Introduction

On January 31, 2005, a group of Montgomery County, Maryland, elected officials, bureaucrats, and community leaders held a press conference at the site of a new day labor center, located in Wheaton, a suburb situated just north of Washington, DC. All the groups praised their collective efforts in opening this, the second formal worker center paid for, in part, by county tax dollars. The county leases the center space, while the day-to-day operations of the center are contracted through and managed by a long-standing local nonprofit organization named CASA de Maryland, which serves the Latino and immigrant populations in metropolitan Washington, DC, and Baltimore, Maryland. Unlike the informal hiring sites – such as street corners or parking lots of convenience stores or home improvement stores – where day laborers gather each morning hoping to sell their labor, formalized day laborer centers are designated as job pick-up sites. At these locations workers also receive shelter, job assistance, and the means to report unscrupulous employer practices and receive advocacy support, and if necessary restitution through legal channels.[1]

Standing with representatives of both public and nonprofit institutions at the construction site in Wheaton, county executive Doug Duncan announced, "I am confident that this center will build on the success of the county's first day-laborer site in Langley Park.... New immigrants have an entrepreneurial spirit and the thirst to work and be productive members of our community, and I am proud to help them help themselves to earn a living and support their families."[2] Gustavo

[1] Parts of this chapter first appeared in my doctoral dissertation, Frasure (2005) "We Won't Turn Back: The Political Economy Paradoxes of Immigrant and Ethnic Minority Settlement in Suburban America," University of Maryland-College Park. Portions of the opening narrative first appeared in Frasure and Jones-Correa (2010) "The Logic of Institutional Interdependency: The Case of Day Laborer Policy in Suburbia." *Urban Affairs Review*, 45: 451–482, and are used here with the permission of *Urban Affairs Review.*

[2] Doug Duncan served as Montgomery County executive from 1994 to 2006.

Torres, executive director of CASA of Maryland, responded, "Doug Duncan has made Montgomery County into a national model in responding sensitively and intelligently to the needs of day laborers." Tom Perez, a former member of CASA's board of directors and Montgomery County Council's first Latino president, further noted, "This center renews our commitment to include everyone in Montgomery County's economic development.... The successful partnership between business, government and CASA of Maryland has shown that matching employers and employees in a safe and organized environment benefit families, small businesses, and the community. The rising tide of ... redevelopment must lift all boats to succeed."[3] Maryland State Delegate Ana Sol Gutierrez added, "This new Wheaton day laborer employment center demonstrates clearly that Montgomery County values all its workforce and recognizes the contributions that all hard-working individuals make to the growth and strength of our state's economy.... I applaud the exemplary efforts of our County Executive and Council members for finding a solution that serves the growing workforce in the Wheaton area. We are helping to make Wheaton and my District 18 a great place to live" (Montgomery County News Release, 2005).

The range of political and nonprofit leaders present at this groundbreaking indicates a significant degree of political backing in Montgomery County for joint public-nonprofit initiatives and coalitions that address newly pressing public policy issues in suburbia, such as day labor. Such initiatives are neither uncontroversial nor costless. The rise of both informal and regulated or institutionalized day labor sites funded by public dollars violates perceived suburban norms regarding the use of public space and public funds, in addition to raising public safety, health, and other concerns among suburban residents. Day labor sites are a very visible appropriation of public space by people who many residents believe have no right to lay claim to suburban space. Informal day labor sites often raise the ire of local business owners and residents, spurring them to petition their local representatives to ban these sites or at least relocate them away from their vicinity. Adding fuel to the fire are charges by undocumented immigration watchdog groups, such as the Minutemen Civil Defense Corps and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), that local governments that regulate day labor centers are misappropriating public dollars to fund services for undocumented immigrants.

