four research questions: 1) What are the main responses taken by cities in response to restrictive or hostile immigration law? 2)What are the motivations behind decisions to implement sanctuary policies and pro-immigrant measures at the municipal level? 3) In the City of Seattle, what does it mean to be a Welcoming City? 4) How does the City of Seattle advance notions of citizenship and belonging through pro-immigrant policies and practices?

Guided by these four questions, this study sought to highlight the role of cities as emergent actors in the political discourse on immigration with considerable influence over shaping experiences of belonging and membership. In addition to supplementing current understandings on sanctuary cities and public safety, the qualitative analyses presented in this dissertation also broadened current perspectives on sanctuary cities through an in-depth exploration of the meanings and intended outcomes attached to pro-immigrant measures. These

findings encourage closer attention to cities as a locus for shaping immigrant experiences as they pertain to integration, civic engagement, and citizenship.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Responding to Restrictive and Hostile Immigration Policies

A defining feature of immigration law over the past several decades is the expansion and intensification of immigration policing and enforcement, especially in the interior. Scholars have described this phenomenon as "crimmigration" pointing to how the growing practice of mass detention and deportation have contributed to the ongoing criminalization and racialization of certain groups of immigrants (Stumpf 2006; García-Hernandez 2015; Arriaga 2016; Menjívar et al. 2018). The scale of immigration policing and enforcement is in large part due to the devolution of immigration law to sub-federal agencies at the state, county, and municipal level.

Not surprisingly, some sub-federal agencies have been reluctant to utilize their limited resources to enforce immigration law, a jurisdiction of the federal government. Concerns about public safety and community wellbeing have also contributed to decisions to refrain from participation. In general, localities that refuse involvement or limit participation in enforcing immigration law are referred to as sanctuary cities. Sanctuary cities are commonly understood to be counties or cities that have a policy that restricts local agencies from enforcing immigration law either directly or indirectly. In the first analysis, Chapter two, of this dissertation, I explore the various orientations that municipalities take in response to federal pressures to enforce immigration law.

In a comprehensive analysis of municipal legislative text and news media spanning 40 states including D.C., and 209 municipalities, I identified five categories of sanctuary policies that are commonly utilized by local governments and police departments in opposition to federal

efforts to expand immigration enforcement. These five types of policies concern the following with regards to immigration enforcement: cooperation with federal enforcement agencies, information sharing, status inquiries, registries, and surveillance.

Among the most common type of sanctuary policy are general non-cooperation or non-assistance policies that address the extent to which local agencies will work with federal immigration enforcement agencies, including ICE and DHS. These policies are often implemented in response to enforcement programs such as 287(g) and S-Comm which depend on contractual partnerships between federal and local authorities to carry out policing and removal efforts. Non-cooperation and non-assistance policies can be traced back to the early 1980s when the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) was the primary agency with jurisdiction over immigration affairs, and changes in wording over time reflect the role of new agencies and enforcement strategies.

A more specific policy that clarifies the relationship between local and federal agencies is that concerning information sharing. The objective of these policies is to protect and withhold sensitive information from agencies and authorities that intend to conduct enforcement activities. Information sharing constitutes a form of cooperation and policies that prohibit this action are a more specific version of the non-cooperation and non-assistance policies described previously.

Many sanctuary cities also have policies directly prohibiting local agencies and authorities from inquiring into immigration or citizenship status. Welfare reforms throughout the 1990s that tightened the eligibility for accessing publicly funded benefits involved state, county, and local actors into the task of verifying immigration and citizenship status. Commonly referred to as “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell”, policies restricting status inquiries have been implemented in

numerous localities to assert that the provision of local services and resources is not conditional on immigration or citizenship status.

Two less frequently observed sanctuary policies concern surveillance and registration. Surveillance related policies were developed in response to the Patriot Act and is evident in their limited popularity between 2003 and 2005. Local decisions to oppose surveillance were motivated by concerns of violating civil rights and the potential for biased policing which can disproportionately affect some immigrant groups. Policies against registration express opposition against maintaining a registry or database of individuals that could be deemed "suspicious." Policies concerning registration are distinct in their wording, but overall, rare; this is likely because the federal government has largely failed in both its attempts to establish a registration system targeting Muslim-majority countries. As sanctuary policies are largely reactionary, enforcement strategies that do not materialize are less of a concern.

There is some overlap between these policies in that all can be characterized as "pro-immigrant" and in varying ways related to the direct and indirect ways localities can be involved in the enforcement of federal immigration law. Even though these policies are in opposition to federal immigration effort priorities, sanctuary policies do not violate any federal laws and this is often clearly outlined in the legislative text.

Though there are similarities that connect sanctuary city policies, the differences are plenty. There are varying degrees of specificity in the wording of sanctuary policies. Ambiguity and vague language were not uncommon. There were also expressions of support for immigrant communities in reaction that appear to be symbolic at best. The qualitative approach taken in this analysis reveal that sanctuary city policies resemble a patchwork. Current attempts to define what qualifies as a sanctuary city must take into account these differences, which are likely

further complicated by varying levels of compliance and adherence by local agencies and city employees.

Motivations for Implementing Sanctuary City Policies

Proponents of sanctuary cities often argue that policies restricting or limiting immigration enforcement are in the interest of public safety. A number of studies support this hypothesis (Lyons et al. 2013; O'Brien et al. 2017; Wong 2017; Kubrin and Bartos 2020). There has been less attention devoted to examining sanctuary cities as pro-immigrant policies as they pertain to immigrant integration and perspectives on citizenship. In the second analysis, Chapter 3, I examine the motivations behind decisions to implement sanctuary city policies and demonstrate that the public safety narrative is one of several used by city officials to justify opposition to immigration enforcement efforts.

The speculated mechanisms through which sanctuary cities may create safer communities converge around trust and cooperation between immigrants and local authorities (Lyons et al. 2013). When immigrants do not have to fear interactions with police and authorities, they are more likely to report crimes and cooperate to help solve crimes (Correia 2010; Wu 2010; Becerra et al. 2016). This reasoning is evident in the wording of many sanctuary policies, some of which highlight the positives associated with community policing.

My examination of the public safety narrative reveals another mechanism that has received less attention in the literature. It was common for cities to refuse or limit participation in immigration enforcement due to limited resources. By involving local officials and agencies in a task that is the jurisdiction of the federal government, it was perceived that valuable time and resources would be taken away from local responsibilities to maintain and promote public safety and community wellbeing.

In addition to the public safety narrative, defense of sanctuary city policies was evident in a more general pro-immigrant narrative promoting immigrant integration and affirming membership. Sanctuary policies, especially "Don't Ask Don't Tell" policies that prohibit status inquiries, convey that city resources are and should be accessible for all residents regardless of immigration and citizenship status. Immigrant contributions were recognized as a reason for this deservingness. Contributions to economic growth, the community's social fabric, or cultural diversity were commonly cited to describe immigrants as a valued and contributing members of society. Community values of diversity and inclusion were also embedded in the pro-immigrant narrative. Emphasis was placed on incorporating immigrants into civic life and minimizing the barriers to participation.

The pro-immigrant narrative is central to the identity of sanctuary cities in the U.S. and it carries the momentum for cities to be a voice in immigration matters. In more established sanctuary cities, especially those with comprehensive non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies in place, it was not uncommon to also find policies that were unrelated to immigration enforcement but related to immigrant integration and civic engagement. My case study of Seattle provides more insight into this process.

Seattle: A Welcoming and Pro-Immigrant City

To understand more closely why sanctuary city policies are implemented and the meanings associated with these contentious spaces, I used Seattle as a case study and conducted in-depth interviews with employees of the city and local immigrant-serving non-profit organizations. In this study's third analysis, Chapter 4, I focus specifically on what it means for the City of Seattle to be a Welcoming City.

The label "sanctuary city" is generally applied to any jurisdiction, county or municipality, that has at least one policy limiting or restricting the enforcement of immigration law. Yet, this label is not always embraced by policymakers and oftentimes not mentioned in the text of the policy itself. Seattle is one of those jurisdictions. With a comprehensive set of non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies, Seattle is instantly recognizable as a sanctuary city but this label has not been embraced by the city council or the mayor officially. Instead, in 2007, the Seattle affirmed its existing non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies and declared itself to be a Welcoming City. Other cities, including Atlanta and Hoboken, have also claimed this label.

Despite having all the ingredients to qualify as a sanctuary city, employees of the City of Seattle expressed a preference for the term "Welcoming City." From the content analysis in the previous two chapters, there was nothing particularly unique about Seattle's sanctuary and pro-immigrant policies that suggested "Welcoming City" would be a more appropriate label over "Sanctuary City." Rather, Seattle's embrace of the label "Welcoming City" had more to do with the meanings and values city employees attached to being a pro-immigrant city and to some extent, the controversies associated with the "Sanctuary City" label. Employees of immigrant serving non-profits used the two labels interchangeably and did not express a particular preference. Most acknowledged that it was the city's policies that mattered with regards to their ability to support immigrant communities and the label itself was of little significance.

Representing Seattle as a "Welcoming City" builds upon a pro-immigrant narrative that prioritizes immigrant integration instead of immigrant protection in civic spaces. Focusing on immigrant integration motivates policy development and decision making to facilitate participation in civic institutions while promoting a sense of belonging. While city employees expressed concern about the overreach of immigration enforcement and the need to protect

immigrants, there was also acknowledgement that municipal powers are limited in this respect. However, several employees with the city also believed that Seattle's non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies potentially deterred federal enforcement agencies by increasing the time and resource costs associated with immigration policing. Nonetheless, efforts to distance municipal policies from the idea of sanctuary helped to portray the city through a more contemporary lens that recognizes immigrants as agentic members of society rather than powerless individuals in need of protection from the city.

Examination of Seattle's "Welcoming City" status also revealed insights about how services and resources are delivered to immigrant communities. Being a Welcoming City helps to establish a context of reception that is open to immigrants, and this also translates into increased support for immigrant-serving non-profit organizations. Employees working in these non-profits noted that Seattle's pro-immigrant policies aided their work of serving immigrant communities. Conversations with city officials suggest that this relationship with non-profits is bidirectional, with some employees of the city recognizing the work of non-profits in helping the city meet its objectives to support immigrant communities.

The findings from this study expand upon current understandings of the concept of "sanctuary." Specifically, in the City of Seattle, interview data with civil servants and non-profit employees shed light on how non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies can help pave the foundations for building pro-immigrant spaces. More importantly, this analysis reveals the creative and strategic navigation of municipal agencies and community non-profits to simultaneously contest immigration enforcement and facilitate immigrant inclusion while operating in a broader context that is increasingly restrictive and hostile to individuals lacking citizenship or regular status.

Constructing Local Citizenship through Pro-Immigrant Policies and Practices in Seattle

Social scientists have examined cities as sites for cultivating alternative forms of citizenship (Baubock 2003; Varsanyi 2006; Ridgley 2008; Bauder 2020). Much of this literature is grounded in the concept of urban citizenship which emphasizes residency as the primary criteria for granting membership and its associated rights. In the context of sanctuary cities, theoretical applications of citizenship are nascent which limit our current understandings of how municipal agencies incorporate immigrants into mainstream institutions. The last analysis of this dissertation, Chapter 5, continued the case study approach; I analyzed how municipal agencies affirm membership and contribute to the formalization of local citizenship by assigning rights and privileges through pro-immigrant policies and practices.

