ACCEPTED – *Journal of the American Planning Association*

ACSP-AESOP SPECIAL SESSION
Learning from Arnstein's ladder: From citizen participation to public engagement

Engaging Non-Citizens in an Age of Uncertainty: Lessons from Immigrant-Serving Nonprofits in Los Angeles County

C. Aujean Lee[1]

[1] *Assistant Professor, Regional and City Planning, University of Oklahoma, aujean@ou.edu*

Abstract:

Problem, research strategy, and findings: Arnstein's (1969) ladder has informed how planners redistribute power among constituents and increase citizen participation. Since the late 1960s, the non-citizen population has increased in the U.S. This demographic shift has affected planning and community engagement because many immigrants experience disparate access to public goods and services more so than native-born residents. Non-citizens are also particularly vulnerable to shifting political landscapes due to citizenship status. I use 29 interviews with immigrant-serving nonprofits to identify unique challenges to serve non-citizen clients after the 2016 election. Immigrant nonprofit experiences are informative because they may be the first and only organization to provide non-citizens with services and resources in times of uncertainty. The interviews inform how planners can improve non-citizen engagement practices and redistribute political power. Interviewees highlight how non-citizens experience barriers to public services and spaces due to fear of deportation and abrupt changes in their citizenship status. As a result, non-citizens are selective in how and where they engage. Thus, they connect to informal and formal spaces that may exist beyond their neighborhoods. These experiences also increase non-citizen dependency on nonprofits. As planners improve immigrant incorporation through these considerations, they can improve how they balance power, constituent representation, and meeting residents' needs.

Keywords: immigrants; nonprofits; participatory planning; civic engagement

Introduction

Arnstein's (1969) ladder of citizen participation arose after the U.S. Civil Rights movement. Community-based grassroots organizations formed around this time to increase low-income resident public participation (de Graauw, 2016; Espiritu, 1992; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). The government also passed policies to increase and/or mandate participation through Community Action Programs and Model Cities programs to address poverty, urban renewal, social services, community development, and participation for the "have-nots" (Arnstein, 1969; Gittell, 1983).

Since then, the ladder has been used to conceptualize participation and the redistribution of power in planning processes (Grengs, 2002). Planners are still grappling with how to engage and increase participation among "the have-nots" who have become increasingly diverse in language, nationality, racial/ethnic composition, and citizenship/nativity status. Planners also manage conflicts in working with a changing public (Qadeer, 1997; Spain, 1993), particularly in the age of immigration.

After the 1965 Immigration Act, immigrants and migrants have steadily grown in numbers. Between 1970 and 2010, immigrants comprised 5% and 13% of the U.S. population, respectively (Frey, 2002; Singer, 2013). Before 1965, most immigrants arrived from Europe, Mexico, the Caribbean, and Central and South America; afterward, a majority migrated from Latin America and Asia (Tienda & Sanchez, 2013). A major reason for this shift is because the 1965 Immigration Act removed racially motivated national origin restrictions that limited immigration from Asian countries (Hing, 1993). Thus, between 1980 and 2018, Asian Americans grew from 2% to 6% of the population, and two-thirds were born outside of the U.S. (Frey, 2018; Gibson & Jung, 2005). During the same period, the Latino population increased from 6% to 18%, and one-third were foreign-born (Frey, 2018; Gibson & Jung, 2005). The 1965 Immigration Act was also the first time that refugees became a permanent migrant admissions category (U.S. Citizens and Immigration Services, 2019).

Several policies after 1965 also changed the composition of non-citizens, including the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, the Immigration Act of 1990, and the Homeland Security Act (Hing, 1993; Singer, 2013). The abrupt termination of the Bracero Program, which brought guest workers from Mexico between 1942 and 1964, also increased the number of undocumented immigrants (Tienda & Sanchez, 2013). These policies aligned immigration priorities with national security and law enforcement and created new statuses, designations, programs, and visas. Now, immigrants include refugees, asylees, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival (DACA), Temporary Protected Status (TPS), legal permanent residents or green card holders, unaccompanied children, H-1B visa holders, and undocumented residents. The Pew Center estimates that a quarter of immigrants are undocumented (Lopez et al., 2018). These groups interact with government agencies differently by their status, networks, legal rights, and language needs (Allen & Slotterback, 2017; Frasure-Yokley, 2015; Kim et al., 2017; Nicholls & Uitermark, 2016). Unless noted, hereon after I will use "non-citizen" to refer to people of multiple statuses and governmental designations who are not citizens by birth or naturalization.

The relationship between planners and non-citizens are also affected by unstable political contexts. The year following the November 2016 presidential election offers an example of changing immigration policies and incompatibility between local, state, and federal laws (McDaniel et al.,

2019; see also the following for summaries of policies: American Bar Association, 2018; American Civil Liberties Union of Washington, n.d.; Ballotpedia, n.d.; Mueller, 2018). For example, Los Angeles enacted sanctuary city laws, which limits cooperation with immigration enforcement agents and has led to conflicts with the federal government (Dola, 2018; Luna, 2018). In these moments of confusion and swift decisions, planners will experience additional challenges to engage with non-citizens.

The government has also shifted the responsibility of services to nonprofits (Alexander, 1999; Kisanne, 2010; Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Swack, 2006). These organizations first formed to address immigrant social needs and link immigrants to government agencies (Cordero-Guzman, 2005; Hung, 2007). Nonprofits have since increased their role in immigrant community development and in creating inclusive planning practices (de Graauw, 2016; Kondo, 2012; Sirianni, 2007; Vitiello, 2009). Nonprofits are also oftentimes the first and only organization to provide immigrant social services in times of uncertainty (Lee et al., 2018). Thus, immigrant nonprofits can offer lessons for how planners work with non-citizens in shifting political landscapes. These considerations are important because non-citizens support economic and neighborhood development, but also pose demands on public services, including schools and hospitals (Fishman, 2005; Kim et al., 2017; Vitiello, 2009). Planners are also asked to recognize "a special need to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged" by the American Institute of Certified Planners (2016) to meet short- and long-term community needs.