On August 17, 2005, just across the Potomac River in Fairfax County, Virginia, Mayor Michael O'Reilly and the city council of the suburb of Herndon approved a publicly funded, institutionalized day labor hiring center

[3] Perez is a civil rights lawyer. He was elected to the Montgomery County Council in 2002, where he served as council president from 2005 until the end of his tenure in 2006. He was appointed by Governor Martin O'Malley to serve as the secretary of the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation (DLLR) in 2007 until his confirmation to serve as U.S. assistant attorney general for the Civil Rights Division in 2009. He was confirmed as the secretary of labor for the Obama administration in July 2013. His affiliation with CASA de Maryland will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.

called the Herndon Official Worker (HOW) Center, which quickly attracted national attention. The local government, in collaboration with local churches and leaders of community-based organizations, contracted Project Hope and Harmony to facilitate the setup and operation of the center inside a former police station. In September 2005, the conservative political watchdog group Judicial Watch filed a lawsuit against the town of Herndon and Fairfax County for using taxpayer funds to establish the day labor center. Less than a year following the opening of the center, Herndon voters voted out of office the local officials who supported it, including the city mayor and several council members, replacing them with candidates who openly opposed the center's establishment (Osterling & McClure, 2008).

In the face of persistent local and national public outcry surrounding the center, coupled with strong opposition from anti-immigrant groups such as Help Save Herndon and the Herndon chapter of the Minutemen, as well as lobbying from 2006 Republican gubernatorial candidate Jerry W. Kilgore, the day labor center closed in September 2007, after operating for only twenty-one months. Thus, two suburbs undertook similar projects with similar public-private partners but experienced very different outcomes.

The preceding narrative reveals both how suburban jurisdictions are tackling issues not generally considered suburban concerns and how divergent local responses can be. To understand the new racial and ethnic politics in the United States and the policy responses of local governments to racially and economically marginalized communities we must turn our lens to the suburbs. This book is about the unprecedented rise of immigrant and ethnic minorities in American suburbs, and specifically, the development and implementation of the policy responses of local governments to these recent mobility patterns. For the purposes of this study a suburb is broadly defined as the remainder of a metropolitan area outside a primary city.[4] However, in this study I move beyond the traditional suburb-versus-central-city dichotomy and toward an examination of the racial/ethnic, cultural, economic, and political differences contained within various types of American suburbs, particularly those in multiethnic areas.

Today, most blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans reside in the suburbs. Yet scholars continue to rely on models developed when these groups were primarily urban dwellers to understand the politics of redistribution in the United States. To be clear, this book does *not* examine why certain suburban actors initially choose to provide controversial programs and services to immigrant, minority, and low-income groups in suburbia. Instead, I examine how public-nonprofit partnerships are developed, maintained, or dismantled through the implementation of controversial policies/programs that use, at

[4] Although a crude typology, this definition is consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) geographic classifications and is "easy to compute and readily understood" (Massey & Denton, 1988b, p. 596).

least in part, local tax dollars. I examine what actors such as elected officials, bureaucrats, and nonprofit leaders gain by developing partnerships toward policy development and implementation.

The Changing Face of Suburban America

This study serves as a corrective to the conventional wisdom of the urban politics and racial/ethnic politics literatures, which represent immigration and racial/ethnic diversity as concentrated in America's inner cities. Popular characterizations of American suburban life – ranging from 1950s and 1960s "feel good" family sitcoms such as *Father Knows Best* and *Leave It to Beaver*, to more contemporary films such as *Pleasantville* (1998) and *Revolutionary Road* (2008) – often portray suburbia as a bland, homogenous place. These depictions suggest suburbs are made up largely of white, upper-middle-income dwellers of Levittown-style tract homes. These residents are assumed to hold conformist ideals regarding family life and the domestic roles of women, to be politically conservative, and to be generally concerned with issues such as schools, low taxes, and maintaining small, localized, autonomous government. Yet most suburbs hardly fit this stereotype of tree-lined neighborhoods populated with "all-American" families like the Cleavers.