Specifically, I looked at three policies and practices associated with the city's Welcoming City framework: the Don't Ask Don't Tell (DADT) ordinance, the language access program, and departmental practices to improve civic engagement and political participation.

When Ordinance 121063, also known as the "don't ask" policy, was passed in 2003, the City of Seattle made clear that municipal resources and services are available to all residents regardless of citizenship or immigration status. This policy, which is typical of sanctuary cities, help to establish an "access-for-all" framework that asserts the right of residents to publicly funded resources and services at the local level, many of which at the federal level have become increasing inaccessible to certain groups of immigrants due to the welfare reforms of the late 1990s. In Seattle, city employees used this policy not only to affirm residents' access rights, but to alleviate fear and minimize barriers that may discourage utilization of municipal resources and services.

The language access program, established in 2017 via Executive Order 2017-10, builds upon the foundations of DADT, by breaking down language barriers to civic participation. In contrast to the process of assimilation whereby immigrants adapt to their host society, the language access program represents how a host society can restructure municipal spaces and platforms to adapt to its immigrant residents. Interviewees shared that the goal was to promote a sense of belonging while facilitating immigrant integration in a way that was consistent with the values associated with being a Welcoming City. Multiculturalism, rather than assimilation, represented the desired outcome.

The language access program and DADT ordinance are two pro-immigrant policies associated with the city's "Welcoming City" status that contribute to the production of local citizenship. Both policies were implemented to widen the boundaries of civic participation and inclusion. The DADT ordinance de-emphasizes immigration and citizenship status and asserts the rights of all residents to access municipal services and resources. This legislation is particularly significant in a context where noncitizens are denied access to certain publicly funded goods as a consequence of increasingly restrictive immigration policies. The Language Access Program similarly challenges the expectations of formal citizenship by redefining citizenship, at least locally, as one that is not conditional on English proficiency – a conventional marker of assimilation and a requirement for acquiring U.S. citizenship through naturalization.

My case study also provided insights into how political rights might be exercised meaningfully, albeit informally, in a municipal setting. Though there is currently no ordinance or resolution asserting the political rights of noncitizen residents, my interviews with city and non-profit employees reveal that there are ongoing efforts to amplify immigrant voices and incorporate them into decision-making processes. Employees from different departments shared

strategies for increasing political participation which often involved adapting spaces and procedures to strengthen community engagement. Despite being shut out of electoral politics, noncitizen immigrants can have their interests represented through processes of bureaucratic incorporation. Members of Seattle's immigrant serving non-profit community credited the city's "Welcoming City" status as conducive to their efforts of movement building and advocacy. The close relationship between the city and its community partners provided an additional and receptive avenue for immigrant interests to be represented through non-profit organizations.

Constructing and formalizing local citizenship are ongoing processes in Seattle that occur through the assignment of rights and privileges. Through legislative efforts and pro-immigrant practices within city departments, the boundaries of civic engagement and participation are widened to incorporate immigrant residents who may otherwise experience marginalization and outsider status.

THEORETICAL APPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

In this dissertation, I presented a qualitative examination of sanctuary city policies by conducting content analyses of municipal level sanctuary city policies and a case study of Seattle using in-depth interviews with civil servants and employees at immigrant-serving non-profit organizations. The analytical strategies utilized have expanded upon current knowledge of sanctuary cities and contributed new approaches to the theorization of sanctuary cities, immigrant integration, and citizenship.

The findings from this study are an examination of how the concept of sanctuary works and how it is put into practice in U.S. cities. By expanding upon theorizations that sanctuary is a process, I demonstrate how the meanings attached to sanctuary may evolve to represent broader pro-immigrant interests that can be incorporated into various structures of a municipality

including legislation, programs, administration, and community organizations. The findings presented expand upon current understandings of sanctuary cities and provide new insights and directions for studying informal citizenship, immigrant integration, and civic engagement.

Defining and Conceptualizing "Sanctuary Cities"

Within the discipline of Sociology, current understandings of "sanctuary city" are narrowly confined to include any jurisdiction that has at least one policy of limiting or restricting immigration enforcement. This definition has informed operationalization in numerous quantitative studies that assess the effect of sanctuary city policies on outcomes related to public safety and crime (Lyons et al. 2013; O'Brien et al. 2017; Wong 2017; Kubrin and Bartos 2020); there is obvious practical methodological utility associated with this definition of "sanctuary city". However, this approach also diminishes the variation that exists within jurisdictions labelled as "sanctuary".

In my analyses of sanctuary city policies across the U.S., I observed variation across many dimensions. First, policies that oppose federal immigration enforcement can be direct or indirect, or a combination of both. Direct policies, such as "don't ask" ordinances, restrict city employees and agencies from enforcing immigration law whereas indirect policies restrict city employees and agencies from cooperating with or assisting federal immigration agencies to enforce immigration law. Second, the language and wording of sanctuary policies also varied with regards to implementation and enforcement which is likely to influence the degree of compliance by employees and agencies affected. Third, the patchwork character of sanctuary policies means that the potential effect – whether protective, deterring, or trust-boosting, will also vary depending on the comprehensiveness of local sanctuary policies in relation to current federal immigration enforcement priorities and strategies.

My findings encourage a more nuanced approach to how sanctuary cities are defined as a concept. One potential strategy is to operationalize sanctuary city as a categorical variable that begins with the five major policy orientations with respect to federal immigration enforcement. This would offer explanatory advantages as the current binary approach assumes uniformity across all jurisdictions categorized as sanctuary cities.

From Sanctuary Cities to Pro-Immigrant Cities

Geographers have made considerable strides in advancing our understandings of "sanctuary cities". In Volume 109 of *Geographical Review*, Serin Houston (2019) advances the concept of sanctuary as a process rather than a place-based designation. I extended Houston's perspective to my analyses to understand how sanctuary cities might advance our knowledge of immigrant integration.

In all four substantive chapters, I attempted to frame sanctuary cities as dynamic and evolving. Policy analyses of sanctuary cities of different ages suggest that jurisdictions are responsive and reactive to changes at the federal level with respect to immigration enforcement. However, this seemingly path-dependent evolution of sanctuary cities does not proceed only linearly in opposition to immigration enforcement. As my case study illuminates, the City of Seattle continued to develop policy in response to federal developments while simultaneously adopting policies and practices that are more directly concerned with immigrant integration. These pro-immigrant policies and practices were all informed by the city's Welcoming City Resolution, which also provided the framework for enforcement-related policies.

Houston's influence on my study encouraged a broader perspective of sanctuary policies that considers local policies and practices as central to shaping immigrant lives and experiences. To this end, the findings in my study advances sociological knowledge on contexts of receptions

and immigrant integration. Specifically, my analyses identified legislative and bureaucratic channels through which political and social opportunities are widened for marginalized immigrant groups.

Though prior studies have included sanctuary city policies as a variable that contributes to a welcoming context of reception (Lyons et al. 2013; Beck and Shklyan 2021), few studies if any have considered sanctuary city policies as the primary catalyst for building a pro-immigrant space. Entertaining this alternative generates additional insights into how local agencies can exercise their limited powers and have shape immigrant experiences within a broader context that has become increasingly hostile and restrictive to noncitizen immigrants. Furthermore, findings from my case study also provoke questions regarding how cities might shape cultural understandings and expectations regarding immigrant assimilation and integration.

My main argument here is that sanctuary cities should not merely be identified and defined as a policy reaction to immigration enforcement. Instead, sociologists should borrow Houston's concept of "sanctuary" as a process and extend this logic to better understand outcomes related to immigrant integration and the role of local agencies in shaping the discourse on immigration. There is tremendous potential here that goes beyond assessing the effect of sanctuary city policies on public safety and crime. My analyses of sanctuary city policies as pro-immigrant policies begin this conversation within the discipline of Sociology and contributes to the growing body of literature on immigrant integration and contexts of reception.

Rethinking Local Citizenships

Sociologists who have theorized about citizenship have often emphasized the everyday practices that constitute citizenship rather than the status of citizenship itself (Glenn 2010). My findings on how citizenship is fostered at the local level in Seattle is consistent with this

perspective. For example, I highlight how the city's Welcoming City Resolution as a framework for developing policies that encourage immigrant inclusion and participation in civic spaces. However, in addition providing support for this body of literature, I also argue that local citizenship despite its vague and informal character can potentially exhibit qualities of formalization that are comparable to that of formal citizenship conferred by the nation-state.

To clarify, I am not suggesting that local citizenship can replace formal citizenship that is acquired by birthright or naturalization. But I am presenting a possibility for an alternative and informal form of citizenship that can be realized through formal enactments of political and social rights. In Seattle, through processes of bureaucratic incorporation, city employees in various departments have attempted to incorporate marginalized immigrant voices into decision-making arenas. The city has also enacted an ordinance to affirm the right of all residents to access municipal services and resources. These efforts enable noncitizen immigrant residents to practice citizenship in their everyday lives.

Though not examined in my study, other sanctuary cities have formally recognized membership through the use of municipal ID cards while New York City recently passed legislation to grant noncitizen residents the right to vote in municipal elections. These observations demonstrate the potential of cities to reimagine the concept of citizenship in ways that are not merely symbolic but consequential in expanding the rights and privileges to which local residents are entitled.

To this end, my findings contribute to the sociological literature on citizenship by highlighting sanctuary city policies as a framework through which local notions of citizenship can be formalized.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICIES

The overall aim of this dissertation was to better understand sanctuary policies with special attention to the intended outcomes that motivated policy implementation. Therefore, in this section, I discuss some of the policy implications based on the observations from this dissertation. I propose three recommendations to guide policy development in sanctuary cities based on the intended outcomes of facilitating immigrant integration and enhancing public safety through municipal agencies and community immigrant-serving non-profit organizations.

Standardization and Coordination of Sanctuary Policies

Jurisdictions that enact sanctuary city policies do so in response to federal immigration enforcement priorities that may contradict values and beliefs within the local community. There is a symbolic dimension to being a sanctuary city but as the analyses presented demonstrate, policymakers intend for these policies to improve the lives of their immigrant residents. My study does not measure the impact of policy on immigrant residents but the findings do reveal characteristics that likely play role in determining the extent of impact.

The current patchwork of policies suggest that some cities are ahead of others in responding to changes in immigration law at the federal level. Cities that have continued to develop and implement policies and practices in tandem with new federal developments will be more comprehensive in their ability to support immigrants. This seems to the situation evident in Seattle. Employees with the city and immigrant serving non-profits both credited ongoing policy development as necessary to effectively serving the immigrant community.

Accordingly, I recommend a coordinated strategy between local jurisdictions interested in supporting immigrant communities. The Welcoming America network which works with local jurisdictions to develop policies to support immigrant integration represents one potential framework through which local policymakers can engage in constructive dialogue to develop

cohesive policies and practices. Standardizing policies in terms of implementation and enforcement will also help with compliance and meeting the intended outcomes.

It is important to remember that the sanctuary city movement has grassroots origins and that the struggle for immigrant rights spans across the country. There is much to be gained from forging linkages between local jurisdictions seeking to build pro-immigrant spaces within a nation that has prioritized crimmigration over integration.

Expanding Opportunities for Political Participation and Civic Engagement

Both the content analyses and case study indicate that sanctuary policies are not implemented solely for the purposes of public safety and crime control. Many jurisdictions are also invested in promoting the inclusion and participation of immigrants in civic spaces. There is plenty of research to suggest that levels of civic engagement are higher when individuals feel a sense of belonging in or connection to their local communities (Bauböck 2003). Policymakers and service providers in my study believe strongly in this assumption.