I examine how immigrant-serving nonprofits were affected in their ability to serve non-citizens after the 2016 election to inform how planners can engage with these communities. In uncertain political and policy contexts, non-citizens were challenging to serve because of their fear of deportation and/or changes in their citizenship status. Thus, these groups were fearful of using public services or public spaces. Non-citizens were also selective in how they engage with spaces because they may not use their right to assembly and fear of immigration services. As an alternative, non-citizens were more comfortable with nonprofits, religious institutions, transnational associations, and using social media to connect for services. Immigrant nonprofits also met important government gaps in services because they can offer specialized services. The findings offer three recommendations for planners, including how to spend concerted time to build trust with non-citizens, using alternative spaces to ensure non-citizen safety, and developing partnerships with nonprofits to support immigrant services and immigrant-friendly policies.

In the following, I describe how planners have or have not successfully engaged with non-citizens. I then highlight how immigrant-serving nonprofits have served an important role to increase non-citizen engagement and representation in planning. After, I summarize the method and the three findings and recommendations to increase immigrant engagement in planning practice.

Planners and Non-Citizen Engagement

Studies have documented when planners minimally engage with non-citizens. For example, planners oftentimes do not specify immigrant integration goals, even in jurisdictions with large foreign-born populations (Kim et al., 2017). In addition to a dearth of formal engagement plans, Vitiello (2009) argues that planners have been ambivalent or dismissive of immigrant needs by using rational planning, which claims to be "culturally neutral" (p. 246). Planners then assume a technical position

rather than political role (Grengs, 2002; Lauria & Long, 2017), which discourages them from tailoring engagement methods.

Yet, planners perpetuate unequal immigrant representation through these "neutral" practices and inadvertently address the needs of long-term white native-born residents.[i] Lung-Amam (2017) documented tensions in Fremont, California between older white residents and new middle- and high-income Asian immigrant homeowners over single-family housing regulations. The participation process favored retired white residents who had the time, resources, and knowledge of formalized planning processes. These residents understood public meeting formats, frequently met with planning staff, and researched ongoing applications for building permits. In contrast, immigrants had trouble understanding and speaking English, were not informed about meetings because notifications were only posted in English or circulated only to previous attendees, and/or could not attend meetings due to conflicting work schedules. After, planners passed zoning that favored white residents and insisted the process did not discriminate against immigrants. Harwood (2005) similarly outlined Orange County, California land use conflict cases. Planners claimed to represent all groups, but de facto supported long-term white residents when they did not translate information, left out racial/ethnic and immigrant composition data in reports, and chose to only include crime statistics for immigrant-tailored land use requests. Planners also maintained that race/ethnicity did not affect their decisions because these methods were widely accepted community engagement practices (Harwood, 2005).

Over time, some planners have sought to improve immigrant engagement. Allen and Slotterback (2017) describe how planners gathered Somali refugee feedback by working with Somali-serving nonprofits, translating outreach materials, and holding public meetings in the evening. Yet, planners did not meet their participation goals because they were unaware of or ignored religious, group, and cultural considerations, including Muslim holidays, gender dynamics, and high illiteracy rates. Non-citizens experience additional barriers to public agencies due to their citizenship status, which impacts access to employment, economic development, and housing (Kim et al., 2017). Further, increasing diversity forces planners to assess their own biases and cultural frameworks as they work through community nuances (Harwood, 2005; Umemoto, 2001).

Nonprofits and Non-Citizen Engagement

Immigrant nonprofits have increasingly bridged the gap between non-citizens and the government for several reasons. Government entities may not be equipped to work with diverse immigrant groups, which have numerous cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic needs (Lee et al., 2017; Vitiello & Acolin, 2017; Wilson, 2012). In contrast, immigrant nonprofits provide important culturally- and linguistically-tailored services (Hung, 2007; Roth et al., 2015). Consequently, immigrants and native-born residents have different institutional support networks. Immigrants who are not fluent in English and/or migrate from non-European countries may rely more on group-specific nonprofits while native-born residents can rely more on formal government agencies (Hung, 2007; Vitiello & Acolin, 2017). Furthermore, nonprofits have expanded their role in immigrant communities as the U.S. restructured and passed social service responsibilities to nonprofits (Alexander, 2000). The 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act particularly affected human service nonprofits because non-naturalized citizens were no longer eligible for welfare benefits, which increased the need for nonprofits to serve these groups (Trudeau, 2008).

Immigrant nonprofits have also expanded their functions and how they intervene for non-citizens. Historically, they focused on addressing immigrants' integration needs and preserving cultural identity (Hung, 2007; Kondo, 2012). Gradually, immigrant nonprofits began to push for political representation and redistribution of resources through advocacy or equity planning (Davidoff, 1965; de Graauw, 2016; Kondo, 2012; Krumholz & Forester, 1990). For example, immigrant nonprofits have asserted immigrant voices in district and community land use and development review processes by using staff technical and organizational skills to inform and engage these constituencies (Espiritu, 1992; Hum, 2010; Ito & Pastor, 2018; Sarmiento & Sims, 2015). Nonprofits also support immigrants in formalized ways, such as speaking on behalf of clients at public meetings (Zapata, 2009), holding positions on planning boards (Sandoval, 2018), and organizing for immigrant-friendly development contracts (Gonzalez et al., 2012). These organizations provide alternative spaces of engagement beyond public meetings or planning boards, such as community meetings to gather resident opinions (Hum, 2010) and rallies or other political actions to challenge planners and policymakers (Sandoval, 2018; Sarmiento & Sims, 2015).

While these organizations may improve non-citizen representation in the planning process, they simultaneously complicate planning processes. Immigrant nonprofits have their own realm of political actors and disparate power dynamics (Bryson et al., 2012). Similarly, planners need to be conscientious of a nonprofit's target audiences to avoid inadvertently prioritizing one immigrant population over another (Allen & Slotterback, 2017). Furthermore, political power and public engagement are complicated in jurisdictions with a "super diversity," or areas with large-scale migration and its resulting diversity in race/ethnicity, national origin, citizenship status, and socioeconomic status (Nicholls & Uitermark, 2016).

Immigrant nonprofits are key stakeholders and institutions that increase non-citizen engagement. However, what happens to non-citizen engagement when political climates shift against non-citizens? This study seeks to understand the challenges that immigrant nonprofits encountered after the 2016 presidential election with their non-citizen clients.

Evaluating Nonprofit Relationships to Non-Citizens

This study draws from 29 semi-structured interviews with executive directors or program staff of immigrant-serving nonprofit organizations with 501(c)(3) status. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 26 different organizations in Los Angeles County between July and December 2017. For three of the organizations, I conducted two interviews because they had programs from multiple sectors—for instance, health and legal services.