Despite the persistent stereotype that American suburbs are white and affluent, more than half of all racial/ethnic minority groups now reside in the suburbs of large metropolitan areas with populations exceeding 500,000. By 2000, 94 percent of immigrants lived in metropolitan areas, and of those immigrants, 52 percent lived in suburbs (Singer et al., 2001). Whites still reside in suburban areas in larger proportions than any other racial/ethnic group, growing from 74 percent in 1990 to 78 percent in 2010, but by 2010, 62 percent of Asians and 59 percent of Latinos also lived in suburbs (up from 54 percent and 47 percent, respectively, in 1990). In contrast, African American suburbanization grew little during that period, increasing by just 7 percent between 1990 and 2000 (from 37 to 44 percent). Black suburbanization finally crossed the 50 percent mark by 2010 (Frey, 2011). According to Frey, "Nearly half (49 percent) of growth in suburbs in the 2000s was attributable to Hispanics, compared to just 9 percent for whites. This contrasts with the 1990s, when Hispanics accounted for 38 percent of suburban growth, compared to 26 percent for whites and 36 percent for other groups" (2011, p. 4).

Many suburban school districts have been transformed from largely white to majority minority; so-called international corridors housing a variety of ethnic restaurants and other specialty shops have replaced nostalgic suburban "bedroom communities"; and increasing numbers of minority candidates have won election to local office. There is good reason to welcome these recent trends in suburban multiethnic diversity whereby heterogeneous groups of racial/ethnic minorities more readily make their way out of central cities, and some immigrants choose to bypass residence in the urban core altogether. However,

Nicolaides and Wiese offer evidence that by the late nineteenth century, American suburbs were already places of significant economic and class diversity, albeit what they term *segregated diversity*. As factories and other employers migrated to the suburbs so too did white, immigrant, and African American working-class families – although these groups settled in their own enclaves, separate from affluent suburbs (2006, p. 99). Nicolaides and Wiese write, "While the suburban periphery diversified, elite and middle-class Americans sought to maintain the exclusivity of their own communities. Through statutory, ideological, and cultural means, they reinforced both the barriers and internal meaning of their own elite suburbs. Neighborhood associations and restrictive covenants became the tools of segregation, operating at the local level" (p. 4).

Fueled by rising immigration from Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East, many U.S. suburbs, in particular those closest to urban cores and developed during or shortly after World War II, are shifting racially, ethnically, and economically at an unprecedented pace. These demographic changes are no longer simply from predominantly white to majority black; increasingly suburbs house a mix of native-born racial/ethnic migrants from central cities and international migrants, who move directly to American suburbs, bypassing the traditional ethnic succession process of initially residing in urban enclaves. However, the contemporary rise in minority representation in U.S. suburbs has not yielded substantial declines in residential segregation. Some suburban areas are paradoxically faced with increasing minority segregation and isolation rather than racial/ethnic diversity (Charles, 2003; Logan, 2003, p. 238).

Despite these developments, scholarship has been slow to recognize these demographic shifts and to analyze the dynamics of new population inflows of immigrants and ethnic minorities into suburbs and the implications for local politics. There remains little written on the politics of suburban government responsiveness to racial/ethnic minorities and immigrant newcomers (but see Graauw, Gleeson, & Bloemraad, 2012; Singer, 2012; Singer, Hardwick, & Brettell, 2008; Varsanyi, 2010; Walker & Leitner, 2011; Winders, 2012). We know very little about how recent suburbanization among immigrants and ethnic minorities is reshaping American political life and the exercise of American democracy (Oliver, 1999, 2001, 2003; Oliver & Ha, 2007; Singer et al., 2008). Unprecedented relocation of racial/ethnic minorities to American suburbs since the 1980s has resulted in close physical proximity among various racial/ethnic groups in these settings, with a host of social and public policy implications: How do "new neighbors" of varying cultural backgrounds (beyond the black-white binary) interact with and perceive their suburban environment? How do their local governments perceive and treat them? How do local institutional actors – such as elected officials, bureaucrats, and leaders of community-based organizations – in suburban jurisdictions address issues important to immigrant and ethnic minority groups (e.g., English as a second

language in public schools, translation services at public facilities, employment opportunities for low-skilled laborers)?