To promote civic engagement, policies and practices should be implemented to meaningfully incorporate immigrants into decision-making arenas. One of the major shortcomings of policies in general is that it produces knowledge asymmetries among groups that are affected. This interferes with the ability of individuals and groups to take advantage of policies and practices designed to benefit them. Incorporating groups that have traditionally been excluded from the political process will not only inform the development of policy that is effective, but it will likely also produce more widespread outcomes as information and knowledge are disseminated through social networks.

Bureaucratic incorporation is a low cost and low stakes channel through which immigrant interests can be represented within formal municipal agencies. The process bypasses the barriers

associated with legislative action while generating outcomes that are evident in daily practices. As bureaucratic incorporation does not occur through any legislative channels, the recommendation here mainly concerns the development of internal practices and procedures that are immigrant-friendly. More formal avenues of political incorporation include issuing municipal ID cards or granting local residents the right to participate in municipal politics. Both these actions strongly affirm membership in local spaces and assert access rights to civic spaces.

Policies and programs that reduce immediate barriers to participation are also strongly recommended. Language access programs should be considered as a supplement to English learning resources to encourage inclusion of immigrants in civic spaces. Creating welcoming environments for new immigrants will facilitate participation in civic spaces which is likely to catalyze long term integration. Currently, lack of English proficiency remains a primary barrier to civic engagement and participation (Rivera-Batiz 1990; Boyd 2009; Brown 2014). Ensuring translations will create spaces that are not only accessible and welcoming, but inclusive and representative.

Incorporating immigrants into mainstream life is simply good policy. With one of the lowest rates of naturalization among advanced industrialized nations (Bloemraad 2012), millions of individuals living in the U.S. are disenfranchised despite being deeply embedded in the economic and social fabric of U.S. society. Studies of other countries' integration policies and intercultural management strategies suggest that open contexts of receptions that offer integration resources are linked to higher rates of naturalization. If increasing naturalization rates is the goal, actions at the local level may be a productive starting point. Naturalization is associated with improved outcomes at both the individual and societal level including more economic power and higher tax revenues (Bloemraad 2002; 2018; Kerwin and Warren 2019).

Partnerships Between Municipal Agencies and Non-Profit Organizations

The decline of the U.S. welfare state throughout the 1990s has shifted the burden of service delivery from government agencies to non-profit sectors. Immigrants lacking citizenship or regular status remain one of the most affected recipient groups as evidenced in lower rates of resource and service utilization (Capps 2002). As eligibility for publicly funded goods become more stringent and immigration enforcement expands, certain groups of immigrants are caught in a welfare gap that prevents full participation and inclusion in mainstream society.

Prior studies examining non-profit organizations in a context of declining public welfare have observed that organizations operate in a "shadow state" whereby government agencies retain control (Wolch 1999; Trudeau 2008). In Seattle, interviews with employees of the city as well as non-profit organizations described the partnership between the city and community organizations to be more equal.

As non-profit organizations often comprise of advocates and activists who typically have connections to the impacted communities, these organizations are sometimes better situated to identify the needs of those who benefit from their services. This was the case for several non-profit organizations in Seattle who were able to assess the issues immigrants faced and communicate this to the city to develop interventions. Conversely, employees with the city were also able to reach out partnered organizations and implement strategies for effectively distributing services. This interdependency between the city and non-profit organizations demonstrates how in a Welcoming City, partnerships between the city and the non-profit sector can be effective and efficient in responding to changing immigration law and narrowing the welfare gap.

Sanctuary policies convey the pro-immigrant attitudes of local governments and municipal agencies which may help establish the local environment as a pro-immigrant space. There is essentially less resistance that non-profit organizations might expect to encounter in their work of serving the immigrant community. In times of heighted hostility, cities may also respond by allocating resources to aid service delivery.

When the Trump administrative passed an executive order intensifying immigration enforcement, the City of Seattle responded by establish a legal defense fund to provide free legal representation to immigrant residents at risk of detention and deportation. The actual legal work was outsourced to several community non-profit organizations who benefited from the city's funding.

Legal defense funds are a common form of partnership between the city and the local non-profit sector. Organizations dedicated to other causes supporting immigrants can also benefit from initiatives in pro-immigrant cities. Findings from my case study suggest that these partnerships can be productive. Policy development intended to support immigrant communities should incorporate the role of non-profit organizations and move towards interventions that utilize the capabilities and strengths of both the city and its partner organizations.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The sociological study of sanctuary cities is nascent. My study has opened up new avenues of research that have received less attention by scholars. As a qualitative study, the analyses in this dissertation exhibit several limitations that can be addressed in future research.

Immigrant Experiences

The data used in this study included legislative text, municipal documents, news media, and interviews with employees of the City of Seattle and immigrant-serving non-profit

organizations. Though this study attempted to understand how sanctuary cities and local pro-immigrant policies and practices contribute to welcoming local spaces, the perspectives and experiences of immigrants are noticeably missing. Policy does not always generate the intended outcomes and this study's findings hinges on the motivations and expectations of conveyed by policymakers and service providers.

Due to budget and time restrictions, I was unable to recruit immigrants to participate in this current study. Future research should incorporate immigrants and assess the extent to which local policies and practices are influential in shaping the immigrant experience. Such studies could utilize survey or interview data to assess whether the intentions of policy makers are realized in the everyday lives of immigrant residents. There are various outcomes that would benefit from analyses including: individual perceptions of trust, self-reported participation in civic spaces, individual knowledge of pro-immigrant policies and practices, and assessments of fear and hostility. Studying these variables would provide more insight into the mechanisms that policy makers believe unfold when sanctuary city policies are implemented.

The Deterrence Effect

Are non-cooperation and non-enforcement policies effective in deterring immigration enforcement from federal agencies? Some policymakers think so. Unfortunately, with a qualitatively driven methodology, my study is not suited to answer this question. It is an important one to consider and exploring if there is indeed a deterrence effect and the strength of it can provide much needed policy guidance.

A study of the deterrence effect is likely to be complex as the magnitude and intensity of immigration enforcement, especially in the interior, is difficult to quantify. Moreover, accounting for the variation in sanctuary policies themselves will also add an additional layer of complexity.

This is especially important for discerning if certain sanctuary policies are more effective than others. A comprehensive analysis will also account for the possibility that it is the combination or interaction of sanctuary policies that strengthen the deterrence effect if it exists. Models will have to account for a host of variables including but not limited to demographic, political, economic, and local law enforcement responses. County and state level orientations to sanctuary policies might also play a role; for example, if a sanctuary municipality is nested within a sanctuary county or a sanctuary state, there are then, theoretically, more walls of resistance against federal agencies seeking to engage in immigration policing within that locality. This might be thought of as a protective buffer against immigration enforcement that potentially can set the stage for a broader range of pro-immigrant policies to be implemented down the road.

Comparative Analyses

One of the major shortcomings attributed to qualitative research, and specifically case studies, is that the findings are not generalizable. As the content analyses in the first two substantive chapters incorporate policies from across the United States, the data is quite comprehensive and there is a fair degree of confidence that the conclusions drawn are representative of sanctuary city policies in the U.S. at the municipal level. The findings from the case study of Seattle, however, is limited in its applicability to other sanctuary cities.

Additional case studies of other sanctuary cities are recommended. Moreover, the selection of these case studies should include cities that span different stages of the process of a sanctuary city evolving into a pro-immigrant city. Work in this vein is likely to supplement the findings presented here while revealing more about the development and evolution of sanctuary cities. Questions remain regarding the trajectories of sanctuary cities and the contextual factors that precipitate policy decisions and changes.

Another opportunity for comparative analyses includes expanding this current study to include other immigrant-receiving Western societies. Sanctuary city policies embody local attitudes of federal decisions on immigration. While most Western societies have similar channels for immigration that include employment-based immigration, family reunification, and humanitarian-based immigration, cultural and political differences shape the type of policies that are implemented. These policies ultimately affect the contexts of reception as well as public perceptions of immigrants and immigration. In the U.S., the discourse on immigration is deeply racialized with certain groups framed through a stigmatizing and criminalizing lens (Abrego et al. 2017; Armenta 2016; Massey 2007). This has informed the creation of immigration laws that are restrictive and hostile which has prompted local jurisdictions to respond. In comparison to other advanced industrialized nations, the U.S. government devotes considerably little resources to aid immigrant integration and encourage naturalization (Bloemraad 2002). This translates into lower rates of economic, social, and political participation in mainstream institutions as citizenship is often a basic criterion for entry.

In Canada and many countries in Europe, sanctuary cities exist but there is little relation to the role of local law enforcement agencies (Bauder 2016). Instead, in Canadian sanctuary cities, sanctuary cities are about promoting access to local services while in European cities, sanctuary cities are more educational and oriented towards raising awareness about the refugee experience (Squire and Bagelman 2012; Bauder 2016). A comparative analysis that incorporates international perspectives will provide insight into the grassroots process of building sanctuary cities. I suspect that despite apparent differences visible in the objectives of sanctuary cities themselves, there are many similarities that will be uncovered pertaining to the processes of

negotiation between residents and local governments, the creative strategies adopted by local agencies to support immigrants, and the broader motivations to facilitate immigrant integration.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this dissertation, I presented four analyses examining sanctuary city policies at the municipal level. Specific attention was placed on identifying the nuances in local orientations to immigration enforcement as well as the intended outcomes that motivated policy development and implementation. A case study of Seattle was also presented to more closely understand how policy makers and service providers in a well-known and established sanctuary city attached meaning to the label "Welcoming City" and the implications this has for resource distribution, civic engagement, and advocacy.

With over four decades of presence in the United States, sanctuary cities are a fascinating area of study that is beginning to gain traction among sociologists. To the best of my knowledge, this dissertation is the first major study within the discipline to present in-depth and comprehensive analyses of sanctuary city policies in the U.S. that moves beyond public safety and crime as key outcome variables. The findings from this study offered new insights on the role of cities in facilitating pro-immigrant spaces and broadened existing perspectives on sanctuary cities to incorporate immigrant integration as an outcome. Sociologists have been at the forefront of studying immigration and it is my hope that this study has introduced new ideas to aid current understandings on contexts of receptions, citizenship, and immigrant assimilation, and inspired new approaches to how sanctuary cities are researched and analyzed.

REFERENCES

Aboii, Sheyda M. 2016. "Undocumented Immigrants and the Inclusive Health Polices of Sanctuary Cities." *Harvard Public Health Review* 9: 1 – 10.

Abrego, Leisy J. 2011. "Legal Consciousness of Undocumented Latinos: Fear and Stigma as Barriers to Claims-Making for First- and 1.5-Generation Immigrants." *Law and Society Review* 45(2): 337 – 369.

Abrego, Leisy, Mat Coleman, Daniel E. Martínez, Cecilia Menjívar, Jeremy Slack. 2018. "Making Immigrants into Criminals: Legal Processes of Criminalization in the Post-IIRIRA Era." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5(3): 694 – 715.

Adelman, Robert M., Lesley Williams Reid, Gail Markle, Saskia Weiss, and Charles Jaret. 2017. "Urban Crime Rates and the Changing Face of Immigration: Evidence across Four Decades." *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 15: 52 – 77.

Agustín, Óscar García, and Martin Bak Jørgensen. 2019. "Solidarity Cities and Cosmopolitanism from Below: Barcelona as a Refugee City." *Social Inclusion* 7(2): 198 – 207.