Interviewees were recruited in several ways. First, I used Guidestar.org, a nonprofit database that is searchable by geography, key words, and National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) codes to identify nonprofits in the target area.[ii] Among more than 12,000 nonprofits in the county, about 230 nonprofits were identified using the key word "immigrant." Of these 230 nonprofits, 48 had the NTEE designation of "ethnic/immigrant services." Additional online searches in newspapers were conducted to identify nonprofits that were active in immigration rights issues during 2016. Using these criteria, 68 organizations were contacted for an interview. Staff members who worked with

immigrant-related services were invited to participate; the executive director was contacted for smaller nonprofits. Other participants were recruited through snowball and convenience sampling.

Participants were asked about changes to client needs and immigrant engagement strategies after November 2016. Staff also described how they work with local, state, and federal governments and public agencies. Interviews were used because they provide insights into staff perceptions of client issues and trends across organizations (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Interviews lasted from 45 to 60 minutes and were audio recorded. Full transcriptions were analyzed using Dedoose.com, a qualitative coding website. I developed a coding dictionary through an iterative inductive process—interviews were reviewed to develop proposed themes, and parent and child codes were edited after analyzing additional transcripts (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Two graduate students validated the coding. Nonprofit names are kept anonymous to protect confidentiality.

Table 1 displays summary characteristics of interviewed nonprofits. On average, the organizations were granted 501(c)(3) status in the late 1980s, and nearly half of the organizations had about $1 million to less than $5 million in revenue. More than half also had fewer than 50 employees. Nonprofits differed in focus and intervention, ranging from advocacy groups to human service providers, legal services, mental health services, housing, and refugee issues; however, most provide more than one service. Twelve nonprofits focused on Latinos, ten targeted Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, two worked with Muslims, and four organizations served immigrants or refugees with no specific racial/ethnic group focus; two nonprofits served Latinos, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders. The majority of nonprofits offered services in Spanish, and some offered Asian or Middle Eastern languages.

Table 1. Characteristics of Interviewed Nonprofits, FY 2016

Year 501(c)(3) Status Established	**Number**
Before 1980	5
1980 to 1989	3
1990 to 1999	15
After 2000	3
Revenue	
Less than $500k	5
$500k to Less than $1 Million	3
$1 Million to Less than $5 Million	12
$5 Million to Less than $15 Million	4
More than $15 Million	2
Employees	
Less than 15	9
16 to 49	7
50 to 150	8
More than 500	2
Primary Activities *	
Civil Rights, Advocacy	9
Community, Neighborhood Development	6
Health Center/Community Clinic, Health Support Services	4
Legal Services	4
Youth Development	4
Human Services	3
Public Housing/Housing Development, Management	3
International Migration, Refugee Issues	2
Mental Health	2
Target Population	
Latinos**	12
Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders**	10
Muslim	2
Immigrants, Non-Specified	5
Non-English Languages Serviced	
Spanish	21
Korean	4
Arabic	3
Farsi	3
Khmer	3
Tagalog	3
Thai	3
Armenian	2
Cantonese	2
Japanese	2
Mandarin	2
Vietnamese	2
Type of Organization***	
Social/Legal Services	18

Grassroots Organizing	5
Advocacy	3

Source: Guidestar.org and online searches. Notes: Nonprofit Internal Revenue Service forms report revenue rather than budget, which can be used to assess size of organizations. *Based on NTEE code. The total does not sum to 26 because organizations may have multiple activities. **Some of these organizations serve both racial groups. ***Nonprofits organized by primary function, but some organizations provide multiple functions.

Los Angeles has had a consistent flow of immigrants since World War II (Singer, 2013), which has led to a robust network of immigrant nonprofits. About 17% of Los Angeles County was foreign-born in 2016 according to the American Community Survey—about 67% of Asian Americans and 39% of Latinos were immigrants. About 1 million undocumented immigrants are estimated to live in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, which is second to New York City (Passel & Cohn, 2017). Los Angeles is estimated to have nearly a third of Latino and Asian nonprofits of the 10 largest metropolitan areas (Hung, 2007).

Sampling may contribute to bias in the results. As with most nonprobability samples, respondents elected to participate and may have stronger opinions than those who did not participate in the study. Furthermore, potential participants may also differ from interviewees if they did not have the capacity to be interviewed for the study, which suggests interviewees may work in more established nonprofits. Second, there are no set guidelines for sample size needed in qualitative studies. However, data collection ended at the 29 interviews because preliminary analysis reached the point of saturation, or when no additional themes arose (Saunders et al., 2017). Further, immigrant-related politics changed nearly weekly or monthly during the 6 months of data collection. To address the goal of capturing nonprofit experiences immediately following significant political changes, the data collection period was limited to capture nonprofits reacting to the same political climate. Still, the findings provide in-depth insights about challenges of working with non-citizens in tumultuous political contexts and how planners can improve non-citizen participation.

Three Considerations for Non-Citizen Engagement

Non-citizens citizens experience disparate access to traditional forms of engagement. For example, those without citizenship or legal status typically cannot serve as public officials, vote in an election, and/or are ineligible for some public benefits.[iii] Nonprofit interviewees highlight how non-citizens experience additional barriers to public services and spaces for a few reasons. First, fear and safety concerns affected non-citizens because of increased cases of detention, arrests, and hate crimes after the 2016 election (Torbati, 2017; Williams, 2018). Second, non-citizens interact with spaces of engagement differently than native-born residents related to these fears. Third, these considerations increase non-citizens dependency on nonprofits. (Table 2 summarizes the findings.) The following includes quotations from staff members, which were edited only for clarification.

Table 2. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Non-Citizen Engagement Consideration	**Recommendation for Planners**
1. Increased fear and safety, depending on citizenship status • Uncertainty about how policy changes will affect various immigration statuses • Opting out of or being selective in what types of public benefits they use because of fear of deportation, losing benefits, or penalties	1. Spend more time with immigrants to build trust • Invest in frequent outreach efforts • Offer small incentives • Be proactive in ensuring immigrant safety • Prioritize multiple forms of translation
2. Different spaces for non-citizen engagement (local, state, national, transnational) • Limited access to public institutions, public spaces, and right to assembly out of fear of immigration services • Comfort with nonprofits, religious institutions, transnational associations, and social media • Connections beyond the neighborhood, including other countries due to deportations	2. Use alternative spaces for immigrant engagement • Ensure safety at existing public institutions • Incorporate small group or individual participation methods • Push for policies that decouple public institutions from immigration services • Hold community forums in anticipation of or in response to policy changes
3. Dependent on immigrant nonprofits • Nonprofits tailor approaches to service group • Government gaps in service • Nonprofits identify policies disproportionately affecting non-citizens	3. Develop partnerships with nonprofits • Establish partnerships with the public, private, and nonprofit sector • Generate funding sources that support nonprofit immigrant services • Collaborate with nonprofits to create immigrant-friendly policies

1. Fear and Safety Concerns

Nonprofits reported that non-citizens of varying immigration statuses had concerns about their safety, changes in immigration status, and deportations. With anti-immigrant rhetoric, members were also

afraid that their legal rights could be taken away. Families were left to make critical decisions about whether they should access public services they are entitled to use.