As immigrants and racial/ethnic minorities move to U.S. suburbs in unprecedented numbers, government actors in these jurisdictions increasingly find themselves balancing the allocation of local public goods and services between long-standing residents' and newcomers' interests. The persistent debates about the proper role of governmental and nongovernmental actors in the provision of local public goods and services only become more heated when the needs and demands of immigrants enter the mix, particularly if these immigrants are (or are perceived to be) undocumented. Given that suburbs face local budgetary constraints and a political environment likely to be averse to a change in the status quo, the reasons some immigrant and ethnic groups choose to move to certain suburban jurisdictions and the ways local institutions respond to these influxes are increasingly important to understand. Elected officials and the public at large have voiced their opposition to undocumented immigration through contested legislation such as California's Proposition 187 and Arizona's S.B. 1070.[5] Other groups, such as the Minutemen, target local communities more directly, setting up local branches in suburbs to deter local municipalities from funding organizations that provide social services to immigrants, both documented and undocumented.

This book sets forth theoretical and methodological goals important to the study of metropolitan governance, American racial/ethnic politics, and public policy. I use literature from political science, sociology, economics, and demography to develop a theoretical road map for advancing the study of immigrant and ethnic minority suburbanization. This book examines four factors related to new patterns of immigrant and ethnic minority suburbanization: why some racial/ethnic groups move to certain types of suburbs, how they interact with their neighbors, how they perceive their local governments' responsiveness to their needs and concerns, and finally, local governments' policy responses to demographic change.

Theoretically, this book challenges interpretations of constraints on local politics emanating from the traditions of public choice (Bish, 1971; Buchanan, 1971; Fischel, 2001; Peterson, 1981; M. Schneider, 1989a; Tiebout, 1956) and urban regime theories (Sanders & Stone, 1987b; Stone 1989; Swanstrom 1988). On one hand, public choice theorists suggest that when localities attempt redistributive programs (and pay for them through local taxation), suburban businesses and individuals will move to a jurisdiction with lower taxation

[5] Proposition 187 was a 1994 ballot initiative designed to bar undocumented immigrants' access to state-level social services including nonemergency health care and public education. The referendum passed but has since been declared unconstitutional. S.B. 1070 requires law enforcement officers to detain any individuals suspected of being in the country illegally, unless those individuals can produce documentation proving they are U.S. citizens or legal immigrants. It also bars state or local officials or agencies from restricting enforcement of federal immigration laws.

(with higher-income residents being more likely to move); hence, residents in local jurisdictions will sort out by class according to local taxation regimens. Therefore, redistributive programs of any kind are unlikely in the fragmented, competitive contexts of U.S. metropolitan areas, and are even less likely since the cuts to intergovernmental transfers from the federal government to states and localities during the 1980s. On the other hand, urban regime theorists argue that both economic imperatives *and* electoral politics matter. Local governments are constrained not only by tax burdens, but also by a political logic whereby public officials need to build and maintain electoral coalitions sufficient both to win office and to govern (Sanders & Stone, 1987b; Stone, 1989; Swanstrom, 1988). In other words, voters matter not necessarily because they will exit, but because they may choose to stay and exercise their voices at the ballot box, in which case public officials would like them to sing a tune in their favor. Therefore, any redistribution that occurs would be the result of electoral pressures as elected officials seek to maintain their governing coalitions.

I argue that both public choice and regime theories fail to explain the mechanisms that drive some suburban jurisdictions to work with nonprofit organizations in an effort to provide goods and services to lower-income, foreign-born, or racial/ethnic minority residents in the absence of either outside funding to underwrite redistributive spending (as public choice theorists would predict), or electoral pressures from voters acting as part of electoral coalitions (as regime theorists would predict).

In this book, I address what I refer to as the *suburban political economy dilemma* facing suburban institutions. This dilemma concerns how local actors address mounting redistributive concerns in the face of rapidly changing demographics in suburbia. I refer to the new suburban policy landscape as a dilemma because the provision of government services to immigrants and ethnic minorities goes counter to the predictions of the classic literature in local governance whose models require some reexamination. For decades public choice theorists suggested that the proper role of municipalities is the provision of local public goods and services that meet their economic development interests and the interests of their upper-income populations. They cautioned local governments to refrain from redistributive policies, which could perceivably raise taxes and induce flight. Such models were developed during the postwar period, when much greater flows of federal dollars served to develop and maintain the economic and racial/ethnic homogeny of suburban neighborhoods and concentrate minorities in the urban areas. During that era the practice of economic sorting across politically fragmented suburban areas was aided by exclusionary zoning, racial covenants, and other de jure and de facto policies that largely exempted suburban jurisdictions from dealing with the redistributive concerns their more diverse urban counterparts were facing.