Akresh, Ilana Redstone, Douglas S. Massey, and Reanne Frank. 2014. "Beyond English Proficiency: Rethinking Immigrant Integration." *Social Science Research* 45: 200 – 210.

Andrews, Abigail L. 2017. "Moralizing Regulation: The Implications of Policing "Good" versus "Bad" Immigrants." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41(14): 2485 – 2503.

Aranda, Elizabeth, and Elizabeth Vaquera. 2015. "Racism, the Immigration Enforcement Regime and the Implications for Racial Inequality in the Lives of Undocumened Young Adults." Sociology of Race and Ethnicity. 1(1): 88 – 104.

Armenta, Amada, and Isabela Alvarez. 2017. "Policing Immigrants or Policing Immigration? Understanding Local Law Enforcement Participation in Immigration Control." *Sociology Compass* 11: 1- 10.

Armenta, Amada. 2016. "Racializing Crimmigration: Structural Racism, Colorblindness, and the Institutional Production of Immigrant Criminality." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 3(1): 82 – 95.

Arnold, Carrie L. 2007. "Racial Profiling in Immigration Enforcement: State and Local Agreements to Enforce Federal Immigration Law." *Arizona Law Review* 49(1): 113 – 142.

Arriaga, Felicia. 2016. "Understanding Crimmigration: Implications for Racial and Ethnic Minorities Within the United States." *Sociology compass* 10(9): 805 – 812.

Asad, Asad L. 2020. "Latinos' Deportation Fears by Citizenship and Legal Status, 2007 – 2018." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 117(16): 8836 – 8844.

Ashford, Grace. 2022. "Noncitizens Right to Vote Becomes Law in NYC." Retrieved May 25, 2022. (https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/09/nyregion/noncitizens-nyc-voting-rights.html).

Aspen Law 2017. "Sanctuary Cities." Retrieved February 18, 2021. (http://www.apsanlaw.com/law-246.list-of-sanctuary-cities.html).

Austin, Michael J. 2003. "The Changing Relationship Between Nonprofit Organizations and Public Social Service Agencies in the Era of Welfare Reform." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32(1): 97 – 114.

Avila, Krsna, Kemi Bello, Lena Graber, and Nikki Marquez. 2018. "The Rise of Sanctuary: Getting Local Officers Out of the Business of Deportations in the Trump Era." *Immigrant Legal Resource Center*. Retrieved September 22, 2018. (https://www.ilrc.org/sites/default/files/resources/rise_of_sanctuary-lg-20180201.pdf).

Barnett, Erica C. 2014. "Harrell's Committee Debates Municipal ID." *Seattle Met*. Retrieved April 22, 2020. (https://www.seattlemet.com/news-and-city-life/2014/07/harrells-committee-debates-municipal-id-july-2014).

Barrick, Kelle. 2012. "Latino Confidence in the Police: The Role of Immigration Enforcement, Assimilation, and Immigration Status." *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 12(4): 289 – 307.

Batalova, Jeanne, and Jie Zong. 2016. "Language Diversity and English Proficiency in the United States." *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved September 13, 2019. (https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/language-diversity-and-english-proficiency-united-states-2015).

Bauböck, Rainer and John Rundell. 1998. *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bauböck, Rainer. 2003. "Reinventing Urban Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 7(2): 139 – 160.

Bauder, Harald. 2016. "Sanctuary Cities: Policies and Practices in International Perspective." *International Migration* 55(2):174 – 187.

Bauder, Harald. 2017. *Migration Borders Freedom*. London, England: Routledge.

Bauder, Harold. 2020. "Urban Citizenship: A Path to Migrant Inclusion." *Retrieved February 21, 2021*. (https://verfassungsblog.de/urban-citizenship-a-path-to-migrant-inclusion/).

Beaman, Jean. 2016. "Citizenship as Cultural: Towards a Theory of Cultural Citizenship." *Sociology Compass* 10: 849 – 857.

Becerra, David, M. Alex Wagaman, David Androff, Jill Messing, and Jason Castillo. 2016. "Policing Immigrants: Fear of Deportations and Perceptions of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice." *Journal of Social Work* 17(6): 715 – 731.

Beck, Kevin and Karina Shklyan. 2021. "Civic Engagement, Legal Status, and the Context of Reception: Participation in Voluntary Associations among Undocumented Immigrants in California." *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 7: 1 – 16.

Beekman, Daniel. 2016. "What does it mean for Seattle to be a Sanctuary City for immigrants?" *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved April 5, 2019. (https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/qa-whats-it-mean-for-seattle-to-be-a-sanctuary-city-for-immigrants/).

Berk, Marc L. and Claudia L. Schur. 2001. "The Effect of Fear on Access to Care Among Undocumented Latino Immigrants." *Journal of Immigrant Health* 3: 151 – 156.

Bialik, Kristen. 2018. "ICE Arrests Went Up in 2017, with Biggest Increases in Florida, Northern Texas, Oklahoma." Retrieved February 12, 2022. (https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/02/08/ice-arrests-went-up-in-2017-with-biggest-increases-in-florida-northern-texas-oklahoma/).

Bleakley, Hoyt and Aimee Chin. 2010. "Age at Arrival, English Proficiency, and Social Assimilation Among U.S. Immigrants." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 2(1): 165 – 192.

Bloch, Alice and Sonia McKay. 2016. *Living on the Margins: Undocumented Migrants in a Global City*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bloemraad, Irene, Anna Korteweg, and Gökçe Yurdakul. 2008. "Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 153 – 179.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2002. ''The North American Naturalization Gap: An Institutional Approach to Citizenship Acquisition in the United States and Canada.'' *International Migration Review* 36(1):193–228.

Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bosniak, Linda. 2007. "Varieties of Citizenship." *Fordham Law Review* 75(5): 2449 – 2453.

Boyd, Monica. 2009. "Official Language Proficiency and the Civic Participation of Immigrants." *Metropolis Language Matters Symposium*. Retrieved February 3, 2022. (https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.530.3254&rep=rep1&type=pdf).

Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2002. "Government-nonprofit partnership: a defining framework." *Public Administration and Development* 22(1): 19 – 30.

Brown, Nadia E. 2014. "Political Participation of Women of Color: An Intersectional Analysis." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 35(4): 315 – 348.

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. "Citizenship as Social Closure" Pp. 21 – 34 in *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany,* edited by Rogers Brubaker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Calavita, Kitty. 1998. "Immigration, Law, and Marginalization in a Global Economy: Notes from Spain." *Law and Society Review* 32(3): 529 – 566.

Capps, Randolph, Leighton Ku, Michael E. Fix, Chris Furgiuele, Jeffrey S. Passel, Rajeev Ramchand, Scott McNiven, and Dan Perez-Lopez. 2002. "How Are Immigrants Faring After Welfare Reform? Preliminary Evidence from Los Angeles and New York City." Retrieved January 24, 2021. (https://www.urban.org/research/publication/how-are-immigrants-faring-after-welfare-reform).

Capps, Randy, Muzaffar Christi, Julia Gelatt, Jessica Bolter, and Ariel G. Ruiz Soto. 2018. "Revving Up the Deportation Machinery: Enforcement Under Trump and the Pushback." Retrieved April 24, 2021. (https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/revving-deportation-machinery-under-trump-and-pushback).

Carliner, Geoffrey. 2000. "The Language Ability of U.S. immigrants: Assimilation and Cohort Effects." *International Migration Review* 34(1): 158 – 182.

Chauvin, Sébastien and Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas. 2012. "Beyond Informal Citizenship: The New Moral Economy of Migrant Illegality." *International Political Sociology* 6(3): 241 – 259.

Chinchilla, Norma Stoltz, Nora Hamilton, and James Louky. 2009. "The Sanctuary Movement and Central American Activism in Los Angeles." *Latin American Perspectives* 36(6): 101 – 126.

Chowdhury, Fariah. 2010. "Building Sanctuary City." Retrieved April 4, 2021. (https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/11-noii-sanctuary-city/).

CIS. 2021. "Map: Sanctuary Cities, Counties, and States." Retrieved January 3, 2022. (https://cis.org/Map-Sanctuary-Cities-Counties-and-States).

City of Chicago. 2022. "About the CityKey." Retrieved March 27, 2022. (https://www.chicityclerk.com/chicagocitykey/about).

City of Seattle. 2020. "Why the City of Seattle Prioritizes Language Access." Retrieved March 24, 2022. (https://www.seattle.gov/iandraffairs/LA).

City of Seattle. 2021. "Frequently Asked Questions about Local City-Level Immigration Policies." Retrieved March 12, 2022. (https://www.seattle.gov/iandraffairs/issues-and-policies/seattle-immigration-policy-faq#11.dontcitieswiththesedontaskpolicieshavehighercrimerates).

Colbern, Allan, Melanie Amoroso-Pohl, and Courtney Gutiérrez. 2019. "Contextualizing Sanctuary Policy Development in the United States: Conceptual and Constitutional Underpinnings, 1970 to 2018." *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 46(3): 489 – 547.

Coleman, Mathew. 2007. "Immigration Geopolitics Beyond the Mexico-U.S. Border." *Antipode* 39(1): 54 – 76.

Coleman, Mathew. 2012. "The 'Local' Migration State: The Site-specific Devolution of Immigration Enforcement in the U.S. South." *Law & Policy* 34(2): 159 – 190.

Collingwood, Loren and Benjamin Gonzlez O'Brien. 2019. *Sanctuary Cities: The Politics of Refuge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Correia, Mark E. 2010. "Determinants of Attitudes Toward Police of Latino Immigrants and Non-Immigrants." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38(1): 99 – 107.

Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2011. "Falling Outside: Excavating the History of central American Asylum Seekers." *Law & Social Inquiry* 36(3): 569 – 596.

Culver, Leigh. 2004. "The Impact of New Immigration Patterns on the Provision of Police Services in Midwestern Communities." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 32(4): 329 – 344.

Curry, Sarah, Kendra Anderson, Angelina Snodgrass Godoy, Carolyn Pinedo-Turnovsky. 2012. "The Growing Human Rights Crisis Along Washington's Northern Border." *One America*: 1 – 54.

Darling, Jonathan and Harald Bauder. 2019. *Sanctuary Cities and Urban Struggles: Rescaling Migration, Citizenship, and Rights*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press

Davies, Garth, and Jeffrey Fagan. 2016. "Crime and Enforcement in Immigrant Neighborhoods: Evidence from New York City." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641(1): 99 – 124.

Davis, Martha F. 2020. "The Limits of Local Sanctuary Initiatives for Immigrants." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 690(1): 100 – 116.

Davis, William E. 1985. "Language and the Justice System: Problems and Issues." *The Justice System Journal* 10(3): 353 – 364.

de Graauw, Els. 2014. "Municipal ID Cards for Undocumented Immigrants: Local Bureaucratic Membership in a Federal System." *Politics and Society* 42(3): 309 – 330.

de Graauw, Els and Floris Vermeulen. 2020. "Local Context and Immigrant Bureaucratic Incorporation: Insights from Amsterdam and New York City." *Journal of ethnic and Migration Studies* (OnlineFirst).

de Graauw, Els. 2021. "City Government Activists and the Rights of Undocumented Immigrants: Fostering Urban Citizenship within the Confines of US Federalism." *Antipode* 53(2): 379 – 398.

Department of Justice. 2002. "Attorney General Prepared Remarks on the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System." Retrieved December 4, 2018. (https://www.justice.gov/archive/ag/speeches/2002/060502agpreparedremarks.htm).