Interviewees explained how clients were concerned for their family's safety in this context. A participant described how non-citizens were targeted for participating in public events: "[A DACA activist] spoke at a press conference, and then the next day, she was detained… and her mom first was picked up for collateral where ICE [Immigration and Customs Enforcement] was collaborating with the sheriffs." This fear extends to clients who are undocumented: "You have these rights as an immigrant. However, if you have an outstanding deportation order, a criminal conviction, a common name, or someone in your apartment had one of these things, you might be at risk." There are other incidents that ICE agents arrest people who live or work nearby raids who are suspected to be undocumented even though the raid was targeting other individuals (Burnett, 2017; Jacobs, 2018; Sanchez, 2017; Sheets, 2017).

Clients also experienced an increase in hate crimes and discrimination. One staff noted, "Hate crimes reported to us rose significantly in the month following the election, more reports than we'd gotten last year, and this is when hate crimes are underreported." Another interviewee observed, "What is more concerning for our members is the old-school white supremacy that happened through the election…with increases in discrimination and being told to go home when you're getting gas."

Additionally, non-citizen clients were apprehensive that the government would suddenly end their immigration program, which would change their immigrant status and legal rights. A staff member shared how clients approached their organization the day after the election:

> There was a lot of tears, a lot of worry, if people are on temporary protection status, or a family member who's awaiting asylum, what's gonna happen? My sister is undocumented, what will happen to her? We were meeting the next morning and at 9 o'clock, people had already gotten calls and messages from their family members and were feeling worried, afraid.

Another interviewee was surprised how "even green card holders were calling us, asking if they can be taken away or if they can travel because people are living in fear of their status." These fears are exacerbated for refugees from a country that persecuted its people: "Our community history and trauma just make them untrusting of the government." Consequently, non-citizens of all statuses were afraid of changes to their programs and whether they would be at risk of deportation.

This distress limited non-citizen access to public resources. Low-income clients were selective in what kinds of assistance they applied for and used because of concerns that the government will track them. A staff member explained: "Clients will receive services from us, but they don't want to apply for food stamps or Medi-Cal because they're worried that the government will deport them." Similarly, a participant noticed, "Clients are hesitant in applying for government services because they feel it would draw attention to them, and they might get penalized." Non-citizen concerns were also elevated due to shifting and unpredictable federal regulations about public programs (Shear & Baumgaertner, 2018). An interviewee used the example of public charges: "The leaked memo about

public charge… didn't become official policy but had a dramatic impact. Our community members weren't applying for public benefits lest they be considered a public charge and not get to stay."

These described fears limit non-citizen access to other services that are assumed to be accessible. A prominent example was public schools. A staff highlighted how students were afraid of attending school: "We're working with school-based children, maybe their parents are not documented, so they don't know if they come home from school one day that their parents might not be there." Alternatively, students opted out of school because of uncertainties around their immigration status. An interviewee explained: "When I was at [High School], staff mentioned that chronic absenteeism has gone up because students, they're new immigrants, they'd rather not go to school." Another staff shared parents' perspectives about deportation: "Parents drop their kid to school and they are worried, should I take my kid?"

2. Non-Citizen Spaces of Engagement

Similar to public resources, non-citizens make decisions about being visible in spaces of engagement based on perceived risk. Thus, non-citizens may not exercise their right to assembly because of their concerns around fear and safety. A staff describes client concerns:

> We didn't think much of public press conferences, protests, or rallies because [in Los Angeles] it's a low-risk activity, but that changed after Trump was inaugurated and ICE targeted undocumented activists. All of a sudden organizing became very high risk, and not normal … We have to be realistic that for a lot of our members it's more than just fear, it's a really intense, dramatic, material consequence if something does happen.

However, this fear of public rallies depends on citizenship status. For example, one interviewee noted how in their campaign for immigrant workers' rights, "Undocumented members won't participate, but those who came out have papers or are citizens." A staff shared another example of clients changing the scale of engagement: "We haven't had as much success in overt forms of organizing, like taking a busload of clients to Sacramento [for lobbying], but we have clients testify at meetings or hearings." These examples show how non-citizens have differential comfort to freedom of speech and assembly than native-born residents in precarious contexts.

Moreover, the neighborhood has been an important geographic unit for the community reinvestment movement (Dreier, 2003) and neighborhood revitalization programs (Martin & Pentel, 2002). Yet, non-citizens may practice democracy or engage with entities beyond their immediate neighborhood, including nonprofits, religious institutions, transnational associations, and social media (Sandoval, 2013; Sarmiento & Beard, 2013; Veronis, 2013). For example, a staff member described their monthly immigration clinics: "We do not have a physical space but we establish relationships with churches to create semi-permanent locations for our immigration consultations." Another interviewee similar shared, "We go out and do advocacy workshops at mosques."

Nonprofits also engage with international agencies and organizations to serve clients who migrated from countries that have agreements with the U.S. to receive deportees. One interviewee described how "few TPS people are going to return to their nation of origin because the situation is worse than

what they're facing here." Many of these individuals are ineligible to apply for permanent residency, and some of these clients sought to cross the Canadian border. To provide cautious information, the nonprofit worked with the Canadian Consulate "to clarify what is the process if someone decides to cross the border into Canada fleeing the unfriendly immigrant policies of the current administration." Other organizations with clients from countries designated for TPS also collaborated with transnational nonprofits to be informed of and influence international agreements.

Non-citizens also used social media to work with immigrant nonprofits across national borders. A participant described how a deported client contacted their organization through Facebook because "his family was left behind, and he wanted help for them to follow him to [home country]. We helped him and used [this incident] to educate our community about when you are arrested and deported." Immigrant nonprofits then use these informal spaces online to further assist their clients.