Indeed, many suburban jurisdictions face a dilemma following the unprecedented exit of the non-Hispanic white population (either back to gentrified central cities or farther into exurbia) and a subsequent influx of lower-income

immigrant and racial/ethnic minorities, many who are noncitizens, ineligible to vote, or disinterested in voting. The increasingly heterogeneous context of many suburban jurisdictions arguably leads to the greater likelihood of redistribution. Today, by implementing programs to address the needs of struggling segments of their demographically diverse populations, institutional actors in these suburban jurisdictions are seemingly acting counter to their locality's economic development interests and the interests of the upper-income residents who are *still* their principal electoral constituents.

I examine the new political economy of fiscal austerity and the need to leverage or stretch scarce resources. I parse the institutional logic behind partnerships of local institutional actors that form to enact redistributive programs and policies benefiting immigrant and racial/ethnic minority newcomers in their increasingly diverse suburban jurisdictions. I argue that to get things done in the "new suburbia," local suburban bureaucracies often resort to outsourcing to nonprofit organizations to mitigate some of the cost of meeting the needs of immigrant and racial/ethnic minority newcomers in their jurisdiction. These collaborative efforts lead to a type of selective inclusion for actors otherwise kept away from the decision-making table. What is more, this form of selective inclusion in suburbia shines a light on the age-old question of politics: "Who holds the power?"

The political processes in post-1980s suburbia differ from those in force during past waves of European migration and the Great Black Migration to Northern cities during the early to mid-twentieth century. Yet new immigrants and racial/ethnic migrants such as African Americans enter a suburban space deeply stratified by race, ethnicity, and class and shaped through decades of systemic, institutional, and structural discrimination in American suburbs. The persistence of the American racial hierarchy, an ordering of political power among groups classified by race (Masuoka & Junn, 2013), further complicates who gets what, when, and how in suburban space. Moreover, the introduction of immigrant and ethnic minority issues into suburban politics often requires some redistribution of public resources. However, political machines and the political parties attached to them play lesser roles in incorporating suburban newcomers than was true for earlier waves of immigration and migration to urban areas.

Underscoring the institutional logic behind collective action to address controversial issues that require redistributive policy solutions, I argue that demographic shifts and fiscal austerity change how politics operates at the local level. Each suburban sector – elected officials, bureaucrats, and community-based organizations – has certain tangible and intangible resources at its disposal but also has constraints on these resources. Local bureaucracies may bring select nonprofit organizations into the fold in order to facilitate the incorporation of newcomers into the social, economic, cultural, and political life of suburbia. I examine the extent to which collaborations are formed and remain stable among unlikely partners. In order to explain how some suburban

institutional actors (particularly electoral, bureaucratic, and nonprofit) form unlikely alliances to advance policies and programs benefiting immigrants and racial/ethnic minorities, I advance a framework called *suburban institutional interdependency* (SII).[6] SII explores the intersection of suburban institutions and contemporary immigrant and ethnic minority incorporation in the United States. The fundamental logic of SII is simple and practical: through repeated interactions, some local public and nonprofit institutions build partnerships based on reciprocity and the exchange of selective incentives for cooperation. The institutional interdependency in suburbia also includes a division of labor and scarce resources that facilitates "getting things done" in the face of rapidly changing demographics and tightening local budgets. These symbiotic relationships between local suburban institutional actors are dynamic. Whereas some collaborative efforts are enduring and last beyond the specific public policy concern that precipitated the formation of the coalition, other alliances are volatile and can be disrupted by changes within the local environment, such as the strength of an opposition group or a regime change resulting from a local election. Haus and Klausen contend that

> we should avoid the harmonistic notions often connected with governance rhetoric, which suggest that 'common' problem solving and 'partnership' are keys to new modes of governance. Governance networks can be understood as a reaction to the crisis of traditional modes of governing, and there is no reason to believe that their creation and operation are free of conflicts and hegemonic strategies. In the end, some type of solution must be found in order to address the complexities of current problems, though it may well be that conflict and contestation play a productive role in the struggle for governance (2011, p. 458).