Department of Homeland Security. 2010. "Yearbook of Immigration Statistics." Retrieved April 7, 2020. (https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/yearbook/2010/ois_yb_2010.pdf).

Derrida, Jacques. 2000. "Hospitality." *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 5 (3): 3–18.

DHS. 2018. "To Make America Safe Again, We Must End Sanctuary Cities and Remove Criminal Aliens." Retrieved March 4, 2020. (https://www.dhs.gov/news/2018/02/15/make-america-safe-again-we-must-end-sanctuary-cities-and-remove-criminal-aliens).

Dinan, Stephen. 2018. "Half of all Americans now live in 'sanctuaries' protecting immigrants." *The Washington Times*. Retrieved February 20, 2022. (https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2018/may/10/half-of-americans-now-live-in-sanctuaries/)

Ellis, Mark and Gunnar Almgren. 2009. "Local Contexts of Immigrant and Second-Generation Integration in the United States." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(7): 1059 – 1076.

Enriquez, Laura E. and Abigail C. Saguy. 2016. "Coming Out of the Shadows: Harnessing a cultural Schema to Advance the Undocumented Immigrant Youth Movement." *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 4: 107 – 130.

Ewing, Walter A., Daniel Martinez, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2015. "The Criminalization of Immigration in the United States." *American Immigration Council:* 1 – 25.

Executive Office of the President. 2017. "Executive Order 13767." Retrieved July 18, 2019. (https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/30/2017-02095/border-security-and-immigration-enforcement-improvements).

Executive Office of the President. 2017. "Executive Order 13768: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States." Retrieved March 13, 2019. *(https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/30/2017-02102/enhancing-public-safety-in-the-interior-of-the-united-states).*

Far USA. 2022. "10 of the Largest Sanctuary Cities in the United States." Retrieved January 24, 2022. (https://www.fairus.org/issue/sanctuary-policies/10-largest-sanctuary-cities-united-states).

Gallup. 2017. “Immigration.” Retrieved August 7, 2019. (https://news.gallup.com/poll/1660/immigration.aspx).

García, Angela S. 2019. *Legal Passing: Navigating Undocumented Life and Local Immigration Law*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

García, Hernández and Cesar Cuautemoc. 2015. *Crimmigration Law*. Chicago: American Bar Association

García, San Juanita. 2018. “Living a Deportation Threat: Anticipatory Stressors Confronted by Undocumented Mexican Immigrant Women.” *Race and Social Problems* 10: 221 – 234.

Gebhardt, Dirk. 2016. “When the State Takes Over: Civic Integration Programmes and the Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(5): 742 – 758.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2002. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2010. “Constructing Citizenship: Exclusion, Subordination, and Resistance.” *American Sociological Review* 76(1): 1 – 24.

Gómez Cervantes, Andrea and Cecilia Menjívar. 2020. “Legal Violence, Health, and Access to Care: Latina Immigrants in Rural Urban Kansas.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 61(3): 307 – 323.

Goodman, Adam. 2020. The Deportation Machine: America’s Long History of Expelling Immigrants. *Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press*.

Gorman, Steve. 2017. “L.A. Police See Drop in Latino Reports of Crime Amid Deportation Fears.” Retrieved April 3, 2022. (https://www.reuters.com/article/us-californiaimmigration/l-a-police-see-drop-in-Hispanic-reports-of-crime-amid-deportation-fearsidUSKBN16T07O).

Greener, Ian. 2002. “Understanding NHS Reform: The Policy-Transfer, Social Learning, and Path-Dependency Perspectives.” *Governance* 15(2): 161 – 183.

Gzesh, Susan. 2006. “Central Americans and Asylum Policy in the Reagan Era.” *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved March 13, 2019. (https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/central-americans-and-asylum-policy-reagan-era).

Haung, Xi, and Cathy Yang Liu. 2016. “Welcoming Cities: Immigration Policy at the Local Government Level.” *Urban Affairs Review* 54(1): 3 – 32.

Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Heywood, Andrew. 1994. *Political Ideas and Concepts. An Introduction*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Houston, Serin. 2019. "Conceptualizing Sanctuary as a Process in the United States." *Geographical Review* 109(4): 562 – 579.

Huntington, Clare. 2008. "The Constitutional Dimension of Immigration Federalism." *Vanderbilt Law Review* 61(3): 787 – 853.

Huszti-Orbán, Krisztina and Fionnuala Ní Aoláin. 2020. "Use of Biometric Data to Identify Terrorists: Best Practice or Risky Business." Retrieved April 24, 2021. (https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Terrorism/Use-Biometric-Data-Report.pdf).

ICE. 2020. "New York's Sanctuary City Policy Leads to Increased ICE Activity, Dozens of Arrests Throughout Metropolitan Area." Retrieved April 24, 2021. (https://www.ice.gov/news/releases/new-yorks-sanctuary-city-policy-leads-increased-ice-activity-dozens-arrests).

ICE. 2021. "Secure Communities." Retrieved April 20, 2022. (https://www.ice.gov/secure-communities).

Isin, Engin F. and Greg M. Nielsen. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jacobson, David. 1996. *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

Janowitz, Morris. 1980. "Observations on the Sociology of Citizenship: Obligations and Rights." *Social Forces* 59(1): 1 – 24.

Johnson, Krista. 2012. "Access for All? Struggles Over Citizenship and Social Policy." *Canadian Woman Studies* 29(3): 124 – 137.

Jones-Correa, Michael. 2005. "Bringing Outsiders In: Questions of Immigrant Incorporation." Pp. 75 – 101 in *The Politics of Democratic Inclusion,* edited by R.E. Hero and C. Wolbrecht. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kagan, Michael. 2018. "What We Talk About When We Talk About Sanctuary Cities." *Scholarly Works:* 391 – 406.

Kalir, Barak. 2010. *Latino Migrants in the Jewish State: Undocumented Lives in Israel*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kanstroom, Daniel. 2004. "Criminalizing the Undocumented: Ironic Boundaries of the Post-September 11th 'Pale of Law'." *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation* 29: 639 – 670.

Kaplan, Larry. 2017. "States' Approach to Sanctuary Cities Hits Nonprofits Serving Undocumented Populations." *Nonprofit Quarterly*. Retrieved April 2, 2021. (https://nonprofitquarterly.org/states-approach-sanctuary-cities-hits-nonprofits-serving-undocumented-populations/).

Kaufmann, David. 2019. "Comparing Urban Citizenship, Sanctuary Cities, Local Bureaucratic Membership, and Regularizations." *Public Administration Review* 79(3): 443 – 446.

Kaur, Harmeet. 2020. "Small Towns in Texas are Declaring Themselves 'Sanctuary Cities for the Unborn.'" Retrieved April 7, 2021. (https://www.cnn.com/2020/01/25/us/sanctuary-cities-for-unborn-anti-abortion-texas-trnd/index.html).

Kerwin, Donald. 2018. "From IIRIRA to Trump: Connecting the Dots to the Current US Immigration Policy Crisis." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 6(3): 192 – 204.

Keung, Nicholas. 2015. "Toronto Police Urged to Stop Immigration 'Status Checks'." *The Toronto Star*, November 24. Retrieved September 22, 2018. (https://www.thestar.com/news/investigations/2015/11/24/toronto-police-urged-to-stop-immigration-status-checks.html).

King County Gov. 2015. "Past Elections." Retrieved January 13, 2022. (https://kingcounty.gov/depts/elections/elections/past-elections.aspx).

King, Kendall A. and Gemma Punti. 2012. "On the Margins: Undocumented students' Narrated Experiences of (Il)legality." *Linguistics and Education* 23(3): 235 – 249.

Kittrie, Orde F. 2006. "Federalism, Deportation, and Crime Victims Afraid to Call the Police." *Iowa Law Review* 91: 1449 – 1508.

Klingbeil, Annalise. 2917. "Sanctuary City Movement 'Very Symbolic,' But Light On Meaning: Nenshi." Retrieved September 3, 2021. (https://edmontonjournal.com/news/local-news/sanctuary-city-movement-very-symbolic-but-light-on-meaning-nenshi).

Kotin, Stepahnie, Grace R. Dyrness, and Clara Irazábal. 2011. "Immigration and Integration: Religious and Political Activism for/with Immigrants in Los Angeles." *Progress in Development Studies* 11(4): 263 – 284.

Kraehenbuehl, James A. 2011. "Lessons from the Past: How the Antebellum Fugitive Slave Debate Informs State Enforcement of Federal Immigration Law." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 78(4): 1465 – 1502.

Krauthamer, Barbara. 2017. "Before Sanctuary Cities, Here's How Black Americans Protected Fugitive Slaves." Retrieved December 4, 2018. (https://theconversation.com/before-sanctuary-cities-heres-how-black-americans-protected-fugitive-slaves-72048).

Ku, Leighton and Brian Bruen. 2013. "The Use of Public Assistance Benefits by Citizens and Non-Citizen Immigrants in the United States. *CATO Institute*. Retrieved November 5

2020. (https://www.cato.org/publications/working-paper/use-public-assistance-benefits-citizens-non-citizen-immigrants-united).

Kubrin, Charis E. and Bradley J. Bartos. 2020. "Sanctuary Status and Crime in California: What's the Connection?" *Justice Evaluation Journal* 3(2): 115 – 133.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Hiromi Ishizawa. 2012. "Why Some Immigrant Neighborhoods are Safer than Others: Divergent Findings from Los Angeles and Chicago." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641(1): 148 – 173.

Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. 2022. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167 – 195.

Landgrave, Michelangelo. 2019. "Immigrants Learn English: Immigrants' Language Acquisition Rates by Country of Origin and Demographics Since 1990." *CATO Institute*. Retrieved February 20, 2021. (https://www.cato.org/publications/immigration-research-policy-brief/immigrants-learn-english-immigrants-language).

Le, Anh T. 2000. "The Determinants of Immigrant Self-Employment in Australia." *International Migration Review* 34(1):183–214

Lee, Jasmine C., Rudy Omri, and Julia Preston. 2017. "What are Sanctuary Cities?" *The New York Times*. Retrieved September 3, 2019. (http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/09/02/us/sanctuary-cities.html).

Lewis, Paul G. and S. Karthick Ramakrishnan. 2007. "Police Practices in Immigrant-Destination Cities: Political Control or Bureaucratic Profssionalism?" *Urban Affairs Review* 42(6): 874 – 900.

Lewis, Paul, Doris Marie Provine, Monica W. Varsanyi, and Scott Decker. 2013. "Why Do (Some) City Police Departments Enforce Federal Immigration Law? Political, Demographic, and Organizational Influences on Local Choices." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 23(1): 1 – 25.

Liebert, Roland. 1974. "Municipal Functions, Structures, and Expenditures: A Reanalysis of Recent Research." *Social Science Quarterly* 54:765-83.

Lippert, Randy K. 2005. *Sanctuary, Sovereignty, Sacrifice: Canadian Sanctuary Incidents, Power and Law*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Łukasiewicz, Karolina, Tanzilya Oren, and Saumya Tripathi. 2021. "Local Welfare System Response to Refugees: Between Innovations, Efficiency, and Creating Unequal Opportunities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1 – 21.

Lustiger-Thaler, Henri. 1993. "Social Citizenship and Urban Citizenship: The Composition of Local Practices." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 2(2): 115 – 129.

Lyons, Christopher J., María B. Vélez, Wayne A. Santoro. 2013. "Neighborhood Immigration, Violence, and City-Level Immigrant Political Opportunities." *American Sociological Review* 78(4): 604 – 632.