Finally, when more public spaces were inaccessible, some nonprofits encouraged clients to meet in private spaces. One nonprofit had members meet at home "instead of our membership meetings" to "find different ways for people to resist, like I'm going to your house and you're inviting two neighbors and do an informal Know Your Rights [workshop]." These organizations understand how to use spaces that feel safe for non-citizens that take place in formal institutions—such as places of worship or nonprofits—and informal spaces. These organizations also consider how clients are affected by national and international policies beyond neighborhood borders.

3. Dependence on Immigrant Nonprofits

Non-citizens are dependent on immigrant nonprofits for several reasons. First, the government may not provide services for this group. As a result, nonprofits have developed and/or are mandated to offer specialized services. Furthermore, non-citizens rely on nonprofits because of language barriers, distrust of the government, and fear due to citizenship status. As previously described, nonprofits understand these challenges when assisting clients, and many nonprofits served clients beyond their city or county who do not have alternate resources (see also DeVita & de Leon, 2012). They also identify ways that non-citizen clients are disproportionately impacted by government policies, which affect client willingness to engage politically.

Immigrant nonprofits serve important functions for non-citizens because of their tailored approach, which bridges gaps in governmental services. One critical gap is in-language services for non-citizens. Kondo (2012) described how government agencies might not prioritize translation services for non-English residents, by not placing translators at the front of a meeting and not leaving enough time for translation of speakers during meetings. Similarly, an interviewee explained: "There is a gap in services because they don't have [our language] speakers on staff, so those who used to receive services no longer receive help." Eventually, this organization became a government subcontractor to help with translation in these services.

Nonprofits also mediate in more serious cases when government agencies do not provide translators. A case with Southeast Asian workers illustrates this point. A nonprofit was alerted that a restaurant was raided by "the Board of Equalization [BOE] for tax evasion so the owners are criminals." However, the staff discovered that "workers were handcuffed, and they [BOE] brought in sheriffs,

though we know the workers are being exploited and they're not a threat." However, BOE did not "take measures to bring people in that speak their own language to explain what's going on, so [the workers] were scared out of their minds." The organization then stepped in to clarify that the workers were not involved in the crime.

Government agencies and programs also may not reach out to non-citizens to inform them of their rights. One nonprofit staff "noticed that people were not using their benefits and were hesitant to go show up at clinics because they heard there was an [ICE] agent that went into the hospital." She then detailed their follow-up process:

> So we enroll somebody, then at 30 days we confirming they got in, and then at 6 months that they used their benefits. At 6 months, people were saying no, I haven't used my benefits, so we'd say, let me help you make an appointment.

This example illustrates how immigrant nonprofits specialize their non-citizen services when government agencies fail to educate non-citizens about their legal rights and benefits.

Furthermore, immigrant nonprofits have a deep understanding of their clients' needs and how they are disproportionately affected by policies. An interviewee explained how their members struggle with naturalization requirements:

We have a population that was not able to learn English and don't qualify for the English or Civics Test waiver for naturalization, and now we're trying to figure out how they'll pass [naturalization] exams …the English and Civics waivers are for seniors and you have your green card for 20 years. But since our community is newer, they don't have their green cards for that long and a lot of our seniors have difficulty learning English.

This nonprofit understand the special needs of their senior clients and roadblocks for members who seek to become citizens.

This issue also extends to intersections of the immigration and criminal justice systems. Nonprofits found ways that minor infractions would escalate clients' risk of deportation. One participant described the situation of her refugee clients from Southeast Asia, who arrived at a young age:

Our clients grew up in high poverty, crime areas here, have criminal records [from] when they were younger, served their sentence, did their time, and then they were re-integrated into the community, and now have families, full time jobs. But because of this past record, they're on a deportation list.

Some of these crimes were minor, such as breaking a window as a teenager. Yet, the way the criminal system charged these clients, there are at high risk of deportation. A different nonprofit described their work on street vending, which was considered an infraction in Los Angeles municipal code. When clients did not show up to court "because there was a new fear with the anti-immigrant rhetoric and executive order on fast-tracking deportations," their infractions turned into misdemeanors and "could put them on the list to be deported." In collaboration with others, this nonprofit successfully decriminalized this municipal code.

Three Recommendations for Non-Citizen Engagement

Immigrant nonprofits utilize several strategies for planners to build trust with non-citizens and increase public participation. The following describes three tactics (see Table 2 for a summary).

1. Spend Concerted Time to Build Trust

Non-citizens are not an efficient group for planners to engage with for several reasons. First, some non-citizens require significant outreach efforts before they may attend their first meeting. However, this absence does not equate to these groups not needing services. An interviewee detailed how the organization engages with their hard-to-reach population:

> There are nuances into outreaching and educating our members before they are even open to receive services. We provide some initial, tangible resources to our members before they're even open to receiving other services and it's all about building trust and relationship.

An example resource is enrolling potential clients in Low Income Energy Assistance, which can decrease utility bills. After a client sees this benefit," we get our foot in the door and then we can have more conversations about their other needs." Planners can offer some small incentives for public participation meetings to build trust. Kondo (2012) also described how an immigrant nonprofit offered families a $25 gift card for Target as an incentive to attend meetings.

Nonprofits also recognize they need to be proactive to maintain trust with non-citizen clients, particularly those who are concerned about deportation or their immigration status changing. For instance, a participant spent extra time to communicate to clients: "our first priority is to protect their confidentiality, and that we don't cooperate with immigration services looking for information about client immigration status." These messages retain clients who "want to drop out of treatment because they think, if I move, I might be harder to find [for ICE]." Another interviewee described how "we sent letters to our families just letting them know that this is a safe organization and we're here to support them."

These efforts may include more translation efforts for non-citizens who do not speak English comfortably. A staff member described their tactics with schools: "We'll work harder to outreach at schools because immigration [ICE] is going to the schools. We'll hold hands with the school and hire more Spanish-speaking staff to work with families because the language would increase trust." Planning departments may already work with translators or hire staff who can speak another language. However, an interviewee demonstrates how planners can implement multiple forms of translation:

> Many immigrant members never had formal education in this country… there are no materials in their language to know about these issues so someone is bilingual, they'll write a kind of memo, and then makes a presentation, these are the key issues, key player in how things happen. We also do some spontaneous translations.