This research is influenced by the interdisciplinary work of scholars of local governance and public-nonprofit partnerships. The cooperative relationship between public and nonprofit organizations to respond to and solve municipal concerns spans decades (see de Graauw 2008; Marwell 2004; Salomon 1995). However, with few exceptions, this relationship has largely been understood from an urban or central city perspective. So what makes the framework of institutional interdependency appropriate for understanding local politics and governance in suburban areas, and perhaps distinct from its urban counterpart? The central tenets of institutional interdependency may prove generalizable in a variety of urban or rural settings. There are three factors related to centralized (city) versus fragmented/decentralized (suburban) government structures, which make SII particularly applicable (and important) to an American suburban context. First, distinct political jurisdictions and local (government) autonomy are, in many ways, the essence of suburbanization and the basis of local suburban politics (Oliver, 2003; M. Schneider, 1989a). Once a suburban municipality incorporates, the local government assumes

[6] Frasure and Jones-Correa, "The Logic of Institutional Interdependency."

control over the physical and social environment and may also become largely responsible for providing its own local goods and services, such as fire and police protection, libraries, parks, and public schools. Thus, the local market for public goods in suburbia is, to some degree, driven by a political economy that links the structure of local government to decisions about service and tax packages offered to residents (M. Schneider, 1989a). During the 1950s, amid rapid post–World War II suburbanization, public choice scholars argued that if government intervention occurred at all at the local level, it should be restricted to ensuring efficient allocation of local public goods (e.g., police and fire protection) with low taxes and a resistance to income redistribution, which could potentially raise taxes and induce (white) flight. The suburban jurisdictions developed around the country during the post–World War II era, from Levittown, PA, to Orange County, CA, served as a testing ground for such theories (Schneider 1989a).

Second, historically, the political incorporation of immigrant "consumer-voters" in urban centers was inextricably tied to their electoral incorporation (e.g., urban political machines). Unlike during earlier eras of immigration to urban centers, during the post-1980s wave of immigrant suburbanization, institutional responsiveness to newcomers' needs often preceded their political incorporation, at least in terms of their likely electoral mobilization (Frasure & Jones-Correa, 2010; Marrow, 2009). Many of the interdependent public-nonprofit partnerships examined in this book developed within a political environment but outside of traditional mainstream (urban) electoral politics framework: the most direct beneficiaries are often nonvoters, legal and undocumented residents.

Third, what makes the recent wave of immigration and racial/ethnic spatial mobility to suburbs and local responsiveness to these patterns unique from earlier waves in urban areas is the lack of federally funded redistributive programs to address the needs of newcomers to suburban areas. Scholars and practitioners in general are not optimistic about a great resurgence of federally funded redistributive programs, akin to the 1960s Great Society or War on Poverty programs, to address affordable housing or greater employment and educational opportunities for new immigrants, minorities, and low-income residents. This is despite the changing demographics of poverty or the growing "suburbanization of poverty" in the United States. As Kneebone and Garr contend, "Suburbs saw by far the greatest growth in their poor population and by 2008 had become home to the largest share of the nation's poor" (2010, p. 1). A study of poverty levels among U.S.-born and foreign-born residents in the nation's ninety-five largest metropolitan areas in 2000 and 2009 finds that foreign-born suburban dwellers experienced higher poverty (14.1 percent) than their U.S.-born counterparts (9.8 percent). Of the 2.7 million foreign-born poor in the suburbs, one of every five lived in poverty (Suro, Wilson, & Singer, 2011). However, as this book will underscore, many suburban initiatives to address the concerns of newcomers are funded, at least in part and not without