Marrow, Helen B. 2009. "Immigrant Bureaucratic Incorporation: The Dual Roles of Professional Missions and Government Policies." *American Sociological Review* 74(5): 756 – 776.

Marshall, Thomas H. 1949. *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays*. Cambridge, England: University Press.

Marshall, Thomas H. 1977. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Martínez-Schuldt, Ricardo D., and Daniel E. Martínez. 2017. "Sanctuary Policies and City-Level Incidents of Violence, 1990 to 2010." *Justice Quarterly* 1- 28.

Martínez-Schuldt, Ricardo D., and Daniel E. Martínez. 2021. "Immigrant Sanctuary Policies and Crime-Reporting Behavior: A Multi-level Analysis of reports of Crime Victimization to Law Enforcement, 1980 to 2004." *American Sociological Review* 86(1): 154 – 185.

Martinez, Ramiro Jr., and Jacob I. Stowell. 2012. "Extending Immigration and Crime Studies: National Implications and Local Settings." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641(1): 174 – 191.

Massey, Douglas. 2007. *Categorically Unequal*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Maya, Theodore W. 2002. "To Serve and Protect or to Betray and Neglect: The LAPD and Undocumented Immigrants." *UCLA Law Review* 49(5): 1611 – 1654.

Menjívar, Cecilia and Olivia Salcido. 2002. "Immigrant Women and Domestic Violence: Common Experiences in Different Countries." *Gender and Society* 16(6): 898 – 920.

Menjívar, Cecilia and Cynthia Bejarano. 2004. "Latino Immigrants' Perceptions of Crime and Polie Authorities in the Untied States: A Case Study from the Phoenix Metropolitan Area." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(1): 120 – 148

Menjívar, Cecilia and Leisy J. Abrego. 2012. "Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(5): 1380 – 1421.

Menjívar, Cecilia, Andrea Gómez Cervantes, Daniel Alvord. 2018. "The expansion of "crimmigration," mass detention, and deportation." *Sociology Compass* 12(4): 1 – 15.

Menjívar, Cecilia. 2006. "Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(4): 999–1037.

Mofette, David., and Jennifer Ridgley. 2018. "Sanctuary City Organizing in Canada: From Hospitality to Solidarity." *Migration and Society* (1): 147 – 155.

Nam, Yunju, and Wooksoo Kim. 2018. "Welfare Reform and Elderly Immigrants' Naturalization: Access to Public Benefits as an Incentive for Naturalization in the United States." *International Migration Review* 46(3): 656 – 679.

National Immigration Law Center. 2008. "Laws, Resolutions, and Policies Instituted Across the U.S. Limiting Enforcement of Immigration Laws by State and Local Authorities." Retrieved March 2, 2017. (https://www.ailadownloads.org/advo/NILC-LocalLawsResolutionsAndPoliciesLimitingImmEnforcement.pdf).

National Immigration Law Center. 2011. "DHS's "Secure Comunities": No Rules of the Road." Retrieved January 8, 2021. (https://www.nilc.org/issues/immigration-enforcement/scomm-no-rules-of-road-2011-03-0/),

Nguyen, Mai Thi and Hanna Gill. 2015. "Interior Immigration Enforcement: The Impacts of Expanding Local Law Enforcement Authority." *Urban Studies* 53(2): 302 – 323.

NYC.gov. 2022. "About IDNYC." Retrieved September 2021. (https://www1.nyc.gov/site/idnyc/about/about.page).

O'Brien, Benjamin G., Loren Collingwood, and Stephen Omar El-Khatib. 2017. "The Politics of Refuge: Sanctuary Cities, Crime, and Undocumented Immigration." *Urban Affairs Review* 55(1): 3 – 40.

Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs. 2016. "Seattle's Immigrants and Refugees." Retrieved October 8, 2021. (https://www.immigrationresearch.org/system/files/OIRA_DataSnapshot.pdf).

OJJPAC. 2021. "The Original List of Sanctuary Cities, USA." Retrieved December 12, 2021. (http://www.ojjpac.org/sanctuary.asp).

Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants. 2012. "Making Ontario Home." Retrieved March 4, 2021. (https://ocasi.org/downloads/OCASI_MOH_ENGLISH.pdf).

Paik, A Naomi. 2017. "Abolitionist Futures and the U.S. Sanctuary Movement." *Race and Class* 59(2): 3 – 25.

Passel, Jeffrey. 2002. "New Estimates of the Undocumented Population in the United States." *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved April 7, 2020. (https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/new-estimates-undocumented-population-united-states).

Pew Hispanic Center. 2007. "2007 National Survey of Latinos: As Illegal Immigration Issue Heats Up, Hispanics Feel a Chill." Retrieved February 22, 2021. (https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2007/12/13/2007-national-survey-of-latinos-as-illegal-immigration-issue-heats-up-hispanics-feel-a-chill/).

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review*94(2): 251 – 267.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74 – 96.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2014. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:1–24.

Purcell, Mark. 2003. "Citizenship and the Right to the Global City: Reimagining the Capitalist World Order." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27(3): 564 – 590.

Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowing Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick and Celia Viramontes. 2010. "Civic Spaces: Mexican Hometown Associations and Immigrant Participation." *Journal of Social Issues* 66(1): 155 – 173.

Rambo, K. 2017. "Iowa City Declined Detainer Outcome Report 2/11 – 2/17." *Iowa State Daily*. Retrieved April 22, 2020. (https://www.iowastatedaily.com/iowa-city-declined-detainer-outcome-report-2-11-2-17/image_ebcd33a6-b299-11e7-becb-47de7753684e.html).

Ridgley, Jennifer. 2008. "Cities of Refuge: Immigration Enforcement, Police, and the Insurgent Genealogies of Citizenship in U.S. Sanctuary Cities." *Urban Geography* 29(1): 53 – 77.

Ridgley, Jennifer. 2011. "Refuge, Refusal, and Acts of Holy Contagion: The City as a Sanctuary for Soldiers Resisting the Vietnam War." *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 10(2): 189 – 214.

Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L. 1990. "English Language Proficiency and the Economic Progress of Immigrants." *Economic Letters* 34(3): 295 – 300.

Robinson, Matt. 2016. "City of Vancouver Grants Access without Fear." *Vancouver Sun,* April 6. Retrieved September 22, 2018. (https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/vancouver-considers-access-without-fear).

Roche, Kathleen M., Elizabeth Vaquera, Rebecca M.B. White, and Maria Ivonne Rivera. 2018. "Impacts of Immigration Actions and News and the Psychological Distress of US Latino Parents Raising Adolescents." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 62(5): 525 – 531.

Romero, Mary and Marwah Serag. 2005. "Violation of Latino Civil Rights Resulting from INS and Local Police's Use of Race, Culture and Class Profiling: The Case of the Chandler Roundup in Arizona." *Cleveland State Law Review* 52(1): 75 – 96.

Roy, Ananya. 2019. "The City in the Age of Trumpism: From Sanctuary to Abolition." *Society and Space* 37(5): 761 – 778.

Rytina, Nancy. 2002. "IRCA Legalization Effects: Lawful Permanent Residence and naturalization through 2001." Retrieved January 24, 2021. (https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/IRCA_Legalization_Effects_2002.pdf).

Salamon, Lester M. 2002. *The State of Nonprofit America*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Sampson, Robert J. 2008. "Rethinking Crime and Immigration." *Contexts* 7(1): 28 – 33.

Shi, Leiyu, Lydia A. Lebrun, and Jenna Tsai. 2009. "The Influence of English Proficiency on Access to Care." *Ethnicity and Health* 14(6): 625 – 642.

Shoemaker, Kevin T. 2013. "Sanctuary for Crime in the Early Common Law." Pp. 15 – 27 in *Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship, and Social Movements*. Abingdon. UK, Routledge.

Spencer, Sarah and Nicola Delvino. 2019. "Municipal Activism on Irregular Migrants: The Framing of Inclusive Approaches at the Local Level." *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 17(1): 27 – 43.

Spiro, Peter J. 1997. "Learning to Live with Immigration Federalism." *Connecticut Law Review* 29: 1627 – 1646.

SPLC. 2021. "Popular Among Antigovernment Extremists, 'Second Amendment Sanctuary' Resolutions Pose Risks." Retrieved April 7, 2021. (https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2021/04/05/popular-among-antigovernment-extremists-second-amendment-sanctuary-resolutions-pose-risks?gclid=CjwKCAjwkYGVBhArEiwA4sZLuE52wHqvTevcVurXjKCp6-WV0UCIBqW37dmfgfhFak9jBRwSTUpMqxoCOcEQAvD_BwE).

Squire, Vicki and Jennifer Bagelman. 2012. "Taking not Waiting: Space, Temporality, and Politics in the City of Sanctuary Movement" Pp. 146 – 164 in *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement,* edited by Peter Nyers and Kim Rygiel. England, UK: Routledge.

Stuesse, Angela and Mathew Coleman. 2014. "Automobility, Immobility, Altermobility: Surviving and Resisting the Intensification of Immigrant Policing." *City and Society* 26(1): 51- 72.

Stumpf, Juliet P. 2006. "The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power." *American University Law Review* 56(2): 367 – 419.

Suárez, David F. and Hokyu Hwang. 2008. "Civic Engagement and Nonprofit Lobbying in California, 1998 – 2003." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37(1): 93 – 112.

Sullivan, Esther. 2021. "Becoming Visible in the Public Sphere: Mobile Home Park Residents' Political Engagement in City Council Hearings." *Qualitative Sociology* 44: 349 – 366.

Telles, Edward and Vilma Ortiz. 2009. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican-Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Theodore, Nik and Robert Habans. 2016. "Policing Immigrant Communities: Latino Perceptions of Police Involvement in Immigration Enforcement." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(6): 970 – 988.

Tilly, Charles. 1995. "Citizenship, Identity, and Social History." *International Review of History* 40(3): 1 – 17.

Toure, Madina. 2017. "City Assures Muslims It's 'Prepared' to Fight Trump's Sanctuary City Order." *Observer*. Retrieved online March 13, 2018. (https://observer.com/2017/02/city-assures-muslims-its-prepared-to-fight-trumps-sanctuary-city-order/).

Trudeau, Dan. 2008. "Junior Partner or Empowered Community? The Role of Non-Profit Social Service Providers Amidst state Restructuring in the U.S." *Urban Studies* 45(13): 2805 – 2827.

Trump White House Archives. 2018. "Remarks by President Trump on Combating the Opioid Crisis." Retrieved August 7, 2018. (https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-combatting-opioid-crisis/).

Trump White House Archives. 2018. "What You Need to Know About Sanctuary Cities." Retrieved April 5, 2019. (https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/need-know-sanctuary-cities/?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=wh).

Turner, Bryan S. 2001. "The Erosion of Citizenship." *The British Journal of Sociology* 52(2): 189 – 209.

United States Census Bureau. 2020. "QuickFacts Seattle City, Washington." Retrieved March 2, 2022. (https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/seattlecitywashington).

Varsanyi, Monica W. 2006. "Interrogating "Urban Citizenship" vis-à-vis Undocumented Migration." *Citizenship Studies* 10:2: 229 – 249.

Varsanyi, Monica W. 2008. "Immigration Policing through the Backdoor: City Ordinances, the "Right to the City," and the Exclusion of Undocumented Day Laborers." *Urban Geography* 29(1): 29 – 52.

Wald, Michael, William S. Koski, Jonathan Berry-Smith, Sarah Brim, Carolyn Hite, and Ray Li. 2017. "Protecting Undocumented and Vulnerable Students." Retrieved March 1, 2022. (https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/CCSA-YELP-SLS-Policy-Lab-Protecting-Undocumented-Students.pdf).