This example shows how planners can create brief written translations, prepared oral translated remarks at the start of a meeting, and additional translations as needed throughout the meeting. By doing so, planners would prioritize translation before, the start of, and throughout meetings. These efforts also signal to non-English speaking non-citizens that planners understand that language issues are about "meaningful access" rather than simple interpretation (Wilson, 2012).

2. Use Alternative Spaces of Engagement for Non-Citizens

Planners can use other spaces to engage non-citizens, and/or using creativity in community events. As previously described, immigrant nonprofits work to engage non-citizens in nonprofits, religious institutions, transnational associations, and informal spaces. Also, planners can push for formal policies that ensure non-citizen safety.

Nonprofits use multiple spaces for constituent participation (Hum, 2010; Sarmiento & Sims, 2015). One organization member further explained their approach:

> We committed to do regular town halls here so that members had access to us and could ask questions. We had our first one the same weekend as the first iteration of the Muslim ban, and we're trying to be ahead of the curve though things are constantly changing.

Interviewees did not indicate a preferred type of space, but rather a multipronged approach and the importance of holding meetings in anticipation of major policy changes. For instance, a nonprofit held community meetings on important dates with government agencies: "The day of the election, we had to have a forum to talk to our immigrant families about their rights." Another nonprofit also held Know Your Rights workshops with the mayoral office immediately upon anticipation of major policy changes: "When the decision [to end DACA] happened, the Mayor's office called us and we said, okay let's do DACA workshops."

These meetings were accessible to non-citizens because a trusted immigrant nonprofit organized it at a non-government venue. These strategies are similar to Hum's (2010) example of nonprofits holding community events at a foundation rather than community board meetings that are otherwise inaccessible to immigrants. Additionally, planners need to understand the timing of meetings. They can schedule forums and workshops in anticipation of major changes, which will help assure non-citizens that planners are looking out for their interests and well-being.

When public buildings are used, planners can push for measures to ensure that non-citizens are not concerned about their immigration status when participating. Los Angeles nonprofits worked with policymakers to decouple public institutions from immigration services. After, in October 2017, California legislation passed A.B. 699 (2017), which prohibits schools from collecting immigration status information of students and their families.

Alternatively, some non-citizens may hesitate to attend public meetings because of their concerns around safety and citizenship status. Consequently, an interviewee explained how "we work more on the 1-on-1 because even when we do an action or event inspired and led by the community, most of them don't come out." Planners may also need to incorporate individual and/or small group

participation along with posting information on social media with nonprofits or other community institutions.

3. Partner with Nonprofits

Planners also can collaborate with the nonprofit sector to involve non-citizens in governmental processes because these institutions dedicate significant resources to build trust with this population. As previously described, nonprofits are important intermediaries with planners and government agencies. These relationships will prevent planners from "parachuting" into non-citizen communities to gather community knowledge without developing lasting mutual connections.

These partnerships can encompass the public, private, and nonprofit sector to generate new funding and foster policy buy-in (Ashley, 2014; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). An organization describes one such example: "Private philanthropy, the county, and the city provided funding for nonprofits to provide legal services around deportation defense. It took 6, 7 months of advocacy with [our Coalition] and engaging our elected officials." This partnership created more than half a million dollars in funds. The interviewee continues to describe the benefits with public partnerships because they can share clients' issues with government agencies "to inform policies and what elected officials need to do now, not in 6 months."

These collaborations can lead to immigrant-friendly policies (de Graauw, 2016; Wilson, 2012). An interviewee described how a state senator approached this organization "with the California Religious Freedom Act. It's not something that we brought up with him, so we've seen senators and city council putting forth motions, and resolutions." Through continued relationships, this elected official was proactive in passing pro-immigrant measures, which helps immigrants feel safe regardless of religious affiliation.

Planners can redistribute power and increase immigrant engagement through similar partnerships. Interviewed nonprofits have established networks to help a broader group of clients, such as connecting with other organizations that specialize in indigenous or uncommon languages. These collaborations would benefit planners who may not have the resources to develop tailored engagement.

An "Imagined Future" with Non-Citizens

The findings summarize how planners can redistribute power and build trust to improve non-citizen engagement, particularly in rapidly changing political contexts. I offer several insights about non-citizens' needs, including increased concerns about fear and safety, restricted access to resources and spaces, and dependency on nonprofits. These findings provide planners with methods to strengthen ties to immigrant communities, including spending time to build trust, using alternative engagement, and partnering with nonprofits.

Planners should understand how issues disparately affect non-citizens by immigration status and context. Groups that are at risk of deportation may experience the highest levels of concern—this group includes undocumented individuals, legal permanent residents, and refugees from countries with repatriation agreements with the United States. Low-income non-citizens will be concerned

about loss of benefits, while non-citizens of all socioeconomic statuses may be confused about their legal rights. Non-citizens who are not fluent in English will require more in-language assistance. Planners may also need to spend more time to build trust with refugees and other migrants who arrived from countries with oppressive governments.

It is important to acknowledge other constraints that will affect planners. Some planners or planning departments may not be equipped to design specialized interventions due to time and resources. When planners cannot implement the first two recommendations, they can focus on supporting immigrant nonprofits, which provide organizing skills and socioeconomic and political infrastructure in immigrant communities (Hung, 2007; Sandoval, 2018; Sarmiento & Sims, 2015).

Planners are also limited by their jurisdictions and political context. First, they may be constrained by state and city policies. Planners in sanctuary cities have more protections to assist non-citizens than planners in jurisdictions with anti-immigrant policies meant to exclude immigrants (Gilbert, 2009). Regardless, all planners can inform constituencies of their legal rights, regardless of status. Second, elected officials and planners may experience tension because of their different objectives. Elected officials aim to win elections and represent their voting constituents; planners aim to reflect the larger public's interests, but are constrained by elected officials (Beckman, 1964; Harwood, 2005). Consequently, planners are embedded in the politics of the planning commission, elected officials, and other government agencies, which may disagree with planners' recommendations (Harwood, 2005).

These considerations can help planners cope with uncertainty from changing demographics and political contexts (Christensen, 1985; Frey, 2002). As Spain (1993) described, "The issue facing planners is how to facilitate the transition from the imagined past to the imagined future" (p. 157). This transition includes shifting planning engagement of long-time residents ("the imagined past") to include new non-citizens ("the imagined future). These incremental practices will not resolve the broken immigration system. Immigration reform is a long process, and any reforms will likely result in multiple immigration statuses. Still, planners can be unwavering in using inclusive practices to increase non-citizen participation and/or representation as the country undergoes waves of federal backlash and support for immigrants.