Walia, Harsha. 2014. "Sanctuary City from Below: dismantling the City of Vancouver." *The Mainlander*. Retrieved April 3, 2020. (https://themainlander.com/2014/06/02/sanctuary-city-from-below-dismantling-the-city-of-vancouver/).

Waslin, Michele. 2011. "The Secure Communities Program: Unanswered Questions and Continuing Concerns." Retrieved February 24, 2021. (https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/SComm_Exec_Summary_112911.pdf).

Weitzer, Ronald and Rod K. Brunson. 2015. "Policing Different Racial Groups in the United States." *Cahiers Politiestudies* 35(2): 129 – 145.

Welch, Michael. 2003. "Ironies of Social Control and the Criminalization of Immigrants." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 39(4): 319–337.s

Welcoming America. 2021. Retrieved February 24, 2021. (https://welcomingamerica.org/).

Wilson, Catherine E. 2013. "Collaboration of Nonprofit Organizations with Local Government for Immigrant Language Acquisition." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 42(5): 963 – 984.

Wishnie, Michael J. 2004. "State and Local Police Enforcement of Immigration Laws." *Faculty Scholarship Series*. Retrieved September 13, 2019. (https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/928/).

Wolch, Jennifer. 1999. "Decentering America's Nonprofit Sector: reflections on Salamon's Crises Analysis." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 10(1): 25 – 35.

Wong, Tom K. 2017. "The Effects of Sanctuary Policies on Crime and the Economy." *Center for American Progress*: 1 – 25.

Wong, Tom K., Karina Shklyan, Andrea Silva. 2022. "The Effect of Intergovernmental Policy Conflict on Immigrants' Behavior: Insights from a Survey Experiment in California." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 52(1): 107 – 132.

Wu, Yuning. 2010. "Immigrants' Perceptions of the Police." *Sociology Compass* 4(11): 924. 935.

Wuthnow, Robert. 2002. "Religious Involvement and Status-Bridging Social Capital." *Journal for the Scientific study of Religion* 41(4): 669 – 684.

Yasenov, Vasil, Michael Hotard, Duncan Lawrence, Jens Hainmueller, and David Laitin. 2019. "Standardizing the Fee-Waiver Application Increased Naturalization Rates of Low-Income Immigrants." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116(34): 16768 – 16772.

Yu, Stella M., Jennifer Huang, Renee H. Schwalberg, and Rebecca M. Nyman. 2006. "Parental English Proficiency and Children's Health Services Access." *American Journal of Public Health* 96: 1449 – 1455.

Zhou, Minn. 1992. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

APPENDIX A: List of Municipalities with Non-Enforcement and/or Non-Cooperation Policies

Municipality	State	Designation
Birmingham	AL	None
Tuskegee	AL	None
Anchorage	AK	None
Fairbanks	AK	None
Sitka	AK	None
Chandler	AZ	None
Mesa	AZ	None
Phoenix	AZ	None
South Tucson	AZ	None
Tucson	AZ	None
Alameda	CA	Sanctuary City
Albany	CA	Sanctuary City
Anaheim	CA	Welcoming City
Berkeley	CA	Sanctuary City
Cathedral City	CA	Sanctuary City
Chula Vista	CA	Welcoming City
Coachella	CA	Sanctuary City
Cudahy	CA	Sanctuary City
Culver City	CA	Sanctuary City
Daly City	CA	Sanctuary City
Davis	CA	Sanctuary City
East Palo Alto	CA	None
El Monte	CA	None
Emeryville	CA	Welcoming City
Fremont	CA	Sanctuary City
Fresno	CA	None
Garden Grove	CA	None
Glendale	CA	None
Hayward	CA	Sanctuary City
La Puente	CA	Sanctuary City
Long Beach	CA	None
Los Angeles	CA	Sanctuary City
Malibu	CA	None
National City	CA	Sanctuary City
Newark	CA	Welcoming City
Oakland	CA	Sanctuary City
Oxnard	CA	Sanctuary City
Palm Springs	CA	None
Pasadena	CA	Sanctuary City
Pomona	CA	None
Richmond	CA	Sanctuary City

Sacramento	CA	Sanctuary City
Salinas	CA	Welcoming City
San Carlos	CA	Welcoming City
San Diego	CA	None
San Francisco	CA	Sanctuary City
San Leandro	CA	Sanctuary City
San Jose	CA	None
San Pablo	CA	None
San Rafael	CA	None
Santa Ana	CA	Sanctuary City
Santa Cruz	CA	Sanctuary City
Santa Monica	CA	None
Santa Rosa	CA	None
Seaside	CA	Sanctuary City
Soledad	CA	Sanctuary City
Sonoma	CA	None
Stockton	CA	None
Union City	CA	Compassionate City
Watsonville	CA	Sanctuary City
West Hollywood	CA	Sanctuary City
Boulder	CO	Sanctuary City
Denver	CO	Welcoming City
Northglenn	CO	None
Hartford	CT	Sanctuary City
New Haven	CT	None
New London	CT	None
Windham	CT	None
Newark	DE	Welcoming City
Washington, D.C.		Sanctuary City
Key West	FL	None
Orlando	FL	None
St. Petersburg	FL	Sanctuary City
Atlanta	GA	Welcoming City
Clarkston	GA	None
Decatur	GA	Welcoming City
Honolulu	HI	Haven of Aloha
Boise	ID	Welcoming City
Carbondale	IL	Welcoming City
Chicago	IL	Sanctuary City
Evanston	IL	Welcoming City
Oak Park	IL	Welcoming Village
Urbana	IL	Sanctuary City
West Lafayette	IN	Machaseh for Immigrants
Ames	IA	None
Dodge City	KS	None
Lawrence	KS	None

Wichita	KS	None
Lexington	KY	None
Louisville	KY	None
New Orleans	LA	None
Portland	ME	None
Annapolis	MD	None
Baltimore	MD	Welcoming City
Gaithersburg	MD	None
Hyattsville	MD	None
Takoma Park	MD	Sanctuary City
Acton	MA	None
Arlington	MA	Sanctuary Town
Beverly	MA	None
Boston	MA	None
Cambridge	MA	Sanctuary City
Chelsea	MA	Sanctuary City
Framingham	MA	None
Greenfield	MA	None
Lawrence	MA	None
Lowell	MA	None
Northampton	MA	Sanctuary City
Somerville	MA	Sanctuary City
Ann Arbor	MI	None
Detroit	MI	Welcoming City
East Lansing	MI	None
Grand Rapids	MI	None
Hamtramck	MI	None
Huntington Woods	MI	Welcoming City
Lansing	MI	None
Royal Oak	MI	Welcoming City
Ypsilanti	MI	None
Brooklyn Park City	MN	None
Duluth	MN	None
Minneapolis	MN	Sanctuary City
Northfield	MN	None
Richfield	MN	None
St. Louis Park	MN	None
St. Paul	MN	Welcoming City
Jackson	MS	None
St. Louis	MO	None
Helena	MT	None
Elko	NV	None
Las Vegas	NV	None
Reno	NV	None
Silver City	NV	None
Deerfield	NH	None

Bloomfield	NJ	None
Camden	NJ	None
East Orange	NJ	Welcoming and Inclusive City
Hoboken	NJ	Welcoming City
Jersey City	NJ	Welcoming City
Livingston	NJ	Welcoming Community
Maplewood	NJ	Welcoming Community
Montclair	NJ	None
Newark	NJ	Sanctuary City
Princeton	NJ	None
Trenton	NJ	None
Albuquerque	NM	Immigrant-Friendly City
Farmington	NM	None
Santa Fe	NM	Welcoming City
Albany	NY	Welcoming City
Ithaca	NY	Sanctuary City
Kingston	NY	Welcoming City
New York City	NY	Sanctuary City
Rochester	NY	Sanctuary City
Syracuse	NY	None
Troy	NY	Sanctuary City
Asheville	NC	None
Carrboro	NC	None
Chapel Hill	NC	None
Charlotte	NC	None
Durham	NC	None
Fargo	ND	None
Cincinnati	OH	None
Cleveland	OH	Welcoming City
Columbus	OH	None
Dayton	OH	Immigrant-Friendly City
Oberlin	OH	None
Tulsa	OK	None
Ashland	OR	None
Beaverton	OR	Sanctuary City
Bend	OR	Welcoming City
Corvallis	OR	Sanctuary City
Forest Grove	OR	Sanctuary City
Gaston	OR	None
Hillsboro	OR	Sanctuary City
McMinnville	OR	Inclusive City
Portland	OR	Sanctuary City
Salem	OR	Sanctuary City
Talent	OR	None
Lancaster	PA	None
Philadelphia	PA	Sanctuary City

Pittsburgh	PA	None
York	PA	Welcoming City
Central Falls	RI	None
Providence	RI	None
Knoxville	TN	None
Austin	TX	Freedom City
Dallas	TX	None
El Paso	TX	None
Houston	TX	None
San Antonio	TX	None
Burlington	VT	Welcoming and Inclusive City
Colchester	VT	None
Middlebury	VT	None
Montpelier	VT	Sanctuary City
Williston	VT	None
Alexandria	VA	None
Richmond	VA	None
Bellingham	WA	Welcoming City
Bothell	WA	None
Burien	WA	None
Everett	WA	None
Issaquah	WA	None
Kirkland	WA	None
Lake Forest Park	WA	Compassionate City
Olympia	WA	Sanctuary City
Seattle	WA	Welcoming City
Snohomish	WA	Welcoming City
Spokane	WA	None
Madison	WI	Open and Welcoming City
Milwaukee	WI	None

APPENDIX B: Interview Protocol

1. Tell me about your job.
    a. Who is your employer?
    b. What is your position?
    c. How long have you served in this position?
    d. *(City of Seattle employees only)* What is your role as a civil servant?
2. What does your typical work day look like?
3. Who do you work with / serve as part of your work?
    a. What services do you provide to the residents of Seattle?
    b. what is the demographic makeup of the people who come in?
        i. age, gender, racial background, etc…
        ii. do you notice a particular demographic that you work with?
        iii. do you notice that certain services are associated with certain groups?
    c. How often do you interact with immigrants?
        i. How do you know (who is an immigrant)? Do they ever disclose their immigration status? How often does it happen?
        ii. What sort of identification do you ask for?
    d. Does citizenship or residency matter for accessing services?
        i. do you have a protocol for verifying one's status?
4. Seattle has been a "welcoming city" for a while now. Can you tell me what this means?
    a. Can you explain whether this makes Seattle a "sanctuary city"?
        i. *(if "no")* How important is this distinction?
        ii. What is the definition of a "sanctuary city"?
    b. Who benefits from sanctuary policies?
        i. (de*pending on answer*) are the people who 'benefit' aware of the SC policies, what they entail and/or how they help them? If not, is anything done to inform them of said policies?
    c. How have ordinances and resolutions that affirm Seattle as a "welcoming city" affected your job responsibilities?
        i. Would you say that these ordinances and resolutions have positively or negatively affected your work?
            1. when the policy was adopted/amended, was this info communicated to you, and if so, how was it conveyed?
            2. was there a sense of urgency or importance placed in you following through with the new protocols?
        ii. *(if applicable)* What are the consequences if you unintentionally or intentionally inquire about a resident's immigration status?
    d. How often do you interact with federal immigration law enforcement officers?
        i. walk me through what an interaction looks like (and/or) walk me through your most recent interaction?
        ii. Is there a procedure you are supposed to follow when interacting with immigration law enforcement?