Acknowledgements

This article was partially funded through the support of the Institute on Inequality and Democracy at UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs. Additional research support was provided by Rachel B. Wells, Susan Baik, and Silvia R. Gonzalez. Thanks to Bryce Lowery, Dwayne Baker, and the three anonymous reviewers for their comments and feedback.

References

A. B. 699, 2017 Reg. Sess. (California 2017). Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB699.

Alexander, J. (1999). The impact of devolution on nonprofits: A multiphase study of social service organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 10,* 57-70.

Allen, R., & Slotterback, C. S. (2017). Building immigrant engagement practice in urban planning: The case of Somali refugees in the Twin Cities. *Journal of Urban Affairs.* doi: 10.1080/07352166.2017.1360745

American Bar Association (2018). The Trump immigration agenda: Timeline of events January 2017 – August 2018. Retrieved from https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/immigration/trump_immigration_agenda_timeline.pdf.

American Civil Liberties Union of Washington. (n.d.) Timeline of the Muslim Ban. https://www.aclu-wa.org/pages/timeline-muslim-ban#.

American Institute of Certified Planners. (2016). "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct." Retrieved from https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/document/AICP-Ethics-Revised-AICP-Code-Professional-Conduct-2016-04-01.pdf.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35*(4), 216-224.

Ashley, S. (2014). The impact of government funding on competition in the nonprofit sector: An integrative model and review of empirical research. *Nonprofit Policy Forum, 5,* 289-305.

Ballotpedia. (n.d). Timeline of federal policy on immigration, 2017-2020. https://ballotpedia.org/Timeline_of_federal_policy_on_immigration,_2017-2020.

Beckman, N. (1964). The planner as a bureaucrat. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 30*(4), 323-327.

Bryson, J. M., Quick, K. S. Slotterback, C. S., & Crosby, B. C. (2012). Designing public participation processes. *Public Administration Review, 73*(1), 23-34.

Burnett, J. (2017, July 20). "Riding with ICE: 'We're trying to do the right thing.'" *National Public Radio.* Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/2017/07/20/537894936/ice-not-apologizing-for-aggressive-tactics.

Christensen, K. S. (1985). Coping with uncertainty in planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 51*(1), 63-73.

Cordero-Guzmán, H. R. (2005). Community-based organisations and migration in New York City. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31*(5), 889-909.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 31*(4), 277-295.

de Graauw, E. (2016). *Making immigrant rights real: Nonprofits and the politics of integration in San Francisco.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

DeVita, C. J., & de Leon, E. (2012). Latino organizations and immigrant integration in the Washington, DC, region. *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations, 17*, 155-180.

Dola, M. (2018, August 1). "Appeals court rules Trump can't withhold funds from California 'sanctuary' cities." *Los Angeles Times.* Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-sanctuary-9th-circuit-20180801-story.html.

Dreier, P. (2003). The future of community reinvestment: Challenges and opportunities in a challenging environment. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 69*(4), 341-353.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fishman, R. (2005). The fifth migration. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 71*(4), 357-366.

Frasure-Yokley, L. (2015). *Racial and ethnic politics in American suburbs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frey, W. H. (2002). Three Americas: The rising significance of regions. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 68*(4), 349-355.

---. (2018). The US will become 'minority white' in 2045, Census projects. *Brookings Institute.* Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/03/14/the-us-will-become-minority-white-in-2045-census-projects/.

Gibson, C., & Jung, K. (2005). *Historical Census statistics on population totals by race, 1790 to 1990, and by Hispanic origin, 1970 to 1990, for large cities and other urban places in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Gilbert, L. (2009). Immigration as local politics: Re-bordering immigration and multiculturalism through deterrence and incapacitation. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 33*(1), 26-42.

Gittell, M. (1983). The consequences of mandating citizen participation. *Policy Studies Review, 3*(1), 90-95.

Golash-Boza, T., & Darity, Jr., W. (2008). Latino racial choices: The effects of skin colour and discrimination on Latinos' and Latinas' racial self-identifications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(5), 899-934.

Gonzalez, E. R., Sarmiento, C. S., Urzua, A. S., & Luevano, S. C. (2012). The grassroots and New Urbanism: A case from a Southern California Latino community. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability, 5*(2-3), 219-239.

Grengs, J. (2002). Community-based planning as a source of political change: The transit equity movement of Los Angeles' Bus Riders Union. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 68*(2), 165-178.

Guidestar. (2019). National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) classification system. Retrieved from https://learn.guidestar.org/help/ntee-codes.

Harwood, S. A. 2005. Struggling to embrace difference in land-use decision making in multicultural communities. *Planning, Practice & Research,* 20(4), 355-371.

Hing, B. O. (1993). *Making and remaking Asian America through immigration policy: 1850-1990.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hum, T. (2010). Planning in neighborhoods with multiple publics: Opportunities and challenges for community-based nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 29*(4), 461-477.

Hung, C.-K. R. (2007). Immigrant nonprofit organizations in U.S. metropolitan areas. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(4), 707-729.

Ito, J., & Pastor, M. (2018). *Sustaining people power: A report to the California Endowment.* Los Angeles, CA: USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity.

Jacobs, B. (2018, April 25). "ICE arrests 8 at Highland apartment building." *Chicago Tribute.* Retrieved from https://www.chicagotribune.com/suburbs/post-tribune/news/ct-ptb-ice-highland-arrests-st-0426-story.html.

Kim, A., Levin J. and Botchwey, N. (2017). Planning with unauthorized immigrant communities: What can cities do? *Journal of Planning Literature, 33*(1), 3-16.

Kisanne, R. J. (2010). The client perspective on nonprofit social service organizations. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 29,* 632-637.

Kondo, M. C. (2012). Immigrant organizations in pursuit of inclusive planning: Lessons from a municipal annexation case. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 32*(3), 319-330.

Krumholz, N., & Forester, J. (1990). *Making equity planning work: Leadership in the public sector.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lauria, M., & Long, M. (2017). Planning experience and planners' ethics. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 83*(2), 202-220.

Lee, C. A., Wong, K., & Pfeiffer, D. (2017). On the frontlines of immigrant homeownership: Asian American nonprofits during the Great Recession. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 46*(6), 1209-1230.

Lopez, G., Bialik, K., & Radford, J. (2018). Key findings about U.S. immigrants. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/11/30/key-findings-about-u-s-immigrants/.

Luna, T. (2018, June 20). "Round 1: California and Trump clash in court over 'sanctuary state' law, Capitol Alert." *The Sacramento Bee.* Retrieved from https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article213476009.html.

Lung-Amam, W. (2017). *Trespassers?: Asian Americans and the battle for suburbia.* Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Martin, J. A., & Pentel, P. R. (2002). What the neighbors want: The neighborhood revitalization program's first decade. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 68*(4), 435-449.

McDaniel, P. N., Xiomara Rodriguez, D., & Wang, Q. (2019). Immigrant integration and receptivity policy formation in welcoming cities. *Journal of Urban Affairs.*

Mueller, Z. (2018, August 8). An ongoing timeline of Trump's separation of families. Retrieved from https://americasvoice.org/blog/family-separation-timeline/.

Nicholls, W. J. & Uitermark, J. (2016). Migrant cities: Place, power, and voice in the era of super diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *42*(6), 877-892.

Passel, J. & Cohn, D. (2017). 20 metro areas are home to six-in-ten unauthorized immigrants in U.S. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/02/09/us-metro-areas-unauthorized-immigrants/.

Qadeer, M. A. (1997). Pluralistic planning for multicultural cities. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 63*(4), 481-494.

Roth, B. J., Gonzales, R. G., & Lesniewski, J. (2015). Building a stronger safety net: Local organizations and the challenges of serving immigrants in the suburbs. *Human Services Organizations: Management, Leadership, & Governance, 39*(4), 348-361.

Sanchez, T. (2017, July 29). "ICE shows up to apartment complex looking for undocumented Hayward man, arrests two others instead." *The Mercury News.* Retrieved from https://www.mercurynews.com/2017/07/29/ice-shows-up-to-apartment-complex-looking-for-undocumented-hayward-man-arrests-two-others-instead/.

Sandoval, G. F. (2018). Planning the barrio: Ethnic identity and struggles over transit-oriented, development-induced gentrification. *Journal of Planning Education and Research. First Published August 15, 2018.*

----. (2013). Shadow transnationalism: Cross-border networks and planning challenges of transnational unauthorized immigrant communities. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 33*(2), 176-193.

Sarmiento, C. S., & Beard, V. A. (2013). Traversing the border: Community-based planning and transnational migrants. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 33*(3), 336-347.

Sarmiento, C. S., & Sims, J. R. (2015). Facades of equitable development: Santa Ana and the affordable housing complex. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 35*(3), 323-336.

Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., Burroughs, H., & Jinks. C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: Exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & Quantity, 52*(4), 1893-1907.

Shear, M. D., & Baumgaertner, E. (2018, September 22). "Trump Administration aims to sharply restrict new green cards for those on public aid." *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/22/us/politics/immigrants-green-card-public-aid.html.

Sheets, C. (2017, March 1). "ICE raids have 'blown up' in Alabama since Trump immigration orders went into effect." *AL.com.* Retrieved from https://www.al.com/news/2017/03/ice_raids_have_blown_up_in_ala.html.

Singer, A. (2013). Contemporary immigrant gateways in historical perspective. *Daedalus, 142*(3), 76-91.

Sirianni, C. (2007). Neighborhood planning as collaborative democratic design. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *73*(4), 373-387.

Smith, S. R., & Lipsky, M. (1993). *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spain, D. (1993). Been-heres versus come-heres: Negotiating conflicting community identities. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 59*(2), 156-171.

Strauss, A., & Corin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd edition).* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Swack, M. (2006). Social financing. In R. G. Bratt, M. E. Stone, & C. Hartman (Eds.), *A right to housing: Foundation for a new social agenda* (pp. 261-278). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Tafoya, S. (2004). *Shades of belonging.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/reports/35.pdf.

Tienda, M., & Sanchez, S. (2013). Latin American immigration to the United States. *Daedalus, 142*(3), 48-64.

Torbati, Y. (2017, December 5). “U.S. deportations down in 2017 but immigration arrests up.” *Reuters.* Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration/u-s-deportations-down-in-2017-but-immigration-arrests-up-idUSKBN1DZ2O5.

Trudeau, D. (2008). Junior partner or empowered community?: The role of non-profit social service providers amidst state restructuring in the US. *Urban Studies, 45*(13), 2805-2827.

Umemoto, K. (2001). Walking in another’s shoes: Epistemological challenges in participatory planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 21*(1), 17-31.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2019). “Refugee timeline.” Retrieved from https://www.uscis.gov/history-and-genealogy/our-history/refugee-timeline.

Veronis, L. (2013). The role of nonprofit sector networks as mechanisms for immigrant political participation. *Studies in Social Justice, 7*(1), 27-46.

Vitiello, D. (2009). The migrant metropolis and American planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 75*(2), 245-255.

Vitiello, D., & Acolin, A. (2016). Institutional Ecosystems of Housing Support in Chinese, Southeast Asian, and African Philadelphia. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 37*(2), 195-206.

Williams, A. (2018, March 23). “Hate crimes rose the day after Trump was elected, FBI data show.” *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2018/03/23/hate-crimes-rose-the-day-after-trump-was-elected-fbi-data-show/?utm_term=.8b3218dc16f6.

Wilson, C.E. (2012). Collaboration of nonprofit organizations with local government for immigrant language acquisition. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 42*(5), 963-984.

Zapata, M. (2009). Deliberating across differences: Planning futures in cross-cultural spaces. *Policy and Society, 38,* 197-209.

---

[i] About 4% of non-Hispanic whites were foreign-born according to the 2017 5-year American Community Survey. The following cases use the category "white" to describe non-Hispanic whites. However, there is evidence that some Latinos may identify or mark the category "white" (see Golash-Boza & Darity, Jr. [2008] and Tafoya [2004]).

[ii] The Internal Revenue Service categorizes nonprofits by the NTEE system (Guidestar, 2019). Categories include health care; environment; civil rights, social action & advocacy; community improvement & capacity building; employment; and human services. NTEE categories that specify immigrants are subcategories under human services (P84) and minority civil rights (R22). Many immigrant-serving nonprofits are then categorized based on other functions, such as housing, health care, human services, or education. Nonprofits can also be categorized by multiple NTEE categories. Many nonprofits in Los Angeles also service immigrants because their service area or target geography has a large foreign-born population.

[iii] There are some unique cases where non-citizens can be appointed to planning boards.