5. What reservations, if any, do you have regarding the legality of Seattle's "welcoming city" status?
    a. (*depending how long they've been working at position*) have any of these opinions changed over time? If so, in what way?
    b. To what extent should the City of Seattle assist with enforcing federal immigration laws?
        i. What sort of immigration violations should take priority?
    c. What are some suggestions you have for the City of Seattle to help integrate immigrants into the community?
6. Based on your experience and observations as a public servant and resident of Seattle, how safe is the City of Seattle?
    a. Do you think Seattle is becoming more or less safe?
    b. What is your overall perception of the Seattle police department?

Ask where to send gift card
Remind participant to take post-interview survey

APPENDIX C: Codebook

1. **Document Attributes**
    a. **Document Type**
        i. **City/Municipal Documents** – Any municipal document that is the product of a municipal governing body.
            1. **Resolutions** – Any municipal document that is clearly labeled as a resolution.
            2. **Ordinances** – Any municipal document that is clearly labeled as an ordinance or an ordinance amendment.
            3. **Executive Orders** – Any municipal document that is clearly labeled as an executive order, usually issued by the mayor
            4. **Other** – Any municipal document that is the product of a municipal governing body or city staff but not labeled as a resolution, ordinance, or executive order. Examples includes passages contained in municipal codes, FAQ info-sheets, and reports.
        ii. **Media** –
            1. **Official city media** – Press releases or information published by the city. This includes information posted on the city's webpage and media advisories.
            2. **News media** – Articles published by news outlets.
        iii. **Police Documents** – Any document that is the product of police departments.
            1. **Procedure Manuals** – Any document produced by a police department that is clearly labeled as a manual, usually intended for law enforcement officers.
            2. **Police Directives** – Any document that is labeled as a "police directive" or "police special order". Typically, these are documents that are issued by the chief of police as a way of establishing interdepartmental communication on pressing matters.
            3. **Other** – Any document produced by a police department that does not fall under the category of "procedure manuals" or "police directives".
    b. **Year of Document** – Local sanctuary and pro-immigrant policies often respond to the broader immigrant-related sentiments that are present at the federal level. To this end, the documents analyzed are classified into four distinct periods to reflect changing attitudes on immigration and the immigrant groups affected.
        i. **Before 1990 –** Any document published before 1990. Throughout the 1980s, several local jurisdictions defied Immigration and Naturalization Services to support asylum seekers fleeing Central America.
        ii. **1990 - 2000 –** Any document published between 1990 and 2000. Throughout the 1990s, growing anti-immigrant sentiment lead to the

several pieces of legislation that prohibited immigrants, including those with permanent resident status, from accessing certain federally-funded resources. These changes contributed to the expansion of immigration enforcement to prioritize verification of citizenship and/or legal status. Undocumented immigrants and permanent residents alike were affected by these changes.

iii. **2001 – 2015** – Any document published between 2001 – 2015. This time frame was characterized by the war on terror which entrenched local and state police in immigration enforcement. People perceived to be of Middle Eastern descent were targeted by immigration enforcement efforts.

iv. **2016 – Present** – Any document published from 2016 onwards. This current time period reflects the anti-immigrant sentiments fueled by the Trump presidency and is characterized by efforts to ramp up deportation, separate families, and impose a Muslim ban.

2. **Compliance and Accountability** – Any discussion about how compliance with sanctuary or pro-immigrant policies will be enforced. This may also include discussions that outline procedures for documenting and reviewing situations in which city employees or members of the departments violate a sanctuary or pro-immigrant related policy (eg. Inquiring about immigration status when it is prohibited or denying service on the basis of immigration status).

    a. **Disciplinary action or dismissal** – Any reference to disciplinary action or dismissal as potential outcomes for personnel that do not comply with procedures outlined in sanctuary or pro-immigrant related documents.
    b. **Reporting** – Any reference to compiling annual reports or collecting data/statistics for review as a way of assessing effectiveness of policies or programs.
    c. **Training –** Any reference to training procedures and programs to ensure personnel are familiar with the procedures regarding sanctuary or pro-immigrant policies and programs. Training can be interpreted broadly to include education and the distribution of manuals.
    d. **Distribution of materials** – Any reference to the distribution of materials or information, including resolutions and ordinances, to municipal departments and staff members.

3. **Intended Outcomes** – This set of codes focus on the motivations and intended outcomes associated with sanctuary and pro-immigrant policies. Some policies and manuals may have more than one motivation or intended outcome.
    a. **Access Without Fear** – Includes discussions that highlight the right of immigrants to access city resources without fear due to immigration and/or citizenship status. This could also include wording that emphasizes ways in which

city resources could be made more accessible to residents from immigrant communities.

b. **Defending Immigrant Communities -** Includes discussions that state or imply the need to protect and defend immigrant communities against anti-immigrant contexts such as hate speech, heightened threats of deportation, immigration enforcement, etc.
c. **Due Process** – Includes documents that reference "due process", "constitution" or "constitutional rights" in the context of why local law enforcement agencies or city employees should not be enforcing federal immigration law. The jurisdiction of enforcing immigration law may also be referenced especially with regards to concerns about liability, but excludes discussions that only mention jurisdiction without reference to liability. This code also does not include general discussions about the equal treatment of all residents regardless of their race, ethnicity, or immigration status.
d. **Economic** – Any discussion that highlights the economic contribution of immigrants to their communities or the potential negative impact to the economy that might accompany the marginalization of immigrants. The economic contribution of immigrants can be emphasized by highlighting the economic functions immigrants provide as employers, employees, investors, and/or consumers.
e. **Human Rights** – Any discussion that frames defending immigrant communities as a human rights issue or any discussion that frames anti-immigrant practices as a violation or abuse of human rights.
f. **Legal Funds –** Any discussion that references programs or policies that are aimed at establishing a legal fund for marginalized immigrant communities. This will mostly pertain to specific ordinances that discuss the need to provide legal resources and representation to undocumented members of the immigrant community.
g. **Jurisdiction –** Any discussion that explicitly specifies the roles of local law enforcement agencies and/or city employees with respect to enforcing immigration law. "Jurisdiction", "authority" and "responsibility" are commonly the words used in discussion of who is in charge of enforcing immigration law.
h. **Inclusion and Participation –** Any discussion that emphasizes the need encourage and expand immigrant inclusion and participation within the community. This can include social, political, economic, and/or cultural forms of inclusion and participation.
i. **Protecting City Resources** – Any discussion that justifies decisions not to enforce immigration law on the basis of protecting city resources including those related to law enforcement. Language consistent with this code may point to the scarcity of city resources and the need to conserve resources in order to best serve residents. City resources should be interpreted broadly to include both financial and non-financial, and tangible and non-tangible (eg. time) resources.

j. **Trust and Cooperation** – Any discussion that emphasizes the need to build trust and cooperation between service providers and residents of the community. While "trust" and "cooperation" are commonly used words, "confidence in law enforcement", "strengthening communities", and "community-oriented policing" are also common phrases to emerge in documents that are centered around building trust and cooperation. Though not always the case, documents from law enforcement agencies often frame the need to build trust and cooperation as a necessary step in order to improve public safety.
k. **Stance** – Any discussion where the intended outcome is purely symbolic or to take an official stance on an immigration-related matter. This will often include municipal statements in response to legislation proposed at the state or federal level.
l. **Equal Treatment** – Any discussion that is aimed at ensuring the equal treatment of all residents regardless of immigration or citizenship status. This includes more general discussions that highlight the need to address or prevent discrimination.
m. **Diversity** – Any discussion that highlights the value of diversity that immigrants bring to the community. This includes efforts centered on celebrating, embracing, or recognizing diversity in culture, heritage, religion, race, color, and national origin. This code also encompasses language that highlights the importance of inclusivity.
n. **Family Unification** – Any discussion that highlights the objective of keeping families together, whether it is in reference to reuniting separated families or keeping already unified families from being separated.
o. **Contracts and Investments** – Any discussion of limiting or prohibiting contracts or investments that may indirectly or directly contribute to federal immigration efforts.

4. **Exceptions** – This code encompasses all references to all circumstances in which immigration enforcement is allowed despite any active pro-immigrant or sanctuary city policies or legislation. Immigration enforcement should be broadly interpreted to include inquiry into immigration status, cooperation with federal immigration authorities, and information sharing that could or potentially impact immigrant communities.

5. **Policy Orientation** – This category of codes provides more in-depth insight into the different types of pro-immigrant and sanctuary policies, including non-enforcement and non-cooperation policies.
    a. **Cooperation with Federal Immigration Enforcement Agency** – Any general statement that prohibits or limits cooperation with ICE or other federal law enforcement agencies without specifying the capacity of this cooperation. If the capacity of this cooperation is stated, content should be coded to something more specific listed below.

b. **Enforcing Federal Immigration Law** – Any discussion that asserts that city resources including local law enforcement will not be used to enforce federal immigration law.
c. **Inquiring into Immigration Status** – Any discussion that asserts city employees, including those employed by local law enforcement agencies, are prohibited from inquiring into the immigration status of residents. This includes asking for documentation with the intent of uncovering information on immigration status.
d. **Information sharing** – Any discussion that prohibits the use of city resources including local law enforcement for sharing information with federal immigration and law enforcement agencies. This can be broadly interpreted to include any information pertaining to the immigration status of an individual or any information that could jeopardize the immigration status of an individual.
e. **Surveillance** – Any reference to "surveillance" or "monitoring" of city residents based on immigration and/or citizenship status.
f. **Registration** – Any reference to a registration program or registry related to efforts to prevent terrorism and/or enforcing immigration law.

6. **Sanctuary status –** This category of codes pertains to ordinances and resolutions that specifically address the status of the jurisdiction as a "sanctuary city". While there are several unofficial lists of sanctuary cities compiled by various agencies including the Department of Homeland Security, many of these jurisdictions do not consider themselves to be "sanctuary cities". In fact, many jurisdictions insist on other labels to emphasize their pro-immigrant orientations. Information coded here refer to content that explicitly claim a name to describe a jurisdiction's pro-immigrant or sanctuary status, or content that reaffirms the jurisdictions pro-immigrant or sanctuary status.
    a. Sanctuary – Any municipal level document that claims the jurisdiction to be a "sanctuary city" or refers to the jurisdiction as a "sanctuary city".
    b. Welcoming – Any municipal level document that claims the jurisdiction to be a "welcoming city" or refers to the jurisdiction as a "welcoming city" or any indication that the jurisdiction is a member of the *Welcoming Cities Network*.
    c. City of Refuge – Any municipal level document that claims the jurisdiction to be a "city of refuge" or refers to the jurisdiction as a "city of refuge".
    d. Freedom City – Any municipal level document that claims the jurisdiction to be a "freedom city" or refers to the jurisdiction as a "freedom city".
    e. Undeclared – Any municipal level document that affirms the pro-immigrant orientation of its jurisdiction without officially adopting a name to describe itself. This can apply to any jurisdiction that specifically discourages the use of "sanctuary city" or some other name to describe itself, or any jurisdiction that simply lacks any official documentation in which the jurisdiction is referred to as a particular type of "sanctuary" or "pro-immigrant" city.

f. Other – Any municipal level document that indicates that the jurisdiction has adopted some sort of "sanctuary" or "pro-immigrant" name for itself that is not "sanctuary city", "welcoming city", "city of refuge", or "freedom city".